Strasbourg, 31/01/2023

CEPEJ(2022)8rev1

Part 1

EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR THE EFFICIENCY OF JUSTICE (CEPEJ)

Study on the functioning of judicial systems in the EU Member States

Facts and figures from the CEPEJ questionnaires 2012 to 2021

Study prepared under the authority of the Working Group on the evaluation of judicial systems (CEPEJ-GT-EVAL)
for the attention of the European Commission (Directorate General Justice)

Part 1 - Data tables per indicator for all EU member States

Generated on 13/1/23 12:03

Methodology

The methodology used for this study completely follows CEPEJ methodology for its biennial evaluation using a questionnaire for evaluating judicial systems. This Scheme is filled by the CEPEJ's national correspondents, whose responses are statistically processed and analysed by the Secretariat of the CEPEJ.

With the data collected, the CEPEJ has built a database to compare situations and developments between the member states (when such comparisons are scientifically consistent).
Such inter-governmental work requires permanent dialogue and full transparency with the member states of the Council of Europe.

- **Data collection, validation and analysis**

Numbers indicated between brackets following the letter Q refer to the questions of the CEPEJ questionnaire.

From a methodological point of view, and with a commitment to quality, consistency and comparability of the data supplied, data collection is primarily responsibility of the CEPEJ's national correspondents. The national correspondents are the unique interlocutors of the Secretariat when collecting new data. States providing such data are liable for the quality of data used in the survey.

According to CEPEJ methodology, an extensive work is carried out by the CEPEJ Secretariat to verify the quality of the data submitted by the correspondents. This quality check process requires a certain time in order to guarantee the reliability of the quantitative and qualitative data to be finally presented to European Commission.

The reference year for the last data collection is 2021. As for previous cycle, wherever data is not possible to obtain notation NA (not available) is used. Only in exceptional cases and only for questions that are used for standardisation, CEPEJ can accept previous cycle data. This data is population, GDP per capita and average annual salary.

The study itself is based on 2021 data as well on previous cycles (every year, starting with 2012) wherever evolution and trends are presented. "
The selected ICT questions for this cycle are limited to only few and the answers are presented in its original form without calculationg an index.

- **The quality of data**

The reader should bear in mind and always interpret statistical figures presented (including in the country fiches) in the light of their attached narrative comments.

The CEPEJ has chosen to process and present only the data which offered a high level of quality and accountability: it decided to disregard figures which were too different from one country to another or from one exercise to another without sufficient explanations, or when they did not present sufficient guarantees of reliability. For some issues covered by this study, no data could be provided. This could mean that none were available, that the data could not be collected as such or that no data meeting these requirements had been provided within the deadline set.

- The following abbreviations have been used in this study:

NA: data not available;

NAP: data non applicable;

CR: Clearance Rate;

DT: Disposition Time.

Methodological disclaimer

1) The data analysed have been provided by the member states until beginning of December 2021 and have then been validated during quality control process finalised beginning of December 2021. Amendments provided by member states after the delivery of this study may appear in future reports, as CEPEJ's database is regularly updated. This also explains why previous cycle data updated on the day of this delivery, may not always fully coincide with the data published in previous CEPEJ reports and studies (even sometimes replacing data with "NA").

The validation has been made according to CEPEJ's methodology. However, the full reliability of data depends mostly on the data providers. It should be kept in mind that the accuracy of some entries was confirmed by national correspondents without specific explanation on potential discrepancies.

2) Some data cannot be compared with previous data since the questionnaire was modified between the different evaluation cycles.

3) It should also be noted that the minimum, maximum, average and median values in certain tables are calculated with quantified data (excluding answers "NA" or "NAP").

4) The CEPEJ works in full transparency vis-à-vis the member states as regards the purpose of the data collection exercise. According to CEPEJ methodology, only the final version of the study can be disseminated, after possible comments from the member states. Before the final version of the study, all the data collected remains confidential. When using data provided by the CEPEJ in public reports, European Commission should always mention "Source: CEPEJ data". If CEPEJ data are presented together with other data, the source of the different data must be clearly mentioned.

5) Certain indicators as well as variations might apear as outliers only because of small absolute numbers. This could be the case of small countries, In this case the indicator or variation is not considered as relevant.

CEPEJ(2022)8rev1 - Part 1

Executive summary

English version

Since 2012 The European Commission has requested the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) of the Council of Europe, to conduct a study aimed at analysing the situation of the judicial systems in the EU member States based on the specific methodology developed and used by CEPEJ for evaluating the functioning of the judicial systems of Council of Europe member States.

This study is based on collecting, processing and analysing data and comments provided by member States through:

selected data among those collected for the CEPEJ evaluation cycles (years of reference of the data: 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020) .

and specific questionnaires (for years of reference 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019 and 2021)

This study will constitute one of the sources used by the European Commission for the "EU justice Scoreboard".

Structure of the study

Following the last proposed technical specifications provided in the framework of the contract No JUST/2020/JACC/PR/RULE/0159 CEPEJ/European Commission, the study, based on 2021 data and also presenting the evolution in relation to 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017,2018, 2019, and 2020 data, is structured in two main parts:

the first part examines the judicial systems in the European Union (EU) member States providing data tables per indicator for all member States ;

the second part contains country profiles for each EU member state separately, with a contextual analysis.

Main elements

The study, trough the 8 indicators, provides an overview of the functioning of the justice public service based on the elements, selected by the European Commission and which, according to the CEPEJ, are constitutive of the effectivity and quality of judicial systems.

Human resources

Different categories of judges (professional, occasional, non-professional) can serve the justice system. The 2021 study focuses on professional judges sitting in courts and the European Union average for this category of judges is 22 judges per 100 000 inhabitants (the median is 24,1 judges per 100 000 inhabitants). The lowest number of professional judges per 100 000 inhabitants is 3.3 and the highest is 42,4. Both median and average values have slightly increased between 2020 and 2021 (Table 7.1.1a).

It can also be noted that the change compared with previous cycle shows that number of judges per 100 000 inhabitants increased for more than 1% in 13 member States, whereas it decreased by more than 1% in only four country which confirms the mentioned trend of increased median and average values. The remaining countries have reported smaller changes in numbers which can be interpreted as a normal fluctuation of human resources within a system.

This number depends considerably on the organisation of the judicial system and the existence of occasional judges, non-professional judges or even *Rechtspfleger* .

The existence alongside professional judges of competent staff with defined functions and a recognised status is essential for the quality and efficiency of a judicial system. A distinction is made between the five types of non-judge staff:

- the "Rechtspfleger" function),
- the non-judge staff whose function is to assist judges directly,
- the staff responsible for administrative matters such as court management,
- the technical staff,
- and other types of non-judge staff that fall outside of all the categories mentioned above.

The analysis of data provided by the member States shows different trends for the average and median values. Since 2012, the average number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants has increased (+1,2%) while the median decreased (-6,4%). Compared with the last cycle, the average in 2021 also shows an increase (+1,5%) whereas median decreased slightly (-0,8%). The European Union median of the non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants is 58,5 with lowest as 22,3 and highest as 164. (Table 7.2.2a)
13 countries have staff with "Rechspfleger" functions (or equivalent) and no changes since 2012 has been observed. (Table 7.2.1)
In this cycle, for the second time, the CEPEJ Study for the EU Justice Scoreboard includes prosecution services. The diversity in activities of the prosecution services are evident and the number of prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitant varies in European Union from minimum 2,4 to maximum 23,9 with an average of 11,4 and median of 10,8 prosecutors per 100 000 inhabitants. Compared to the previous cycle, the average value increased by +1,7%, whereas median increased more significantly (+9,4%). (Table 7.3.1)
The prosecutors are assisted in their work by non-prosecutor staff attached to the prosecutors' offices. Their number varies largely in the Member States from 0,5 to 42,2 non-prosecutor staff per 100 000 inhabitants with an average 15,2 and median 14,7. Compared to the previous cycle, the average value decreased slightly (-0,8%), whereas median decreased more notably (-3,7%). (Table 7.4.1)

Lawyers

The average number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants in the EU member States has generally had an upward trend since 2013 with only small drops in 2016. However, between 2020 and 2021 a decrease of average value has been identified (-1,2%) while median value increased by 2,2%. (Table 7.6.1)
Even if the southern States seem to have larger bars (number of lawyers per 100 000 inhabitants), the wide dispersal of values, also verifiable with the number of lawyers per professional judge, is also likely to indicate a considerable heterogeneity within the tasks actually carried out by qualified persons and persons entitled to plead in accordance with national law, to act on behalf of his clients, to practice law, to take part in judicial proceedings or to advise and to represent their clients in legal matters (Definition of the lawyers' legal practice in accordance with the Recommendation Rec(2000)21 of the Committee of Ministers, Council of Europe).

Judicial organisation

The study distinguishes three types of courts:

- ordinary courts with jurisdiction in all matters for which jurisdiction has not been assigned to a specialised court – their enumeration is made as legal entities
- specialised courts of first instance and those of higher instances, also considered as legal entities
- courts, at all levels and of first instance, as geographic locations

Since 2012, 15 countries have reduced their number of geographical locations, 2 have same number and 10 increased it. Between the last two cycles, 6 countries increased, while only one country reduced number of courts' geographic locations (Table 2.2b).
The geographical locations per 100 000 inhabitants has decreased in most of the member States (the median was 1,71 per 100 000 inhabitants in 2012; 1,52 in 2015 and 1,43 in 2021 which is -16,4% decrease). The average shows a smaller decrease of -5,3%. (Table 2.3b)

As regards the distribution of the disputes between legal entities, all the EU member States except Czech Republic and Hungary have specialised courts of first instance.

The existing specialised courts deal mainly with administrative cases (78% of countries) , with disputes related to the application of labour legislation (41%) and commercial cases (41%). (Table 2.4a)

Significant number of countries have also other not mentioned specialised courts (41%). While majority of countries have few types of specialised courts there are some that have many specialised courts for different matters like Spain and Portugal but also Austria, Cyprus, France and Italy. France, Portugal, Malta and Cyprus also have large number of specialised courts of 1st instance compared with all courts of 1st instance (83%, 75%, 64% and 63% respectively) (Table 2.2a). There are few more countries with many different types of specialised courts, but they qualified them as “Other” so they cannot be easily compared with other systems.

This year for the second time the data on higher instances specialised courts was collected. Expectedly, their number is smaller than the 1st instance. Few countries have many specialised courts dealing with different cases on higher instances. In most of the other countries that have higher instance specialised courts, they concern administrative matters. There are also some higher instance military courts as well. There are also 4 countries that have specialised courts on 1st instance but no specialised courts on higher instances. (Table 2.3b).

Legal aid

Legal aid is one of the fundamental elements guaranteeing equal access to justice for all individuals. It is intended to provide, particularly for citizens without sufficient financial resources, the benefit of legal assistance for free or limited expenses.

Legal aid comprises two aspects, clearly distinguished by certain States:

- on the one hand, aid for access to law (legal information and advice, aid for an alternative to trial – ADR alternative dispute resolution),
- on the other hand, aid in asserting one's rights in the context of a judicial action as applicant or defendant in a trial.

Consequently, the CEPEJ drew up the following typology to quantify the resources allocated to legal aid:

- cases not brought to court with regards to aid for access to law
- cases brought to court with regards to aid for assistance or representation within a framework of litigation.

In all countries of the European Union, legal aid applies to both representation in court and legal advice. Concerning fees that are related to the enforcement of judicial decisions, in most of the countries (20) legal aid is covering these fees, whereas only 7 countries do not include this as part of legal aid (Table 5.3). Also, regarding other costs (for example fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries), travel costs etc.), legal aid covers them in most of the states. In 19 states legal aid can be granted to cover these costs in both criminal and other than criminal cases while in 5 states these costs can be covered only in other than criminal cases.

The number of cases for which legal aid has been granted varies from 0,07 to 4,05 cases per 100 inhabitants. The average in 2021 is 1,13 while the median is 0,84 cases per 100 inhabitants (Table 5.4.2). 41% of the countries are not able to provide this data.

ADR - Alternative Dispute Resolution measures

In various European countries, the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) measures is now widely accepted among the public and legal professionals. It contributes to the improvement of effectiveness of justice by providing courts users with alternatives to a regular judicial procedure.

There are different types of ADR in the member countries:

Mediation: refers to a voluntary trial in a non-binding private dispute settlement in which an impartial and independent third party assists the parties in facilitating discussions aiming to resolve their difficulties and to reach an agreement.

Court-related mediation: within this type of mediation, there's always an intervention of a judge and of a prosecutor who facilitates, advises, decides and/or approves the procedure.

Conciliation: the main objective of a conciliator is to reconcile, most of the time he/she will do so by seeking for concessions. He/she may make suggestions to the parties aimed to settle a dispute. The conciliator has more power

Arbitration: the parties choose a neutral third party - an arbitrator whose final decision is binding. The parties may present evidences and testimonies to the arbitrators. Sometimes, several arbitrators are appointed to work as a court. Arbitration is most widely used for commercial disputes settlements because it provides a greater confidentiality.

Court-related mediation exists in all States, essentially in civil and commercial spheres. (Table 8.2)

It could be noted that the median number of accredited or registered mediators per 100 000 inhabitants has strongly increased since 2012 (from 9,5 in 2012 to 16,2 in 2021). This may contribute to strengthen awareness of the member States that having a high level of trained mediators supports the policies of enhancement of ADR.

Performance of the courts and public prosecution services

One of the essential components of the proper functioning of courts is related to the respect of the fair trial principle within a reasonable time (Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights). This principle should be taken into account whenever analysing the workload of the court, the length of procedures and the specific measures to reduce the length of delays in proceedings and to improve the efficiency.

The CEPEJ has chosen to develop efficiency court indicators on the European level.

The first indicator is the Clearance Rate (CR) which indicates the capacity of the courts and judicial system to deal with the inflow of new cases.

The second indicator is the calculated Disposition Time (DT). This ratio between pending cases and resolved cases (in days) shows the theoretical duration for a court to solve all the pending cases.

When analysing the efficiency of the courts it is important to look at both indicators together and its evolution over time.

However, interpreting data from different cycles should be done with caution, due to the specific situation caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and to some extent in 2021. This is why further observations are required to fully understand tendencies on both EU and individual countries' level.

Civil and commercial litigious cases

Looking at the CR for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases, it should be noted that almost every year since 2012 the EU median has been equal or over 100%. The only exception is year 2020 when CR reached 98% as the impact of COVID-19 measures affected the work of courts the most during this year. In 2021, EU median returned to the level above 100% with 102,5%. Comparing individual countries' data for 2021 and 2020, most of them (18) show improved CRs, with the highest increases registered in Spain, France and Ireland (+16,1, +14,3 and +11,3 percent points respectively). On the other side, five countries experience decreases of the CR with more notable drop in Denmark with -13,4 and Malta with -12,5 percent points. To understand fully this comparison between the cycles, we need to look if the number of incoming and resolved cases increased or decreased during these two years. The data shows that the average number of incoming cases increased by +3,8% compared to 2020, but the average number ofeal with the total or partial settlement of the concerned litigation. The court shall, on the request of the parties, issue a decision in accordance w

Looking at table 3.3.2 we see that in majority of countries (17) the number of resolved civil and commercial litigious cases increased in 2021. Many countries had a significant increase above 10% (such as Croatia, France, Italy, Malta and Spain). Only 6 countries experienced decrease of resolved cases in this category.

As regards the Disposition Time, it should be noted that 16 member states decreased their DT compared to 2020. More specifically, 9 countries decreased it by more than 10%, 4 countries from 5-10%, 3 countries from 0-5% and only 5 countries increased their DT. This trend in countries is not surprising considering that number of their resolved cases generally increased more than incoming. This led to the decrease of pending cases at the end of 2021. Increase in the number of resolved cases combined with decreases of pending cases inevitably causes drop of the DT due to the construction of this indicator.

All these tendencies seem to be a logical consequence of return to the more normal pace of work in courts after the termination of the most restrictive anti-pandemic measures. However, EU average value of DT decreased only slightly and the median even increased which might be interpreted as a warning that it will take more time to counter-balance all the negative effects of the pandemic.

Administrative law cases

Compared with other categories of cases in EU in general, administrative cases have highest Disposition time of 400 days on average compared with 411 days in 2020 and 347 days in 2019. They take notably longer time than the civil and commercial cases that need 292 days on average in 2021.

The number of countries that decreased their Disposition Time for administrative cases is 15, whereas 10 countries increased disposition time. 7 countries decreased the DT significantly (more than 10%), such as Romania, Belgium, Austria, Czech Republic. 6 decreased moderately and 10 increased DT among which some significantly (above 10% increase) such as Malta, Slovenia, Latvia, Slovak Republic, Estonia. (See table 3.3.6.).

Clearance Rate decreased in 15 countries, out of which significantly in 7 countries (above 10 percent points) among whom particularly large drop was recorded for Cyprus, Malta and Greece (above 30% percent points).In spite of CR decreases in majority of the member states, 14 countries managed to still keep it above 100%. Increased CR is identified in 10 countries among which Romania, Belgium, Netherlands and Hungary had above +10 percent points increase (See table 3.3.4).

As evident from this analysis, administrative cases have not demonstrated such clear general trends as civil and commercial litigious cases. In order to have a precise picture, CR and DT of individual countries will have to be analysed on a case-by-case basis and contextualised with regard to the evolution of the number of incoming and resolved administrative cases in their respective systems.

Criminal law cases

This is the second year in which criminal cases will be reported as part of this study. Consequently, the focus will be only on 2021 and 2020 data without comparison with previous data.

Looking at the efficiency indicators for the first instance criminal cases, it is immediately notable that CR was not very high in 2021 as EU average is 97,7% while median was on a borderline level of 100%. However, this still represents a significant improvement compared to 2020 when average value for the whole European Union was 92,9% whereas median was at the level of 95,2%. Furthermore, in 2020 only three countries achieved CR over 100% while in 2021 half of the EU member States reached this level. At the end, it is important to note that 21 countries improved their CR while only two decreased its level in 2021 which leads to a conclusion that although generally CR could be at the higher level, it does

Regarding Disposition time, the situation seems to be more favourable than in Civil and commercial litigious and administrative law cases. The situation also improved compared to the last year. In 2021 the average is 161 and median 134 whereas in 2020 the average value was 194 days and median was at the level of 139 days. The improvements are visible also on the individual countries' DTs as 16 states reduced it while only 5 countries rose its level. The maximum values were again observed in Malta (566 days) and Italy (399 days) but both states showed improvements compared to 2020. The lowest DT was recorded in Estonia (31 days) and Hungary (43 days) same as in 2020. (Table 3.15.2 and 3.16.5)

Although the CR ad DT in criminal cases show improvements after year 2020 that was the most affected by the global pandemic, the situation should still be closely monitored. The level of CR lower than 100% was reported in half of the states which might lead to backlog formation and corresponding increase of DT in the future years. Therefore, affected states should put efforts to prevent such negative developments. Also, countries with very high DT should continue reducing it toward average or median EU levels in future years.

Public prosecutors: Total number of 1st instance criminal cases

This is the second year in which public prosecutors' cases will be reported as part of this study. Consequently, the focus will be only on 2021 and 2020 data without comparison with previous data.

During 2021, the average value of cases received by public prosecution services in the European Union was 3.1 cases per 100 inhabitants. The number of cases processed was at approximately same level. (Table 4.1.2) The median showed the same tendency with slightly lower values (2.9 for both incoming and resolved) probably because the average was affected by the very large number of cases reported for some of the countries, such as Luxembourg with 9,0 incoming and Denmark with 7,0 processed cases. Similar tendency and average values were recorded in 2020, with slightly lower median values.

Out of processed cases, there were 1,4 discontinued cases per 100 inhabitants (median value); 0,2 cases concluded by a penalty, or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor; 0,3 cases closed for other reasons; and 0,5 cases were brough to courts.

Looking at the individual countries, it is interesting to note that out of 21 systems that provided relevant data, 11 states have more processed then received cases, whereas in 10 states received outnumbered processed cases which might potentially lead to accumulation of backlogs in the respective prosecution services. Comparing the number of processed cases as percentage of received cases over the last two cycles, it could be concluded that 13 states managed to improve this ratio which indicates better efficiency in their work in 2021 compared with 2020.

System for measuring and evaluating the functioning of courts

In a lot of countries many fields of courts activity (case flow, courts' decisions, length of proceedings) are undergoing evaluation and follow-up procedures. In terms of court management, arrangements for regular monitoring of the activity are made everywhere in Europe. These are intended to review the day-to-day activity of courts through data gathering and statistical analyses.

Same as last cycle, the majority of countries use performance or activity indicators at court level. The number of countries that defined qualitative standards is above half of the EU members (16 states as in table 1.1).

Regular evaluations seems to be standard in courts in all but 2 EU member states (Table 1.3). In prosecution services this number is slightly lower where 21 EU member states have regular evaluation while 7 do not do this regularly (Table 1.6).

The use of information technology (IT) in courts and for the benefit of court users

While initially acting as a simple support tool for productivity, the information technology (IT) is always one of the major levers for improvement of the efficiency of courts. The increasing role of the ICT in assisting strategic decision making and improving productivity and efficiency, is indeed based on the extraordinary possibilities of the automation of tasks and the inevitable general technological progress.
Compared with previous cycles and considering that the number of questions selected for this study varies, CEPEJ has decided to only present the data collected without any additional calculation of indices.

Table 6.1 shows that only 2 countries in EU do not have writing assistance tools while in the others these tools are very present and majority of the countries (over 65%) reported 100% deployment rate on these tools in all three matters.

Similarly for the voice recording tools only 2 countries did not report on presence of these tools in courts. The present tools are installed in all courts in 68% of cases for all matters. In 8 countries these tools include voice recognition feature. (Table 6.2)

The workload of judges is measured with an ICT tool in all but four countries. In most of the cases (15 countries of 23 having the tool) this feature is integrated within the Case management system. These tools are visibly more present for judges then for prosecutors both on national and on court/local level. (Table 6.4)

Version française

Depuis 2012, la Commission européenne a demandé à la Commission européenne pour l'efficacité de la justice (CEPEJ) du Conseil de l'Europe de réaliser une étude ayant pour objet l'analyse de la situation des systèmes judiciaires dans les Etats membres de l'UE, basée sur la méthodologie propre développée et utilisée par la CEPEJ dans le cadre de l'évaluation du fonctionnement des systèmes judiciaires des Etats membres du Conseil de l'Europe.

Cette étude s'appuie sur la collecte, le traitement et l'analyse des données et commentaires communiqués par les Etats membres au travers de :

- données sélectionnées parmi les données collectées dans le cadre de cinq cycles d'évaluation (données des années de référence 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018 et 2020)
- et de questionnaires spécifiques (pour les années de référence 2013, 2015, 2017, 2019 et 2021).

Cette étude sera l'une des sources utilisées par la Commission Européenne pour rédiger le « Tableau de bord de la justice dans l'UE ».

Structure du rapport

Conformément à la dernière proposition technique rédigée dans le cadre du contrat No JUST/2020/JACC/PR/RULE/0159 CEPEJ/Commission Européenne, l'étude porte sur les données de 2021 et leurs évolutions par rapport aux données de 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 et 2020. Elle est divisée en deux parties :

- la première décrit les systèmes judiciaires des Etats membres de l'Union européenne (UE) à l'aide de tableaux de données par indicateur pour tous les Etats membres ;
- la seconde contient des fiches par pays, qui réalisent une analyse contextualisée pour chaque Etat membre de l'UE.

Principaux éléments

L'étude, au travers de 8 indicateurs, dresse un état des lieux relatif au fonctionnement du service public de la justice sur la base des éléments sélectionnés par la Commission Européenne parmi ceux qui, d'après la CEPEJ, sont principalement constitutifs de l'efficacité et de la qualité des systèmes judiciaires.

Ressources humaines

Plusieurs catégories de juges (professionnels, occasionnels, non professionnels) peuvent contribuer au système judiciaire. L'étude 2021 se concentre sur les juges professionnels siégeant dans les tribunaux et la moyenne de l'Union Européenne pour cette catégorie de juges s'élève à 22 juges pour 100 000 habitants (la médiane est de 24,1 juges pour 100 000 habitants). Le nombre le plus faible de juges professionnels pour 100 000 habitants est de 3,3 et le plus élevé de 42,4. Les valeurs médianes et moyennes ont toutes deux légèrement augmenté entre 2020 et 2021 (Tableau 7.1.1a).

On peut également noter que l'évolution par rapport au cycle précédent montre que le nombre de juges pour 100 000 habitants a augmenté de plus de 1% dans 13 Etats membres, alors qu'il n'a diminué de plus de 1% que dans quatre pays, ce qui confirme la tendance mentionnée de l'augmentation des valeurs médiane et moyenne. Les autres pays ont fait état de variations moins importantes, ce qui peut être interprété comme une fluctuation normale des ressources humaines au sein d'un système.
Ce nombre dépend considérablement de l'organisation du système judiciaire et de l'existence de juges occasionnels, de juges non professionnels ou même de Rechtspfleger.
L'existence aux côtés des juges professionnels d'un personnel compétent avec des fonctions définies et un statut reconnu est une condition essentielle pour la qualité et l'efficacité d'un système judiciaire.
Une distinction est opérée entre cinq types de personnels non-juges :

- la fonction de "Rechtspfleger",
- le personnel non-juge dont la fonction est d'assister directement les juges,
- les personnes responsables de tâches administratives telles que la gestion des tribunaux
- *le personnel technique*
- les personnels non-juges n'entrant dans aucune de ces catégories.

L'analyse des données fournies par les États membres montre des tendances différentes pour les valeurs moyennes et médianes. Depuis 2012, le nombre moyen de personnel non-juge pour 100 000 habitants a augmenté (+1,2%) alors que la médiane a diminué (-6,4%). Par rapport au dernier cycle, la moyenne en 2021 montre également une augmentation (+1,5%) alors que la médiane a légèrement diminué (-0,8%). La médiane de l'Union européenne du personnel non-juge pour 100 000 habitants est de 58,5, avec un minimum de 22,3 et un maximum de 164. (Tableau 7.2.2a).

13 pays ont des personnels non-juge comprenant des fonctions de "Rechspfleger" (ou équivalent) et aucun changement depuis 2012 n'a été observé. (Tableau 7.2.1)

Pour ce cycle, pour la deuxième fois, l'étude de la CEPEJ pour le tableau de bord de la justice de l'UE inclut les services des ministères publics. La diversité des activités des ministères publics est évidente et le nombre de procureurs pour 100 000 habitants varie dans l'Union européenne d'un minimum de 2,4 à un maximum de 23,9 avec une moyenne de 11,4 et une médiane de 10,8 procureurs pour 100 000 habitants. Par rapport au cycle précédent, la valeur moyenne a augmenté de +1,7%, tandis que la médiane a augmenté de manière plus significative (+9,4%). (Tableau 7.3.1)

Les procureurs sont assistés dans leurs fonctions par du personnel non-procureur attaché aux ministères publics. Leur nombre varie considérablement de 0,5 à 42,2 personnels non-procureurs pour 100 000 habitants avec une moyenne de 15,2 et une médiane de 14,7. Par rapport au cycle précédent, la valeur moyenne a légèrement diminué (-0,8%), tandis que la médiane a diminué de manière plus importante (-3,7%). (Tableau 7.4.1)

Avocats

Le nombre moyen d'avocats pour 100 000 habitants dans les États membres de l'UE a généralement connu une tendance à la hausse depuis 2013, avec seulement de légères baisses en 2016. Cependant, entre 2020 et 2021, une diminution de la valeur moyenne a été identifiée (-1,2%) tandis que la valeur médiane a augmenté de 2,2%. (Tableau 7.6.1)

Même si les Etats du sud paraissent avoir des barreaux plus importants (nombre d'avocats pour 100 000 habitants), la forte dispersion des valeurs, également vérifiable avec le nombre d'avocats par juge professionnel, est également susceptible de révéler une grande hétérogénéité dans les tâches effectivement exercées par des personnes qualifiées et habilitées conformément au droit national à plaider, à agir au nom de ses clients, à pratiquer le droit, à ester en justice ou à conseiller et représenter leurs clients en matière juridique (Définition de l'activité d'avocat au regard de la Recommandation Rec(2000)21 du Comité des Ministres du Conseil de l'Europe).

Organisation judiciaire

L'étude distingue trois types de tribunaux :

- les tribunaux de droit commun compétents dans toutes les matières pour lesquelles la compétence n'a pas été donnée à une juridiction spécialisée – leur dénombrement est effectué en tant qu'entités juridiques
- les tribunaux spécialisés de première instance et d'instances supérieures, compris également comme entités juridiques
- les tribunaux, tous niveaux confondus et de première instance, en tant qu'implantations géographiques

Depuis 2012, 15 pays ont réduit leur nombre d'implantations géographiques, 2 ont conservé le même nombre, tandis que 10 pays ont augmenté ce nombre. Entre les deux derniers cycles, 6 pays ont augmenté alors que seulement 1 pays a réduit le nombre d'implantations géographiques (Tableau 2.2b).
Le nombre d'implantations géographiques pour 100 000 habitants a diminué dans la plupart des Etats membres (la médiane était de 1,71 tribunaux pour 100 000 habitants en 2012, 1,52 en 2015 et 1,43 en 2021, ce qui représente une baisse de 16,4 %). La moyenne montre une légère diminution de 5,3%. (Tableau 2.3b)

En ce qui concerne la répartition des contentieux entre entités juridiques, tous les Etats membres de l'Union Européenne, à l'exception de la République tchèque et de la Hongrie, disposent de tribunaux de première instance spécialisés.

Les tribunaux spécialisés existants traitent majoritairement des affaires administratives (78% des pays) avec des contentieux relatifs à l'application de la législation de travail (41%) et des affaires commerciales (41%). (Tableau 2.4a)

Un nombre significatif de pays dispose également d'autres tribunaux spécialisés non mentionnés (41%). Alors que la majorité des pays ont peu de types de tribunaux spécialisés, certains ont de nombreux tribunaux spécialisés dans différentes matières comme l'Espagne et le Portugal mais aussi l'Autriche, Chypre, la France et l'Italie. La France, le Portugal et Malte ont également un grand nombre de tribunaux spécialisés de 1ère instance par rapport à l'ensemble des tribunaux de 1ère instance (83%, 75%, 64 % et 63% respectivement) (Tableau 2.2a). Il existe quelques autres pays avec de nombreux types différents de tribunaux spécialisés, mais ils les ont qualifiés d'"autres", de sorte qu'ils ne peuvent pas être facilement comparés à d'autres systèmes.
Cette année, pour la deuxième fois, les données sur les tribunaux spécialisés d'instances supérieures ont été collectées et, bien sûr, leur nombre est inférieur à celui de la première instance. Peu de pays disposent d'un grand nombre de tribunaux spécialisés traitant de différentes affaires au niveau des instances supérieures. Dans la plupart des autres pays qui disposent de tribunaux spécialisés au niveau des instances supérieures, ceux-ci traitent de questions administratives. Il existe également des tribunaux militaires au niveau d'instances supérieures. Il y a également 4 pays qui ont des tribunaux spécialisés en première instance mais pas de tribunaux spécialisés au niveau des instances supérieures. (Tableau 2.3b).

Aide judiciaire

L'aide judiciaire est un des éléments fondamentaux garantissant un égal accès à la justice pour tous les individus. Elle doit permettre, en particulier pour les citoyens qui n'ont pas de moyens financiers suffisants de pouvoir bénéficier gratuitement ou à moindre coût d'une assistance juridique.
L'aide judiciaire comporte deux aspects, que distinguent clairement certains Etats :

- d'une part, l'aide à l'accès au droit (information et conseil juridique, aide pour une alternative au procès – ADR règlement alternatif des litiges),
- d'autre part l'aide pour faire valoir ses droits dans le cadre d'une action en justice en tant que demandeur ou défendeur dans un procès civil.

En conséquence, la CEPEJ a dressé la typologie suivante pour quantifier les moyens alloués à l'aide judiciaire :

- les affaires non portées devant les tribunaux en ce qui concerne l'aide à l'accès au droit
- les affaires portées devant les tribunaux en ce qui concerne l'aide à l'assistance ou à la représentation dans un cadre contentieux.

Dans tous les pays de l'Union européenne, l'aide judiciaire s'applique à la fois à la représentation en justice et au conseil juridique. En ce qui concerne les frais liés à l'exécution des décisions judiciaires, dans la plupart des pays (20), l'aide judiciaire couvre ces frais, tandis que seuls 7 pays ne les incluent pas dans l'aide judiciaire (tableau 5.3). De même, en ce qui concerne les autres coûts (par exemple, les honoraires des conseillers techniques ou des experts, les coûts des autres professionnels du droit (notaires), les frais de voyage, etc.), l'aide judiciaire les couvre dans la plupart des Etats. Dans 19 Etats, l'aide judiciaire peut être accordée pour couvrir ces coûts à la fois dans les affaires pénales et dans les affaires autres que pénales, tandis que dans 5 Etats, ces coûts ne peuvent être couverts que dans les affaires autres que pénales.
Le nombre d'affaires pour lesquelles une aide judiciaire a été accordée varie de 0,07 à 4,05 affaires pour 100 habitants. La moyenne en 2021 est de 1,13 alors que la médiane est de 0,84 cas pour 100 habitants (Tableau 5.4.2). 41% des pays ne sont pas en mesure de fournir cette donnée.

Mesures alternatives au règlement des litiges (ADR - alternative dispute resolution)

Dans différents pays européens, l'utilisation des mesures alternatives au règlement des litiges (ADR) est maintenant largement acceptée par le public et les professionnels du droit. Ces mesures contribuent à l'amélioration de l'efficacité de la justice en fournissant aux usagers des alternatives à une procédure judiciaire régulière.

Il existe différents types d'ADR dans les pays membres :

La médiation: il s'agit d'un procès volontaire, non contraignant de règlement des litiges privés dans lequel un tiers impartial et indépendant aide les parties à faciliter la discussion afin de les aider à résoudre leurs difficultés et de parvenir à un accord

La médiation conduite ou renvoyée par le tribunal : dans ce type de médiation, il y a toujours intervention d'un juge, d'un procureur qui facilite, conseille, décide ou/et approuve la procédure.

La conciliation: le principal objectif du conciliateur est de concilier, la plupart du temps en recherchant des concessions. Il/Elle peut proposer aux parties des suggestions pour le règlement d'un litige. Par rapport au médiateur, le conciliateur a plus de pouvoir et il est davantage proactif.

L'arbitrage: les parties choisissent un tiers impartial - un arbitre, dont la décision définitive est contraignante. Les parties peuvent présenter des preuves et des témoignages devant les arbitres. Parfois, il y a plusieurs arbitres désignés qui travaillent en tant que juridiction. L'arbitrage est le plus souvent utilisé pour la résolution des litiges commerciaux car il offre une plus grande confidentialité.

La médiation conduite ou renvoyée par le tribunal existe dans tous les Etats, essentiellement en matière civile ou commerciale. (Tableau 8.2)

Il peut être relevé que la médiane du nombre de médiateurs accrédités ou enregistrés pour 100 000 habitants a fortement augmenté depuis 2012 (de 9,5 en 2012 à 16,2 en 2021). Cela peut contribuer à sensibiliser davantage les États membres au fait que le fait de disposer d'un niveau élevé de médiateurs formés soutient les politiques de renforcement des ADR.

Performance des tribunaux et services du ministère public

Un des éléments essentiels du bon fonctionnement des tribunaux est lié au respect du principe fondamental du procès équitable dans un délai raisonnable (Article 6 de la Convention Européenne des Droits de l'Homme). Ce principe doit être pris en compte lors de l'analyse de la charge de travail du tribunal, de la durée des procédures et des mesures spécifiques pour réduire la durée des retards dans les procédures et améliorer l'efficacité.

La CEPEJ a choisi de développer des indicateurs d'efficacité des tribunaux au niveau européen.

Le premier indicateur est le taux de variation du stock d'affaires pendantes (Clearance Rate-CR) qui montre la capacité du tribunal et du système judiciaire à faire face au flux d'affaires nouvelles.

Le second indicateur est la durée estimée d'écoulement du stock. Ce ratio entre les affaires pendantes et les affaires terminées (en jours) indique la durée théorique pendant laquelle un tribunal doit résoudre toutes les affaires pendantes.

Lorsque l'on analyse l'efficacité des tribunaux, il est important d'examiner les deux indicateurs ensemble et leur évolution dans le temps.

Toutefois, l'interprétation des données de différents cycles doit être faite avec prudence, en raison de la situation spécifique causée par la pandémie de COVID-19 en 2020 et, dans une certaine mesure, en 2021. C'est pourquoi des observations supplémentaires sont nécessaires pour comprendre pleinement les tendances au niveau de l'UE et des pays individuels.

Affaires civiles et commerciales contentieuses

Si l'on examine le Clearance rate (CR) des affaires civiles et commerciales de première instance, il convient de noter que la médiane de l'UE est égale ou supérieure à 100 % presque chaque année depuis 2012. La seule exception est l'année 2020, où le CR a atteint 98 %, car c'est au cours de cette année que l'impact des mesures COVID-19 a le plus affecté le travail des tribunaux. En 2021, la médiane de l'UE est revenue à un niveau supérieur à 100% (102,5%). Si l'on compare les données des différents pays pour 2021 et 2020, la plupart d'entre eux (18) affichent une amélioration des CR, les plus fortes augmentations étant enregistrées en Espagne, en France et en Irlande (+16,1, +14,3 et +11,3 points de pourcentage respectivement). D'un autre côté, cinq pays connaissent une baisse de leur CR, avec une chute plus notable au Danemark (-13,4 points) et à Malte (-12,5 points). Pour mieux comprendre cette comparaison entre les cycles, nous devons examiner si le nombre d'affaires nouvelles et résolues a augmenté ou dittlement of the concerned litigation. The court shall, on the request of the parties, issue a decision in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code regarding the expedient court decision.

According with the provisions of article 59 para. 2 of the Law no. 192/2006, the parties to the mediation agreement may go to court to request, in

Le tableau 3.3.2 montre que dans la majorité des pays (17), le nombre d'affaires civiles et commerciales résolues a augmenté en 2021. De nombreux pays ont connu une augmentation significative supérieure à 10% (comme la Croatie, la France, l'Italie, Malte et l'Espagne). Seuls 6 pays ont connu une diminution des affaires résolues dans cette catégorie.

En ce qui concerne le Disposition Time (DT), il convient de noter que 16 États membres ont diminué leur DT par rapport à 2020. Plus précisément, 9 pays l'ont diminué de plus de 10%, 4 pays de 5 à 10%, 3 pays de 0 à 5% et seulement 5 pays ont augmenté leur DT. Cette tendance dans les pays n'est pas surprenante étant donné que le nombre de leurs affaires résolues a généralement augmenté plus que les nouvelles affaires. Cela a conduit à la diminution des affaires pendantes à la fin de 2021. L'augmentation du nombre d'affaires résolues combinée à la diminution du nombre d'affaires pendantes entraîne inévitablement une baisse du DT en raison de la construction de cet indicateur.

Toutes ces tendances semblent être une conséquence logique du retour à un rythme de travail plus normal dans les tribunaux après la fin des mesures de lutte contre la pandémie les plus restrictives. Cependant, la valeur moyenne du DT dans l'UE n'a que légèrement diminué et la médiane a même augmenté, ce qui pourrait être interprété comme un avertissement qu'il faudra plus de temps pour contrebalancer tous les effets négatifs de la pandémie.

Affaires de droit administratif

Par rapport aux autres catégories d'affaires au sein de l'UE en général, les affaires administratives présentent le DT le plus élevé, soit 400 jours en moyenne, contre 411 jours en 2020 et 347 jours en 2019. Elles sont nettement plus longues que les affaires civiles et commerciales, qui nécessitent 292 jours en moyenne en 2021.
Le nombre de pays qui ont diminué leur DT pour les affaires administratives est de 15, tandis que 10 pays ont augmenté ce DT. 7 pays ont diminué le DT de manière significative (plus de 10%), comme la Roumanie, la Belgique, l'Autriche, la République tchèque. 6 ont diminué modérément et 10 ont augmenté le délai de traitement, dont certains de manière significative (augmentation supérieure à 10%), comme Malte, la Slovénie, la Lettonie, la République slovaque et l'Estonie. (Voir tableau 3.3.6.).

Le Clearance Rate a diminué dans 15 pays, et de manière significative dans 7 d'entre eux (plus de 10 points de pourcentage), parmi lesquels Chypre, Malte et la Grèce qui ont enregistré une baisse particulièrement importante (plus de 30 points de pourcentage). 14 pays ont réussi à maintenir le CR au-dessus de 100 %, malgré les baisses enregistrées dans la majorité des États membres. Une augmentation du CR est identifiée dans 10 pays, dont la Roumanie, la Belgique, les Pays-Bas et la Hongrie, avec une augmentation de plus de 10 points de pourcentage (voir tableau 3.3.4).

Comme il ressort de cette analyse, les affaires administratives n'ont pas montré des tendances générales aussi claires que les affaires litigieuses civiles et commerciales. Afin d'avoir une image précise, le CR et le DT des pays devront être analysés au cas par cas et contextualisés par rapport à l'évolution du nombre d'affaires administratives nouvelles et résolues dans leurs systèmes respectifs.

Affaires de droit pénal

Il s'agit de la deuxième année pour laquelle des affaires pénales seront examinées dans le cadre de cette étude. Par conséquent, l'accent sera mis uniquement sur les données de 2021 et 2020 sans comparaison avec les données précédentes.
Si l'on examine les indicateurs d'efficacité pour les affaires pénales de première instance, on remarque d'emblée que le CR n'était pas très élevé en 2021, la moyenne de l'UE étant de 97,7 % tandis que la médiane se situait à la limite de 100 %. Toutefois, cela représente tout de même une amélioration significative par rapport à 2020, où la valeur moyenne pour l'ensemble de l'Union européenne était de 92,9 % alors que la médiane se situait au niveau de 95,2 %. En outre, en 2020, seuls trois pays ont atteint un CR de 100 % ou plus, alors qu'en 2021, la moitié des États membres de l'UE ont atteint ce niveau. Enfin, il est important de noter que 21 pays ont amélioré leur CR alors que seulement deux l'ont diminué en 2021, ce qui permet de conclure que, même si le CR pourrait être à un niveau plus élevé, il s'améliore (tableaux 3.15.1 et 3.16.4).

En ce qui concerne le DT, la situation semble être plus favorable que pour les affaires civiles et commerciales et de administratives. La situation s'est également améliorée par rapport à l'année dernière. En 2021, la moyenne est de 161 jours et la médiane de 134 jours, alors qu'en 2020, la valeur moyenne était de 194 jours et la médiane de 139 jours. Les améliorations sont également visibles sur les DT des différents pays, puisque 16 États les ont réduits tandis que 5 pays seulement les ont augmentés. Les valeurs maximales ont de nouveau été observées à Malte (566 jours) et en Italie (399 jours), mais ces deux pays ont enregistré des améliorations par rapport à 2020. Le DT le plus faible a été enregistré en Estonie (31 jours) et en Hongrie (43 jours), comme en 2020. (Tableaux 3.15.2 et 3.16.5)

Bien que les CR et DT des affaires pénales s'améliorent après l'année 2020 qui a été la plus touchée par la pandémie mondiale, la situation doit encore être surveillée de près. Un niveau de CR inférieur à 100 % a été signalé dans la moitié des États, ce qui pourrait entraîner la création d'arriérés et une augmentation correspondante du DT dans les années à venir. Par conséquent, les États concernés doivent s'efforcer de prévenir de telles évolutions négatives. De même, les pays présentant un niveau de DT très élevé doivent continuer à le réduire pour atteindre les niveaux moyens ou médians de l'UE dans les années à venir.

Procureurs publics : Nombre total d'affaires pénales de première instance

Il s'agit de la deuxième année au cours de laquelle les affaires des procureurs seront traitées dans le cadre de cette étude. Par conséquent, l'accent sera mis uniquement sur les données de 2021 et 2020 sans comparaison avec les données précédentes.

En 2021, la valeur moyenne des affaires reçues par les services du ministère public dans l'Union européenne était de 3,1 affaires pour 100 habitants. Le nombre d'affaires traitées se situait approximativement au même niveau. (Tableau 4.1.2) La médiane a montré la même tendance avec des valeurs légèrement inférieures (2,9 pour les affaires nouvelles comme résolues), probablement parce que la moyenne a été affectée par le très grand nombre d'affaires indiqué par certains pays, comme le Luxembourg avec 9,0 affaires reçues et le Danemark avec 7,0 affaires traitées. Des tendances et des valeurs moyennes similaires ont été enregistrées en 2020, avec des valeurs médianes légèrement inférieures.

Parmi les affaires traitées, il y a eu 1,4 affaires classées pour 100 habitants (valeur médiane) ; 0,2 affaire conclue par une sanction, ou une mesure imposée ou négociée par le procureur ; 0,3 affaire classée pour d'autres raisons ; et 0,5 affaire portée devant les tribunaux.

Si l'on considère les pays individuellement, il est intéressant de noter que sur les 21 systèmes qui ont fourni des données pertinentes, 11 Etats ont plus d'affaires traitées que d'affaires nouvelles, tandis que dans 10 Etats, les affaires nouvelles étaient plus nombreuses que les affaires traitées, ce qui pourrait potentiellement conduire à l'accumulation d'arriérés dans les services de poursuite respectifs. En comparant le nombre d'affaires traitées en pourcentage des affaires nouvelles au cours des deux derniers cycles, on peut conclure que 13 Etats ont réussi à améliorer ce ratio, ce qui indique une meilleure efficacité dans leur travail en 2021 par rapport à 2020.

Système pour mesurer et évaluer le fonctionnement des tribunaux

Dans de nombreux pays, de nombreux domaines d'activité des tribunaux (flux d'affaires, décisions des tribunaux, durée des procédures) font l'objet de procédures d'évaluation et de suivi. En matière de gestion des tribunaux, des dispositifs de suivi régulier de l'activité sont mis en place partout en Europe. Ils visent à examiner l'activité quotidienne des tribunaux par la collecte de données et des analyses statistiques.

Comme lors du cycle précédent, la majorité des pays utilisent aujourd'hui des indicateurs de performance ou d'activité au niveau des tribunaux. Le nombre de pays ayant défini des standards qualitatifs est supérieur à la moitié des membres de l'UE au cours des dernières années (16 États comme l'indique le tableau 1.1)

Les évaluations régulières semblent être la norme dans les tribunaux dans tous les Etats membres de l'UE sauf 2 (Tableau 1.3). Dans les ministères publics, ce nombre est légèrement inférieur, puisque 21 Etats membres de l'UE ont une évaluation régulière, tandis que 7 ne le font pas (Tableau 1.6).

L'utilisation des technologies de l'information (TI) dans les tribunaux et au bénéfice des usagers des juridictions

Alors qu'elles agissaient initialement comme un simple outil de soutien à la productivité, les technologies de l'information (TI) constituent toujours l'un des principaux leviers d'amélioration de l'efficacité des tribunaux. Le rôle croissant des TIC dans l'aide à la prise de décision stratégique et l'amélioration de la productivité et de l'efficacité, repose en effet sur les possibilités extraordinaires de l'automatisation des tâches et l'inévitable progrès technologique général.

Par rapport aux cycles précédents et compte tenu du fait que le nombre de questions sélectionnées pour cette étude varie, la CEPEJ a décidé de ne présenter que les données collectées sans calcul supplémentaire d'indices.

Le tableau 6.1 montre que seuls 2 pays de l'UE ne disposent pas d'outils d'aide à l'écriture alors que dans les autres pays, ces outils sont très présents et la majorité des pays (plus de 65%) ont déclaré un taux de déploiement de 100% de ces outils dans les trois matières.

De même, pour les outils d'enregistrement vocal, seuls deux pays n'ont pas signalé la présence de ces outils dans les tribunaux. Les outils actuels sont installés dans tous les tribunaux dans 68% des cas pour toutes les matières. Dans 8 pays, ces outils comprennent une fonction de reconnaissance vocale. (Tableau 6.2)

La charge de travail des juges est mesurée à l'aide d'un outil TIC dans tous les pays sauf quatre. Dans la plupart des cas (15 pays sur 23 disposant de cet outil), cette fonction est intégrée au système de gestion des affaires. Ces outils sont visiblement plus présents pour les juges que pour les procureurs, tant au niveau national qu'au niveau des tribunaux/locaux. (Tableau 6.4)

Annex 1

List of the tables presented in the Study

Indicator 3: The performance of courts at all stages of the proceedings

First instance other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.1.1.1a(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2021
Table 3.1.1.1b(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2021
Table 3.1.1.2a(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2021
Table 3.1.1.2b(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2021
Table 3.1.1.3a(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2021
Table 3.1.1.3b(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2021
Table 3.1.1.4a(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2021
Table 3.1.1.4b(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2021
Table 3.1.1.5(2021): First instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2021
Table 3.1.1.1a(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020
Table 3.1.1.1b(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020
Table 3.1.1.2a(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2020
Table 3.1.1.2b(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2020
Table 3.1.1.3a(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2020
Table 3.1.1.3b(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2020
Table 3.1.1.4a(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020
Table 3.1.1.4b(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020
Table 3.1.1.5(2020): First instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2020
Table 3.1.1.1a(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2019
Table 3.1.1.1b(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2019
Table 3.1.1.2a(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2019
Table 3.1.1.2b(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2019
Table 3.1.1.3a(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2019
Table 3.1.1.3b(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2019
Table 3.1.1.4a(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2019
Table 3.1.1.4b(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2019
Table 3.1.1.5(2019): First instance civil (and commercial litigious) and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2019
Table 3.1.1.1(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 1st Jan. 2018
Table 3.1.1.2a(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2018
Table 3.1.1.2b(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2018
Table 3.1.1.3(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2018
Table 3.1.1.4a(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2018
Table 3.1.1.4b(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2018

Table 3.1.1.5(2018): First instance civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pendingmore than 2 years in 2018
Table 3.1.1.1(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2017
Table 3.1.1.2a(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2017
Table 3.1.1.2b(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2017
Table 3.1.1.3(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2017
Table 3.1.1.4a(2017): First instance other than criminal cases- pending on 31 Dec. 2017
Table 3.1.1.4b(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2017

Table 3.1.1.5(2017): First instance civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2017
Table 3.1.1.1(2016): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2016
Table 3.1.1.2a(2016): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2016

General data: economic and demographic data

General data: economic and demographic data in 2021 (Q1, Q3, Q4, Q5)

States	Population	GDP* per capita (in €)	Average gross annual salary (in €)	Exchange rate** in 2022 (on 1st Jan. 2022)
Austria	8 978 929	45 030 €	36 283 €	NAP
Belgium	11 569 034	43 937 €	44 023 €	NAP
Bulgaria	6 838 937	9 868 €	9 514 €	1,96
Croatia	3 871 833	14 773 €	15 309 €	7,52
Cyprus	904 700	23 436 €	25 116 €	NAP
Czech Republic	10 516 707	22 267 €	18 296 €	24,86
Denmark	5 873 420	57 320 €	42 403 €	7,44
Estonia	1 330 068	23 641 €	18 576 €	NAP
Finland	5 548 241	43 483 €	47 516 €	NAP
France	67 626 000	36 660 €	37 742 €	NAP
Germany	83 237 124	42 918 €	54 163 €	NAP
Greece	10 678 632	17 013 €	NA	NAP
Hungary	9 689 010	15 401 €	14 906 €	369,00
Ireland	5 123 536	85 061 €	44 912 €	NAP
Italy	58 983 122	30 036 €	31 484 €	NAP
Latvia	1 875 757	17 454 €	15 324 €	NAP
Lithuania	2 805 998	19 760 €	19 084 €	NAP
Luxembourg	645 397	114 400 €	67 574 €	NAP
Malta	516 102	28 216 €	19 755 €	NAP
Netherlands	17 509 672	49 100 €	64 300 €	NAP
Poland	38 088 000	13 691 €	15 397 €	4,59
Portugal	10 352 042	20 528 €	18 729 €	NAP
Romania	19 038 098	12 510 €	14 093 €	4,95
Slovak Republic	5 434 712	15 660 €	14 532 €	NAP
Slovenia	2 107 180	24 678 €	23 635 €	NAP
Spain	47 435 597	25 404 €	24 271 €	NAP
Sweden	10 452 326	50 876 €	43 384 €	10,26
Average	16 556 673	33 449 €	30 012 €	
Median	8 978 929	24 678 €	23 953 €	
Minimum	516 102	9 868 €	9 514 €	
Maximum	83 237 124	114 400 €	67 574 €	
Nb of values	27	27	27	
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	

*** In current prices**

**** Local currency needed to obtain 1 €**

General data

Comments provided by the national correspondents

Question 001. Number of inhabitants (if possible on 1 January of the reference year +1)

Question 003. Per capita GDP (in €) in current prices for the reference year

Question 004. Average gross annual salary (in €) for the reference year

Question 005. Exchange rate of national currency (non-Euro zone) in € on 1 January of the reference year +1

Austria

Q004 (General Comment): Since the 2010 evaluation, the provided figure corresponds to the average gross income including taxes and social expenses borne by the employee, but not employer's contribution for social insurance. This is in line with the figures given in question 132 (gross annual salary of judges and prosecutors).

Q004 (2021): Not available yet.

Q004 (2019): 2018 data has been communicated, pending 2019 data.

Belgium

Q001 (2021): source Statbel: https://www.ibz.rrn.fgov.be/fileadmin/user_upload/fr/pop/statistiques/population-bevolking-20220101.pdf

Q001 (2020): La source : Statbel

Q001 (2016): Number of inhabitants 1/1/2017

Q003 (2017): Gross domestic product at market prices

Q004 (2021): The average gross annual salary is 44022,8 euros, source National Bank of Belgium.

Q004 (2020):
Answer provided based on the latest data published by the National Accounts (April 2021).

Q004 (2019): Average gross annual salary for employees (both full-time and part-time).

Q004 (2016): Average gross salary for a full-time employee (without exceptional bonuses and vacation pay)

Bulgaria

Q003 (2021): Preliminary estimates. We confirm the nominal growth of 11.57% for the indicator GDP per capita in current prices for 2021 (preliminary data) compared with 2020. The result is based on an increase in nominal GDP and a decrease in the average annual population.

Q003 (2020): The data per capita GDP (in €) in current prices for 2020 will be available after 15.12.2021.

Q003 (2018): NSI data

Q003 (2016): No explanation.

Q004 (2021): Preliminary data.
The minimum wage in the country has been risen with 6.6%. In section "Human health and social work activities" the average annual wage increased with 25.7% due to additional wage payments related with the health crisis. In section "Education" there was an increase of the teachers' wages and salaries and the increase in the section was 17.0%. High growth rate of wages and salaries in 2021 compared to 2020 (17.7%) was recorded in "Accommodation and food service activities" as the section started to recover after 2020 lockdowns.

Q004 (2018): NSI data

Q004 (2016): No explanation.

Q005 (2019): BGN 1= EUR 0,51129
EUR 1= BGN 1, 9558

Croatia

Q001 (2021): https://podaci.dzs.hr/hr/statistika-u-nizu/. Final results of the population census.

Q003 (2021): https://podaci.dzs.hr/hr/statistika-u-nizu/

Q004 (2021): Average monthly gross salary for 2021 for person in paid employment in legal entities in the Republic of Croatia is available at web page of the Croatian Bureau of Statistics (https://podaci.dzs.hr/2021/en/10583).
This monthly gross salary (9599 Croatian Kuna) has been multiplied by 12 and then divided by Croatian Kuna / Euro average annual medium exchange rate published by the Croatian National Bank (7,52418 Croatian Kuna for 1 Euro; this information is available at https://www.hnb.hr/temeljne-funkcije/monetarna-politika/tecajna-lista/tecajna-lista.)

Q005 (2021): In other words, 7,52045 Croatian Kuna for 1 Eur (medium exchange rate for January 1th 2022). This exchange rate was published on the web page of the Croatian National Bank (available at https://www.hnb.hr/temeljne-funkcije/monetarna-politika/tecajna-lista/tecajna-lista).

Cyprus

Q001 (2020): The number is provisional.

Q001 (2018): this is the number on 1st January 2019

Q003 (2016): Per Capita GDP (current prices)
Total GDP (current prices)
The revised figures provided by the statistical service are
Per Capita GDP (current prices) Total GDP (current prices 2015 20.931 euro 17.742,0 million euro
2016 21.282 euro 18.122,5 million euro

Czech Republic

Q003 (2016): The Czech economy is doing well + the exchange rate.

Q004 (2021): The gross salary is constantly growing.

Q004 (2020): The gross salary is constantly growing.

Q004 (2019): Positive trends in Czech economy and the exchange rate have had an influence on the rise of average gross annual salary (in €).
Q004 (2016): The Czech economy is doing well + the exchange rate.

Q005 (2021): Czech Statistical Office
Czech National Bank

Denmark

Q001 (2019): Number of inhabitants pr. 1. januar 2020.

Q001 (2017): Per January 1, 2018

Q003 (2017): Source: Eurostat http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?query=BOOKMARK_DS-420898_QID_CE733B3_UID_-3F171EB0&layout=TIME,C,X,0;GEO,L,Y,0;UNIT,L,Z,0;NA_ITEM,L,Z,1;INDICATORS,C,Z,2;&zSelection=DS-420898INDICATORS,OBS_FLAG;DS-420898NA_ITEM,B1GQ;DS-420898UNIT,CP_EUR_HAB;&rankName1=UNIT_1_2_-1_2&rankName2=INDICATORS_1_2_-1_2&rankName3=NA-ITEM_1_2_-1_2&rankName4=TIME_1_0_0_0&rankName5=GEO_1_2_0_1&sortC=ASC_-1_FIRST&rStp=&cStp=&rDCh=&cDCh=&rDM=true&cDM=true&footnes=false&empty=false&wai=false&time_mode=ROLLING&time_most_recent=false&lang=EN&cfo=%23%23%23%2C%23%23%23.%23%23%23

Q005 (2021): Statistics Denmark (dst.dk) and Danmarks Nationalbank (nationalbanken.dk)

Q005 (2017): Source: https://www.ecb.europa.eu/stats/exchange/eurofxref/shared/pdf/2018/01/20180102.pdf
European Central Bank

Estonia

Q001 (2021): Statistics Estonia

Q003 (2021): Very high inflation rates.

Q003 (2017): Economic growth accelerated

Q004 (2020): Inflation

Q004 (2018): There is no specific reason.

Finland

Q001 (2021): On 1 January 2022: 5 548 241 (or 5 533 793 on 1.1.2021)

Q001 (2020): Comments: Number of inhabitants 31.12.2020 = 1.1.2021

Q001 (2019): Number of inhabitants 31.12.2019 = 1.1.2020.

Q001 (2018): Number of inhabitants on 31 December 2018.

Q003 (General Comment): Source: https://pxweb2.stat.fi:443/PxWeb/sq/3f341957-c80a-4c54-83c6-581c701e5819

Q003 (2021): Newest available data is for the year 2019.

Q004 (General Comment): Source: Structure of Earnings, Statistics Finland
https://pxweb2.stat.fi/PxWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/StatFin__pra/
Q004 (2021): Preliminary information: salary in 2020 multiplied by the annual percentage change in the earnings level index 2021q4
Q004 (2020): In 2020, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3 595 per month.

Q004 (2019): In 2019, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3528 per month.

Q004 (2018): In 2018, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3465 per month. Correspondingly, the median was EUR 3079 per month. The most common monthly earnings of all full-time wage and salary earners was EUR 2600 per month.

France

Q001 (General Comment): Source: INSEE, demographic assessment

Q001 (2020): INSEE

Q001 (2017): Estimation INSEE on 1 January 2018

Q001 (2016): Source: INSEE, demographic balance 2016 (population at 1 January 2017)

Q003 (General Comment): Source: INSEE, national accounts

Q003 (2021): The exact data are 36 660,6

Q003 (2020):
"The exact figure is 33 958.7
Source INSEE"
Q003 (2017): INSEE national accounts

Q003 (2016): Source : INSEE, national accounts

Q004 (2021): The exact data are 37 742,7

Q004 (2020): The exact figure is 34,494.5_x000D_
Source INSEE
Q005 (2020): Euro zone

Germany

Q001 (2014): The data for 2013 and 2014 is the same reference. Because no significant difference has been expected for the year 2014, 2013 data is provided in the frame of the present evaluation.
Q001 (2012): The information refers to the number of inhabitants on 31 December 2012 determined on the basis of the 2011 census.
Q003 (2016): The circumstances have changed since the last campaign.

Q003 (2014): The data for 2013 and 2014 is the same reference. Because no significant difference has been expected for the year 2014, 2013 data is provided in the frame of the present evaluation.
Q004 (2021): The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 49 202 EUR)
Special payments are any payments outside of the regular remuneration. Typical examples of such payments are Christmas bonuses/end-of-the year bonuses, holiday bonuses, payments for jubilees, bonuses for the fulfilment of target agreements.

Q004 (2020): figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time

Q004 (2019): With regard to this question, no data are available for 2019. The data from 2018 have therefore been included.

Q004 (2018): With regard to this question, no data are available for 2018. The data from 2017 have therefore been included.

Q004 (2016): The circumstances have changed since the last campaign

Greece

Q001 (2021): Estimated population on 01-01-2021.The year 2022 will be published after 01-01-2023.

Q003 (2021): GDP per capita in euros at current prices for the year 2021: 17.013* provisional figures.

Q003 (2020): Provisional data

Q003 (2019): The competent authority for this data (see Hellenic Statistical Authority) provides the relevant numbers. The numbers cannot be evaluated by the Hellenic Ministry of Justice

Q003 (2018): The data provided correspond to 2017. The data for 2018 will be available on summer 2020 (http://www.statistics.gr/news-announcements/-/asset_publisher/oj6VK3PQ0oCe/content/nws-gdp-oct).

Q003 (2017): Data published on October 17, 2018.

Q004 (2021): Our service has the data of the structure and distribution of Remuneration Survey in enterprises on the structure of remuneration of employees(having a dependent employment relationship) in enterprises by Sector (B-S branches), excluding X (Public Administration and Defense, compulsory Social Security) based on the NACE Rev. 2. The survey is conducted on a four-year basis. Therefore, the latest available figures are of the year 2018. The results of the of the survey will be published in late 2024 to early 2025.

Q004 (2020): The data come from the Survey of the Structure and Distribution of Remuneration in Greece for the year 2018, from which the sector X is excluded (Public Administration and Defense, Compulsory Social Security) based on the classification of activities NACE Rev. 2 and relate to the average annual gross earnings in euros. Data is available by gender.The only one available at the moment.
Men 19 234 Average Women 15 947 Average

Q004 (2019): The competent authority for this data (see Hellenic Statistical Authority) provides the relevant numbers. The competent authority did not provide any numbers for this section.

Q004 (2016): The data provided correspond to those of 2014, since the statistics on this point are carried out every four years. Therefore, they are not absolutely accurate.

Hungary

Q001 (2021): Main indicators of population and vital events on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office: https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/nep/en/nep0001.html

Q001 (2020): Central Statistical Office (KSH)

Q003 (2021): See the main data of macroeconomy on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office: https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/gdp/en/gdp0001.html

Q003 (2020): The GDP increased significantly compared tto the last cycle. According to Eurosatat, the Hungarian economy continued to catch up with the EU average in the year of the coronavirus crisis.

Q004 (2021): In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the general development of Hungarian economy, to the increase in our GDP, as well as to the raising of the minimum wage.
See the most important annual data on the labour market on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office: https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html

Q005 (2021): As 1 January 2022 was a Saturday, we used the middle exchange rate of the National Bank of Hungary on 31 December 2021:
1 EUR = 369 HUF

Q005 (2020): 1 € = 360,90 HUF

Q005 (2019): 1 EUR = 329.99 HUF

Q005 (2016): Source: Magyar Nemzeti Bank (Hungarian National Bank) exchange rate of 02. January 2017 https://www.mnb.hu/arfolyam-tablazat?deviza=rbCurrencyActual&devizaSelected=EUR&datefrom=2017.01.01.&datetill=2017.01.02.&order=1

Ireland

Q001 (2021): Preliminary data from 2022 Census - source https://data.cso.ie/ [Accessed 25/08/2022]

Q001 (2019): Comments Taken from Population and Migration Estimates April 2019 release of 27 August 2019 https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/pme/populationandmigrationestimatesapril2019/

Q001 (2018): Taken from Population and Migration Estimates April 2018 release of 28 August 2018 https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/pme/populationandmigrationestimatesapril2018/

Q001 (2017): Figure of 4729500 as at April 2017. The population number for 2017 based on the GDP figure below for 2017 is 4,793. Taken from Population and Migration Estimates April 2017 release date 28 September 2017. https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/pme/populationandmigrationestimatesapril2017/

Q001 (2016): The population number for 2016 based on the GDP figure below for 2016 is 4,673,700 Taken from Population and Migration Estimates April 2016 release date 23 August 2016. http://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/pme/populationandmigrationestimatesapril2016/

Q003 (2021): ANA 2021 Table 1.2 – Main Aggregates, 2016-2021 refers
https://www.cso.ie/en/media/csoie/releasespublications/documents/ep/annualnationalaccounts/2021/P-ANA2021TBL1.2.xlsx.

Q003 (2020): (See Sources)The 3rd block of data in NIE 2020 Table A shows data Per head of population. GDP at Current Market Prices for reference year 2020 per NIE2020 = €372,869 million. Population 2020 = 4,977,400. The National Income and Expenditure data are subject to potential revision each year (i.e. please note that Ireland does not operate a five-year benchmark revisions policy unlike certain other EU Member States and other countries internationally. It is CSO Ireland policy to incorporate all revisions and updates to the annual national accounts on an annual basis, whenever a new series of annual results are being published. This applies both to routine changes involving the use of more final data and to the less frequent revisions resulting from any major methodological developments. In the past, such major methodological revisions would also have been incorporated in the historic backdata estimates [back to year 1995] published at the same time.).

Q003 (2019): Comments Taken from Table A of the National Income and Expenditure 2019 release of 20 July 2020
https://www.cso.ie/en/statistics/nationalaccounts/nationalincomeandexpenditureannualresults/
The 3rd block of data shows data at Per head of population.
GDP @ current Market prices per NIE2019 = € million 356,051
Population 2019 = 4,921,000 The National Income and Expenditure data each year is subject to revisions.

Q003 (2018): Taken from Table A of the National Income and Expenditure 2018 release of 11 July 2019
https://www.cso.ie/en/statistics/nationalaccounts/nationalincomeandexpenditureannualresults/
The 3rd block of data shows data at Per head of population.
GDP @ current Market prices per NIE2018 = € million 324,328
Population 2018 = 4,857,000 The National Income and Expenditure data each year is subject to revisions.

Q003 (2017): GDP per capita @ current market prices for 2017 = €61,369
Taken from the National Income and Expenditure Annual Results 2017. Release date 14 July 2018. Table A. (main aggregates). https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/ep/p-nie/nie2017/
The National Income and Expenditure data each year is subject to revisions

Q003 (2016): Taken from the National Income and Expenditure Annual Results 2016.
The National Income and Expenditure data each year is subject to revisions.
The following is an extract from the National Income and Expenditure 2016 methodology note
...The estimates for 2016 are based upon indicators for the different aggregates and must be regarded as tentative. The provisional nature of the estimates for 2014 and 2015 must also be borne in mind. In particular, the estimates for the year 2016 must be regarded as preliminary. Many of the inquiries upon which the basic compilations rest are incomplete and to the extent that figures given for 2014 and 2015 are still partly subject to revision, projections for the year 2016 are also affected. While no guarantee can be given that published figures will remain unaltered as inquiries proceed and as sources and methods are reviewed, it is expected that any changes made in future in relation to years earlier than 2011 will have a relatively insignificant effect on the year-to-year trend in these data. ...
See Link to the National Income and Expenditure 2016 methodology note on the CSO website
http://www.cso.ie/en/media/csoie/methods/nationalincomeandexpenditureannualresults/NIE2016MethodologyNote.pdf
The GDP figure increased significantly in 2015. The scale of increase was unprecedented. Therefore the GDP per capita increased. Please see link to the Press Statement of 12 July 2016
http://www.cso.ie/en/media/csoie/newsevents/documents/pr_GDPexplanatorynote.pdf
Link to the National Income and Expenditure Annual Results 2016 release on the CSO website.
http://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/nie/niear2016/
Please scroll down to Table A Main Aggregates, 2011-2016 The 3rd block of data shows data at Per head of population. See GDP at current market prices first line under Per head of population for years 2011 to 2016

Q003 (2015): The 2015 GDP figure was considerable higher compared to other years and at the time of release attracted a lot of media attention and continues to do so.
Q004 (2021): Year 2021 is the latest data available. The figure of €44,912.24 was taken from Q4 but it should be noted that the annual gross salary fluctuated during the course of 2021.
https://www.cso.ie/en/releaseandduplications/en/elcq/earningsandlabourcostsq42021final/2022premliminaryestimates.
According to preliminary estimates of the Earnings and Labour Costs Quarterly release, the average weekly earnings were €880.3 in Q1 2022, an increase of 2.3% from €860.19 one year earlier and an increase of 10.0% from the same period in 2020. This represents average earnings of those in employment in the Irish economy in Q1 2022, including those supported by the Employment Wage Subsidy (EWSS).
https://www.cso.ie/en/releaseandduplications/en/elcq/earningsandlabourcostsq42021final/2022premliminaryestimates.

Q004 (2020): Year 2019 is latest data available

Q004 (2019): Comments Taken from Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2019 release of 26 June 2020
https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2019/
Q004 (2018): Taken from Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2018 release of 11 June 2019
https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2018/

Q004 (2016): Average annual earnings increased by 1.1% to €36,919 in 2016, from €36,519 in 2015.
Taken from CSO release of 29 June 2017 - Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2016. See link
http://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2016/

Q005 (2021): Ireland Exchange Rate against USD averaged 0.987 (EUR/USD) in Aug 2022, compared with 0.983 EUR/USD in the previous month.

Latvia

Q001 (2021): Data on 01.01.2022.

Q001 (2020): The data is on 01.01.2021.

Q001 (2019): Data are on 01.01.2020.

Q001 (2017): 01.01.2017.- 1 950 116
01.01.2018.- 1 934 379
Q001 (2016): On 2016 1st January - 1 968 957
On 2017 1st January - 1 950 116
Q003 (2021): The data provided by the Central Statistical Bureau.
The data for 2020 is a little bit different from that number provided in 2021 for 2020. In the Central Statistical Bureau home page the GDP in current prices for 2020 is 15497.
Q004 (General Comment): After 2012, the minimum monthly salary increased, which could have had an effect on the average gross annual salary.
Q004 (2021): The data provided by the Central Statistical Bureau.

Q004 (2020): The data provided by the Central Statistical Bureau.

Q004 (2016): on 2016

Lithuania

Q001 (2020): https://osp.stat.gov.lt/statistiniu-rodikliu-analize?hash=5b7fa09d-7ace-4909-89d9-b8a8897da5ba#/

Q003 (2020): http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=nama_10_pc&lang=en

Q004 (2021): From the 1st January, 2021 the minimum monthly salary was increased, the base salary of state politicians, judges, state officials, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions was increased, the procedure for calculating the amount of tax-free income was changed and other reasons.
https://osp.stat.gov.lt/informaciniai-pranesimai?articleId=9732032

Q004 (2020): Annual salary growth has been affected by the increase in the minimum monthly salary since the beginning of the reference year, the base salary of state politicians, judges, state politicians, judges, civil servants, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the procedure for calculating tax-free income and other reasons.

Q004 (2019): The increase in wages in 2019 was caused by changes in the tax system: an increase in the basic salary of politicians, judges, civil servants, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions, an increase in the minimum monthly salary, a revision of the new salary system for civil servants, a change in the procedure for calculating exemptions and other reasons.
Q004 (2018): The state budget and salary increased due to the growth of the economy.

Q004 (2016): The state budget and salary increased due to the growth of the economy (after recovering from crisis before).

Q005 (2017): Lithuania is in an Euro zone.

Q005 (2016): Lithuania is in an Euro zone.

Luxembourg

Q001 (2020): Total population as of January 1, 2021. Source:
https://statistiques.public.lu/fr/actualites/population/population/2021/04/20210401/index.html

Q001 (2019): Total population on 01.01.2020 (https://statistiques.public.lu/stat/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=12858&IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=2&FldrName=1)

Q001 (2018): Total population at the date of 31.12.2018

Q003 (2021): The evolution of the GDP per capita depends on the general evolution of the economy and the population of Luxembourg. The year 2021 represents a year of economic recovery after the start of the pandemic that marked the year 2020. For more information, please consult the publications of the National institute of statistics and economic studies of the Grand-Duché de Luxembourg (STATEC), in particular the conjunctural note 2022-1. Gross domestic product at market prices per capita published by the National institute of statistics and economic studies of the Grand-Duché de Luxembourg (STATEC) (https://lustat.statec.lu/vis?pg=0&lc=fr&df[ds]=release&df[id]=DF_E2105&df[ag]=LU1&df[vs]=1.0&pd=2015%2C2021&dq=.A)

Q003 (2019): OECD.STAT (https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=SNA_TABLE1)

Q004 (2020): The 2019 data has been tentatively provided, pending the official release of the 2020 data.

Q004 (2019): This figure represents the average gross salary for the "Industry and Service" sector, according to the NACE Rev 2 code. (https://statistiques.public.lu/stat/ReportFolders/ReportFolder.aspx?IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=3&FldrName=1&RFPath=30).

Q004 (2016): The variation between the different cycles (44% between 2014 and 2016) comes from a difference between gross salary (which was given for this cycle) and net salary (which was given for the previous cycles).

Malta

Q001 (2017): The discrepancy is mainly due to the increase in population in Malta.

Q003 (2021): The GDP is estimated by the nSO and is quoted form the following link: https://nso.gov.mt/en/News_Releases/Documents/2022/05/News2022_095.pdf

Q003 (2018): The quoted figure has been confirmed by NSO and can be verified at https://nso.gov.mt/en/nso/Selected_Indicators/National_Accounts/Documents/2018/GDP_capita_Q4-2018.pdf

Q004 (2021): The figure quoted above relates specifically to the Average Annual BASIC salary as provided by the National Statistics Office of Malta. The NSO do not collect the Average Annual Gross salary.

Q004 (2018): This data has been provided by NSO based on as yet provisional estimates.

Netherlands

Q001 (2019): Number of inhabitants on 1 January 2020

Q001 (2018): Number of inhabitants on 1 January, 2019

Q001 (2016): The figures for state level include regional level and social security institutions. They cannot be separated due to transfers from state level to regional level (and to a lesser extent the other way around). Public expenditure according to EU-definition also includes official social security institutions. This is neither state nor regional level. Transfers from state level to official social security institutions are also possible. According to EU-rules the figures are revised up to 30 months after the end of the reporting period. Compared to previous questionaires (before 2014) these figures have been adjusted according to new rules of the european system of national accounts (illegal activities are now included)

Q003 (2020): Source: https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2021/28/bbp-per-inwoner-in-nederland-nog-altijd-relatief-hoog-binnen-de-eu

Q003 (2019): GDP 810 247 000 000 divided by the number of inhabitants on 1 January 2019 (17 282 163)

Q003 (2018): gdp 2018: 774.039.000.000
devided by the number of inhabitants on 1 January, 2018

Q003 (2017): the gdp is 3.2% percent higher than in 2016. see also https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/achtergrond/2018/19/de-nederlandse-economie-in-2017.

Q003 (2016): The per capita GDP is calculated by dividing total GDP by the average population (=[population on jan 1st current year+ population on jan 1st next year]/2). Note: the explanatory notes say anything on how to calculate per capita GDP.

Q004 (General Comment): These are provisional numbers; definitive numbers (available next year) may differ slightly from those provided here. The data specifies ‘reward per working year’ as salary. This reward consists of salary (gross salary, including taxes and social contributions/premiums), rewards like holiday stipends, payment in kind, expense allowances tied in with work (e.g. travel allowances), and social premiums for the employer (payments for lawful and contractual social security, like pension contributions).

Q004 (2020): These are provisional numbers and the definitive numbers (available in 2022) may differ slightly from these provided here. The data specifies ‘reward per working year’ as salary. The reward consists of salary (gross salary, as it includes taxes and social contributions/premiums), rewards like holiday stipends, payment in kind, expense allowances that tie in with work (like travel allowances that cover costs to and from work), and social premiums that are for the employer (payments for lawful and contractual social security, like pension contributions).

Q004 (2019): The Statistics Bureau only had numbers for 2018. 2019 data was not available at the moment of data collection.

Q004 (2018): This is average salary of all employees; the number includes money that employers pay for pension plans, social security (money that is paid directly to employees). The statistic does not include the income of people who are not employees (people without work, employers).
Q004 (2016): Compared to previous questionaires (before 2014) these figures have been adjusted according to new rules of the european system of national accounts (illegal activities are now included)

Poland

Q001 (2016): Source: Concise Statistical Yearbook of Poland 2017

Q003 (2016): Source: Concise Statistical Yearbook of Poland 2017

Q004 (2021): data source - Central Statistical Office
The wage increases linked to economic changes.
Q004 (2016): NA

Q005 (2021): 1 euro=4,59 pln

Q005 (2020): 1 euro = 4.6148 PLN

Q005 (2016): Source: National Bank of Poland

Portugal

Q004 (2016): In the present questionnaire we used another "concept" of gross anual salary that we believe is closer to the objectives of this question.
We opted for the category of "payments and salaries" instead of "remunerations" of the national budget because "remunerations" also includes social contributions by the employer which constitue wage costs and not salary.

Romania

Q001 (2020): Usually resident population of Romania on January 1st -provisional data

Q001 (2019): provisional data

Q001 (2018): Provisional data (which will be completed when the National Institute of Statistics will finalize population data).The revised data will be available in the TEMPO database of the National Institute of Statistics (www.insse.ro).

Q001 (2017): Provisional data which will be completed when the National Institute of Statistics will finalize population data.

Q001 (2016): Provisional data which will be completed when the National Institute of Statistics will finalize population data - (19638309 -as communicated in September 2017).
Update:
After reviewing/completing of population data by the National Institute of Statistics, in accordance with the methodology of calculation, the revised data are as follows- for January 1, 2015, the number of inhabitants (as revised) is 19875542; for January 1, 2016, the number of inhabitants (final data) is 19760314; for January 1, 2017, the number of inhabitants (final data) is 19644350.
Methodological explanations:
Reference moments for statistically determining the usual resident population are January 1st and July 1st, t year. The data on usual resident population at the moment of January 1st, t year are available on August (provisional data) and on January, t+1 year (final data). Usual resident population represents all persons of Romanian nationality, foreign or stateless who have their usual residence in Romania. Usual residence is the place where a person normally spends the daily period of rest, regardless of temporary absences for purposes of recreation, holidays, visits to friends and relatives, business, medical treatment or religious pilgrimage. The usual residence may be the same as the domicile or may differ from it, for the persons who choose to establish their usual residence in a locality other than the locality of domicile in the country or abroad. It is considered having their usual residence in a specific geographic area just people who have lived in that usual residence for a continuous period of at least 12 months prior to reference moment. The resident population includes the persons who immigrated to Romania but excludes the persons who emigrated from Romania. In order to carry out international comparisons, it will be used only the usual resident population, calculated according to European regulations (Regulation no. 1260/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council on European demographic statistics and Regulation no. 205/2014 laying down uniformed conditions for the implementation of Regulation no. 1260/2013 on European demographic statistics as regards breakdowns of data, deadlines and data revisions). For the period between the last two censuses (2002-2011 period), data refers to usual resident population, re-estimated under comparability conditions with final results of the Population and Housing Census of 2011. After January 1st, 2012, the usual resident population on January 1st was estimated according to the usual residence criterion, using the components method.
The revised data are available in the TEMPO database of the National Institute of Statistics (www.insse.ro).

Q003 (2021): Definitive data should be available in September 2023.

Q003 (2020): provisional data

Q003 (2019): provisional data

Q003 (2017): Provisional data provided by NIS

Q003 (2016): Provisional data

Q003 (2014): For the 2012 and 2014 evaluations, was used the resident population on 1 July of each year, estimated in terms of comparability with the final results of the Population and Housing Census – 2011.
Q003 (2012): For the 2012 and 2014 evaluations, was used the resident population on 1 July of each year, estimated in terms of comparability with the final results of the Population and Housing Census – 2011.
Q004 (General Comment): At national level, the average gross annual salary is not calculated and included in the official statistical reports made annually by the National Institute of Statistics. Thus, the SMBA was calculated on the basis of the monthly average gross salary at an average monthly value of the euro calculated by the National Bank of Romania for the reference year concluding in the average gross annual salary (as the sum of monthly average salary).

Q004 (2020): The difference can be explained based on salary increases, and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.
Q004 (2018): At national level, the average gross annual salary is not calculated and included in the official statistical reports made annually by the National Institute of Statistics. Thus, the SMBA was calculated by request by the National Institute of Statistics on the basis of the monthly average gross salary at an average annual value of the euro calculated by the National Bank of Romania for the reference year 2018
According to the provisions of the national legislation in force (GEO no. 79/2017 with subsequent amendments and completions), the social insurance contributions, respectively those of social health insurance that fell to the employer, were transferred to the employee's responsibility and, starting with 2018, are fully supported by the employee, being reflected in the gross amount of the earning.
Consequently, the indicator "monthly gross average wage" produced and disseminated from 2018 is no longer comparable with the previous data series.
These legal provisions do not influence the data comparability for the series of "average monthly net earnings."

Slovak Republic

Q001 (2021): source: https://slovak.statistics.sk/

Q004 (2021): http://datacube.statistics.sk/#!/view/en/VBD_INTERN/pr0204qs/v_pr0204qs_00_00_00_en

Q004 (2020): Ministry of Finance did not offer closer explanation. Source: https://www.statista.com/statistics/419502/average-annual-wages-slovak-republic-slovakia-y-on-y-in-euros/

Slovenia

Q004 (2020): Annual average gross salary is increasing (increase by 4% from 2018 to 2019 and by 6% from 2019 to 2020).

Q004 (2016): Average monthly gross earnings for 2016.

Indicator 1: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts and public prosecution services

Policies at the national level

Table 1.1 National level quality standards applied in courts and public prosecution services in 2021 (Q66 and Q67)

States	National level quality standards applied in courts and public prosecution services		
	Quality standards defined	Specialised staff entrusted with quality policy and/or quality system within the courts	Specialised staff entrusted with quality policy and/or quality system within the public prosecution services
Austria			
Belgium			
Bulgaria			
Croatia			
Cyprus			
Czech Republic			
Denmark			
Estonia			
Finland			
France			
Germany			
Greece			
Hungary			
Ireland			
Italy			
Latvia			
Lithuania			
Luxembourg			
Malta			
Netherlands			
Poland			
Portugal			
Romania			
Slovak Republic			
Slovenia			
Spain			
Sweden			
Yes	16	6	7
No	11	21	20

Performance and Evaluation - At the court's level

Table 1.2 Performance and quality indicators defined for courts in 2021 (Q77 and Q78)

States	Defined performance and quality indicators	Main performance and quality indicators defined for courts													
		Number of incoming cases	Length of proceedings (timeframes)	Number of resolved cases	Number of pending cases	Backlogs	Productivity of judges and court staff	Satisfaction of court staff	Satisfaction of users (regarding the services delivered by the courts)	Costs of the judicial procedures	Number of appeals	Appeal ratio	Clearance rate	Disposition time	Other
Austria															
Belgium															
Bulgaria															
Croatia															
Cyprus															
Czech Republic															
Denmark															
Estonia															
Finland															
France															
Germany															
Greece															
Hungary															
Ireland															
Italy															
Latvia															
Lithuania															
Luxembourg															
Malta															
Netherlands															
Poland															
Portugal															
Romania															
Slovak Republic															
Slovenia															
Spain															
Sweden															
Yes	26	22	26	26	24	19	16	7	8	3	14	11	15	13	5
No	1	5	1	1	3	8	11	20	19	24	13	16	12	14	22

Table 1.3 Regular evaluation of the court performance in 2021 (Q73, Q73-0, Q73-1 and Q73-2)

States	Regular evaluation of the court performance								
	Existence and Frequency				Evaluation used for the later allocation of resources within the court and courses of action taken for this allocation				
	Existence	Annual	Less frequent	More frequent	Evaluation used for the later allocation of resources within the court	Identifying the causes of improved or deteriorated performance	Reallocating resources (human/financial resources based on performance)	Reengineering of internal procedures to increase efficiency	Other
Austria	■			■	■	■	■	■	
Belgium	■	■							
Bulgaria	■	■							
Croatia	■			■					
Cyprus	■			■	■		■		
Czech Republic	■	■			■	■	■		
Denmark	■			■	■	■	■		
Estonia	■			■					
Finland	■	■			■	■	■		
France	■	■			■	■	■	■	
Germany	■	■			■		■		
Greece	■	■							
Hungary	■			■	■	■	■	■	
Ireland									
Italy	■			■	■		■	■	
Latvia	■	■							
Lithuania	■	■			■	■	■	■	
Luxembourg									
Malta	■			■	■	■	■	■	
Netherlands	■			■	■	■	■		
Poland	■			■	■	■	■	■	
Portugal	■	■			■	■	■	■	
Romania	■			■	■	■	■	■	
Slovak Republic	■	■							
Slovenia	■	■			■	■	■	■	
Spain	■			■	■	■	■	■	
Sweden	■			■	■	■	■	■	
Yes	25	12	0	13	18	15	18	12	0
No	2	15	27	14	9	12	9	15	27

Performance and Evaluation - At the public prosecution services' level

Table 1.4 Performance and quality indicators defined for public prosecution services in 2021 (Q77-1 and Q78-1)

States	Defined performance and quality indicators	Main performance and quality indicators defined for public prosecution services												
		Number of incoming cases	Length of proceedings (timeframes)	Number of resolved cases	Number of pending cases	Backlogs	Productivity of prosecutors and prosecution staff	Satisfaction of prosecution staff	Satisfaction of users (regarding the services delivered by the public prosecution)	Costs of the judicial procedures	Clearance rate	Disposition time	Percentage of convictions and aquittals	Other
Austria														
Belgium														
Bulgaria														
Croatia														
Cyprus														
Czech Republic														
Denmark														
Estonia														
Finland														
France														
Germany														
Greece														
Hungary														
Ireland														
Italy														
Latvia														
Lithuania														
Luxembourg														
Malta														
Netherlands														
Poland														
Portugal														
Romania														
Slovak Republic														
Slovenia														
Spain														
Sweden														
Yes	24	18	19	22	21	17	14	2	2	3	10	9	12	6
No	3	9	8	5	6	10	13	25	25	24	17	18	15	21

Table 1.5 Regular evaluation of the public prosecution services performance in 2021 (Q73-3, Q73-4, Q73-5 and Q73-6)

States	Regular evaluation of the public prosecution services performance								
	Existence and Frequency				Evaluation used for the later allocation of resources within the public prosecution services and courses of action taken in this allocation				
	Existence	Annual	Less frequent	More frequent	Evaluation used for the later allocation of resources within the public prosecution service	Identifying the causes of improved or deteriorated performance	Reallocating resources (human/financial resources based on performance)	Reengineering of internal procedures to increase efficiency	Other
Austria									
Belgium									
Bulgaria									
Croatia									
Cyprus									
Czech Republic									
Denmark									
Estonia									
Finland									
France									
Germany									
Greece									
Hungary									
Ireland									
Italy									
Latvia									
Lithuania									
Luxembourg									
Malta									
Netherlands									
Poland									
Portugal									
Romania									
Slovak Republic									
Slovenia									
Spain									
Sweden									
Yes	23	7	0	16	20	15	20	17	1
No	4	20	27	11	7	12	7	10	26

Table 1.6 Performance and evaluation of public prosecutors in 2021 (Q83-2, Q83-3, Q120 and Q120-1)

States	Quantitative performance tagets defined for each prosecutors						Qualitative individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work			
	Existence	Body responsible for setting the individual targets					Existence	Frequency		
		Executive power (for example the Ministry of Justice)	Prosecutor General /State public prosecutor	Public Prosecutorial Council	Head of the organisational unit or hierarchically superior public prosecutor	Other		Annual	Less frequent	More frequent
Austria							■		■	
Belgium							■		■	
Bulgaria							■		■	
Croatia	■	■					■		■	
Cyprus							■	■		
Czech Republic							■		■	
Denmark							■			■
Estonia										
Finland	■				■					
France							■		■	
Germany							■		■	
Greece	■		■		■		■	■		
Hungary							■		■	
Ireland	■		■		■		■	■		
Italy							■		■	
Latvia	■				■		■		■	
Lithuania							■		■	
Luxembourg										
Malta							■			■
Netherlands							■	■		
Poland										
Portugal							■		■	
Romania							■		■	
Slovak Republic										
Slovenia	■			■			■		■	
Spain	■		■							
Sweden							■			■
Yes	7	1	3	1	4	0	21	4	14	3
No	20	26	24	26	23	27	6	23	13	24

Monitoring

Table 1.7 Modalities for monitoring court activities (performance and quality) in 2021 (Q70)

States	Total number of monitoring elements (out of 14)	Modalities for monitoring court activities													
		Number of incoming cases	Length of proceedings (timeframes)	Number of resolved cases	Number of pending cases	Backlogs	Productivity of judges and court staff	Satisfaction of court staff	Satisfaction of users (regarding the services delivered by the courts)	Costs of the judicial procedures	Number of appeals	Appeal ratio	Clearance rate	Disposition time	Other
Austria	9	■	■	■	■	■	■				■		■	■	
Belgium	6	■	■	■	■	■								■	
Bulgaria	6	■	■	■	■	■					■				
Croatia	9	■	■	■	■	■	■				■		■	■	
Cyprus	6	■	■	■	■	■					■				
Czech Republic	7	■	■	■	■	■					■	■			
Denmark	5	■	■	■	■										■
Estonia	13	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■
Finland	11	■	■	■	■	■	■	■			■	■	■	■	
France	10	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■			
Germany	11	■	■	■	■	■				■	■	■	■	■	■
Greece	6	■	■	■	■	■	■								
Hungary	12	■	■	■	■	■	■		■		■	■	■	■	■
Ireland	3	■	■												■
Italy	8	■	■	■	■	■	■						■	■	
Latvia	12	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	
Lithuania	8	■	■	■	■	■	■		■				■		
Luxembourg	10	■	■	■	■	■				■	■	■	■	■	
Malta	10	■	■	■	■	■			■		■		■	■	■
Netherlands	9	■	■	■	■	■		■	■		■			■	
Poland	10	■	■	■	■	■	■				■	■	■	■	
Portugal	11	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■		■	■	
Romania	13	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■
Slovak Republic	9	■	■	■	■	■	■				■		■	■	
Slovenia	13	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
Spain	10	■	■	■	■		■				■	■	■	■	■
Sweden	7	■	■	■	■	■					■				■
Yes		27	27	26	26	24	16	7	10	4	21	12	17	18	9
No		0	0	1	1	3	11	20	17	23	6	15	10	9	18

Table 1.8 Modalities for monitoring public prosecution services' activities (performance and quality) in 2021 (Q70-1)

States	Total number of monitoring elements (out of 13)	Modalities for monitoring public prosecution services' activities												
		Number of incoming cases	Length of proceedings (timeframes)	Number of resolved cases	Number of pending cases	Backlogs	Productivity of prosecutors and prosecution staff	Satisfaction of prosecution staff	Satisfaction of users (regarding the services delivered by the public prosecution)	Costs of the judicial procedures	Clearance rate	Disposition time	Percentage of convictions and aquittals	Other
Austria	9													
Belgium	7													
Bulgaria	9													
Croatia	8													
Cyprus	4													
Czech Republic	5													
Denmark	9													
Estonia	12													
Finland	8													
France	8													
Germany	9													
Greece	7													
Hungary	1													
Ireland	7													
Italy	9													
Latvia	7													
Lithuania	8													
Luxembourg	9													
Malta	4													
Netherlands	4													
Poland	9													
Portugal	10													
Romania	11													
Slovak Republic	6													
Slovenia	10													
Spain	7													
Sweden	6													
Yes		25	22	26	26	20	18	6	3	6	14	13	19	5
No		2	5	1	1	7	9	21	24	21	13	14	8	22

Table 1.9 Monitoring of the number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) in 2021 (Q71)

States	Monitoring of the number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs)		
	Civil law cases	Criminal law cases	Administrative law cases
Austria			
Belgium			
Bulgaria			
Croatia			
Cyprus			
Czech Republic			
Denmark			
Estonia			
Finland			
France			
Germany			
Greece			
Hungary			
Ireland			
Italy			
Latvia			
Lithuania			
Luxembourg			
Malta			
Netherlands			
Poland			
Portugal			
Romania			
Slovak Republic			
Slovenia			
Spain			
Sweden			
Yes	25	24	24
No	2	3	3

Table 1.10 Monitoring of the waiting time during judicial proceedings within courts and the public prosecution services in 2021 (Q72)

States	Monitoring of the waiting time during judicial proceedings	
	Within the courts	Within the public prosecution services
Austria		
Belgium		
Bulgaria		
Croatia		
Cyprus		
Czech Republic		
Denmark		
Estonia		
Finland		
France		
Germany		
Greece		
Hungary		
Ireland		
Italy		
Latvia		
Lithuania		
Luxembourg		
Malta		
Netherlands		
Poland		
Portugal		
Romania		
Slovak Republic		
Slovenia		
Spain		
Sweden		
Yes	14	11
No	13	16

Indicator 1: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts and prosecution services

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 066. Are quality standards determined for the judicial system at national level (are there quality systems for the judiciary and/or judicial quality policies)?
Question 067. Do you have specialised personnel entrusted with implementation of these national level quality standards?

Question 073. Do you have a system to evaluate regularly court performance based primarily on the defined indicators?

Question 073-0. If yes, please specify the frequency:
Question 073-1. Is this evaluation of the court activity used for the later allocation of resources within this court?
Question 073-2. If yes, which courses of action are taken?
Question 070. Do you regularly monitor court activities (performance and quality) concerning:
Question 077-1. Concerning public prosecution activities, have you defined performance and quality indicators?
Question 078-1. If yes, please select the main performance and quality indicators for the public prosecution services that have been defined:
Question 073-3. Do you have a system to evaluate regularly the performance of the public prosecution services based primarily on the defined indicators?
Question 073-4. If yes, please specify the frequency:
Question 073-5. Is this evaluation of the activity of public prosecution services used for the later allocation of resources within this public prosecution service?
Question 073-6. If yes, which courses of action are taken?
Question 070-1. Do you regularly monitor public prosecution activities (performance and quality) concerning:
Question 071. Do you monitor the number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) for:
Question 072. Do you monitor waiting time during judicial proceedings?
Question 077. Concerning court activities, have you defined performance and quality indicators?
Question 078. If yes, please select the main performance and quality indicators that have been defined for courts:

Question 083-2. Are there quantitative performance targets defined for each public prosecutor (e.g. the number of decisions in a month or year)?
Question 083-3. Who is responsible for setting the individual targets for each public prosecutor
Question 120. Is there a system of qualitative individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work?
Question 120-1. If yes, please specify the frequency of this assessment:

Austria

Q073-0 (2021): monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (more frequent); periodic check lists (annual), Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Q073-0 (2020): monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (more frequent)
Periodic check lists (annual)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)

Q073-0 (2019): Operational Information System (BIS) annually
Periodic check lists
Less frequent:
Internal Audit all 4 to 7 years
More frequent:
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (“Kurzstatistik”)

Q073-0 (2018): Operational Information System (BIS) annually
Periodic check lists (on October 1st of every year)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (“Kurzstatistik”) (more frequent)
Q073-0 (2017): Operational Information System (BIS) annually
Periodic check lists (on October 1st of every year)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases ("Kurzstatistik") (more frequent)
Q073-0 (2016): Operational Information System (BIS) annually
Periodic check lists (on October 1st of every year)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases ("Kurzstatistik") (more frequent)
Q070 (General Comment): .

Q070 (2017): "other": e.g. certain kinds of decisions, clearance rate (annually)

Q073-4 (2021): Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (more frequent); periodic check lists (annual); Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Q073-4 (2020): Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (more frequent)
Periodic check lists (annual)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Q073-4 (2018): Operational Information System (Sta-BIS) annually
Periodic check lists (on October 1st of every year)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (“Kurzstatistik”) (more frequent)
Q072 (2016): Supreme administrative Court: Statistic of incoming cases, number of decisions delivered, number of postpones cases, length of proceedings (timeframes) and age of cases
Q083-3 (2018): There are no specific targets given to public prosecutors.

Belgium

Q066 (2021):
The College of Courts and Tribunals and its support service are working on the implementation of a quality system at the national level; there is no declination at the local level yet, but this project is in full evolution. Within the framework of the law of 14 February 2014 and the College's action plans (2018 and 2020), a quality system will be implemented in respect of judges. The intention is therefore to introduce an integrated framework of quality, internal control and (internal) audit models to replace the executive's existing ex ante control and monitoring systems.

Q067 (2021): The College of Courts and Tribunals is working on the implementation of a quality system. This system is based on international scientific references and will be broken down into ten or so themes that constitute the management modules of an organisation. These management modules cover all aspects of an organisation, including organisational management, process management, human resources management, organisational culture, information and communication, financial management, facility management and information and communication technologies. The College of Courts and Tribunals and the steering committees work together to develop their maturity in these different areas.

Q073 (2017): There are ad hoc evaluation systems within the courts. But there is not yet a central or coordinated system.

Q073 (2016): There are ad hoc evaluation systems within the courts. But there is no central or coordinated system.

Q073-1 (2021): No, allocation of resources between courts is carried out based on a methodology defined by the College of courts and tribunals, independently of the performance evaluation.
Q070 (2021): In 2021, the College of Courts and Tribunals has started a project to make a central inventory of the backlog in the courts and tribunals using indicators such as length of proceedings, number of pending cases, Disposition time, backlogs.

Q070 (2017): There are ad hoc systems for monitoring activities within the courts. There is a central service responsible for the collection of statistics which ensures the annual publication of statistics. The Central Statistical Service is developing a uniform and coordinated policy, but there is (as yet) no central system for regular monitoring of activities.

Q070 (2016): There are ad hoc systems for monitoring activities within the courts. There is a central service responsible for the collection of statistics which ensures the annual publication of statistics. But there is no (yet) central system for regular monitoring of activities.

Q073-4 (2021): By means of monthly statistics on the number of processed cases (general prosecution offices).
On the basis of bi-monthly dashboards (public F75 offices).
Quarterly at the Attorney General's meetings with the King prosecutors and the labour auditors.

Q073-4 (2020): "More frequent :
- by means of monthly statistics on the number of cases handled (general prosecutors' offices)
- on the basis of bi-monthly dashboards (public prosecutors' offices)
- quarterly at the meetings of the public prosecutor with the public prosecutors and the labour auditors".

Q073-5 (General Comment): Comment on Q73-5:
Evaluation used at local level (public prosecutor's offices, labour auditorates, general public prosecutor's offices).

Q073-6 (2021): There is an evaluation at local level (public prosecutor's offices, labour auditorates, general public prosecutor's offices).

Q073-6 (2020): "comments for question 73-5:
Evaluation used at the local level (public prosecutor's offices, labor auditorates, general prosecutor's offices)"

Q071 (2016): There are ad hoc evaluation systems within the courts. But there is no central or coordinated system.

Q072 (2021): Public Prosecutor's Office: Monitoring mechanism via dashboards for the public prosecution services.

Q072 (2020): Monitoring mechanism via dashboards for prosecution services.

Q078 (2021): The operational work reports provide the above-mentioned indicators. However, qualitative data are not available for all types of courts. The statistics are based on data extracted from the different computer applications used by the registries of the courts and tribunals and calculated by means of counting rules validated by experts.

Q083-3 (2021): To underline the consistency between Q 83-2 and Q 83-3: these are not quantitative targets.

Q120 (General Comment): This is the evaluation system of the "ordre judiciaire" (excluding administrative courts).

Bulgaria

Q066 (General Comment): Ordinance № 2 from 23.02.2017 on the indicators, methodology, and procedure for appraisal of a judge, chairman, and deputy chairman of a court
Article. 4. The Ordinance aims: 1. to affirm the rule of law and ensure effective protection of the rights of judges; 2. to ensure a lawful, transparent, and fair procedure for career growth; 3. to increase the personal motivation for professional development of the judges, to maintain and improve the quality of their work; 4. to prevent corruption in the system of the judiciary; 5. to contribute to increasing the trust in the judiciary. Article 5. (1) The appraisal is an objective assessment of the professional, business, and moral qualities of a judge, chairman, and deputy chairman of a court, demonstrated in the performance of his position. (2) A unified appraisal form for a judge, chairman, and deputy chairman of a court shall be filled in according to a sample pursuant to the appendix for the assessment as a result of the appraisal. Article 6. The appraisal guarantees professional self-improvement, and equal and fair opportunities for the career growth of judges, based on the principles of legality, equality, objectivity, and transparency. Article 7. The appraisal may not affect the independence and fundamental rights of judges. Article 8. (1) The appraisal shall refer to the qualification, achievements, and professional suitability, as well as the observance of the rules for ethical behavior by a judge, chairman, and deputy chairman of a court. (2) The qualification is a set of the acquired professional knowledge, skills, and personal abilities of the appraised. (3) The achievements are the personal qualitative and quantitative results, achieved by the appraised in his practical activity. (4) Professional suitability is the specific qualification for a specifically defined position. (5) The observance of the rules for ethical conduct is conducted, compliant with the rules of the respective code of ethics.
Judiciary System Act
Article. 196. (1) Appraisal shall be carried out:
1. initial - for a three-year period as of the appointment of a judge, prosecutor, or investigator - when participating in a competition or in case of a proposal for promotion in ranking;
2. for the purpose of acquiring tenure: upon completion of five years of service as a judge, prosecutor, or investigating magistrate;
3. periodic - for a 5-year period as of the attestation for the tenure of a judge, prosecutor, and investigator, of an administrative head and a deputy administrative head;
4. extraordinarily: in the cases under Article 197 (5).
(2) Junior judges, junior prosecutors, and junior investigators shall not undergo an initial appraisal. A report on their work shall be drawn up by the supervisor for the second year of their appointment.
Article. 197. (1) Advance appraisal shall have as an object to assess the qualities and professional competence of judges, prosecutors, and investigating magistrate after the appointment to the respective position, as well as compliance with the rules of the relevant code of ethics. Any such appraisal shall be carried out under the criteria established in this Act and in the ordinance under Article 209b.
(3) Appraisal for the purpose of acquiring tenure shall have as an object to make an objective evaluation of the professional qualification and of compliance with the rules of the relevant code of ethics after the completion of five years of service in the position of a judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate. Upon an appraisal for the purposes of acquiring tenure, the results of the advance appraisal of a judge, prosecutor, or investigating magistrate shall be taken into consideration in cases where an

Q066 (2021): Please see the General Comments

Q066 (2020): Judiciary system Act:
Article. 198 (1) The criteria for the appraisal of a judge, prosecutor or an investigating magistrate shall be:
1. legal knowledge and skills of applying it;
2. skill of analysing legally relevant facts;
3. skill of making optimum working arrangements;
4. efficiency and discipline;
5. compliance with the rules of ethical behaviour.
(2) In the course of the appraisal under Paragraph (1) the following indicators shall be taken into account:
1. keeping deadlines;
2. number of instruments upheld and reversed and the grounds for this;
3. the results of inspections carried out by the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council,
4. the overall caseload of the respective judicial district and judicial authority, as well as the workload of the appraised judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate compared to other judges, prosecutors or investigating magistrates in the same judicial authority.
(4) The time served by the judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate as a permanent trainer at the National Institute of Justice shall also be included in the appraisal period. The evaluation of the work performance as a trainer shall be given by the Managing Board.
(5) The time served by the judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate as an European Delegated Prosecutor shall also be included in the appraisal period. The evaluation of the results of their work under Regulation (EU) 2017/1939 shall become part of their appraisal.
Article. 199. (1) A judge shall be appraised under the following specific criteria:
1. complying with the schedule for conduct of court hearings;
2. skill of conducting a court hearing and drawing up a record of proceedings;
3. administrating cases and appeals, preparing for a court hearing;
4. number of appealed judicial instruments from among the appealable judicial instruments, appealed judicial instruments upheld, judicial instruments reversed or invalidated, in whole or in part, and the grounds for it; the ability to reason and justify judicial instruments and to analyse evidence shall be subject to evaluation.
(2) A prosecutor shall be appraised under the following specific criteria:
1. skills of planning and structuring steps in pre-trial and trial proceedings;
2. complying with the written instructions and orders of the superior prosecutor;
3. ability to make working arrangements and direct the investigating authorities and the teams participating in pre-trial proceedings;
4.number of unappealed prosecutorial instruments, including warrants to terminate and suspend criminal proceedings, number of final judicial instruments rendered on instruments submitted by the prosecutor appraised, as well as the final judicial instruments returning cases for the rectification of procedural breaches, and the reasons for this, number of appeals granted, the prosecutorial instruments upheld, modified and reversed upon an instance and ex officio review. (2) An investigating

Q067 (2020): The Supreme Judicial Council, through its Commission for Attestation/Appraisal and Competitions at the Judges College/Chamber of the Supreme Judicial Council and the Commission for Attestation/Appraisal and Competitions at the Prosecutorial College/Chamber, are the bodies that perform an objective assessment of the professional, business and moral qualities of magistrates.

Q073 (General Comment): The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) is a body of the judicial system of the Republic of Bulgaria established under the art. 132a of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria /published in State Gazette N.12 from 6th February 2007/. The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council is an independent body with the primary function of examining the operation of the judicial bodies without affecting their independence. Art. 54, para. 1 of the Judicial System Act assigns powers to the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council.
The Inspectorate annually, not later than the end of March of the current year, adopts a program for the planned inspections.

Q073 (2019): The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) is a body of the judicial system of the Republic of Bulgaria created with art. 132a of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria /published in State Gazette N.12 from 6th February 2007/. The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council is an independent body with the primary function of examining the operation of the judicial bodies without affecting their independence. The powers of the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council are provided for in Art. 54, para. 1 of the Judiciary System Act.
Rules for the organization of the activities of the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council and for the activity of the administration and the experts
Section II Organization and procedure for conducting plan checks
Art. 53. (1) The Inspectorate annually, not later than the end of March of the current year, adopts a program for the planned inspections.
(2) The Annual Program for the planned inspections contains:
1. the appellate areas and the bodies of the judiciary in which a complex inspection will be carried out;
2. the bodies of the judiciary in which thematic and control inspections will be carried out;
3. an indicative timetable for carrying out the inspections.
(3) The annual program may be supplemented and amended by a decision of the Inspectorate. (4) The annual program is announced on the website of the Inspectorate.
Art. 54. (1) The planned inspections may be complex, thematic and control inspections. (2) The complex inspections relate to the overall activity of the body of the judiciary. (3) Thematic inspections are conducted on a specific topic on the application of the law by a judicial authority during the period under review, a judge, a prosecutor or an investigating magistrate.
(4) Control inspections are carried out after a complex or thematic inspection, which provides recommendations for overcoming negative practices. Art. 55. (1) Immediately after the adoption of the annual program, by lot ensuring random allocation, the chief inspector in the presence of all inspectors determines the specific judicial authority that will be inspected, and the teams that will carry out the inspection.

Q073-0 (2017): The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) is a body of the judicial system of the Republic of Bulgaria created with art. 132a of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria /published in State Gazette N..12 from 6th February 2007/. The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council is an independent body with the primary function of examining the operation of the judicial bodies without affecting their independence. Art. 54, para. 1 of the Judicial Power Act assigns to the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council the following powers:
1. check the organisation of administrative operation of the courts, prosecution offices and investigating authorities;
2. check the arrangements made for the institution and progress of court, prosecutorial and investigative cases, as well as the disposal thereof within the established time limits;
3. analyse and summarise the cases that have been disposed of by virtue of an enforceable judicial instrument, as well as the case files and cases disposed of by prosecutors and investigating magistrates;
4. in the presence of conflicting case-law, the existence of which has been found in carrying out the activity under Paragraph (3), it shall alert the competent authorities of the need to request the rendition of interpretative judgements or interpretative decrees;
5. upon breaches identified in the implementation of the activities under Items 1 to 3, it shall alert the administrative head of the judicial authority concerned and the respective chamber of the Supreme Judicial Council;
6. make proposals for the imposition of disciplinary sanctions on judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates and on the administrative heads of judicial authorities;
7. address alerts, proposals and reports to other state bodies, including the competent judicial authorities;
8. carry out integrity testing and examinations for conflict of interest of judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates, verifications of the financial interests disclosure declarations, as well as checks for identifying actions damaging the prestige of the Judiciary and such related to impairment of the independence of judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates;
9. examine applications against an infringement of the right to have a case examined and disposed of within a reasonable time;
10. adopt internal rules for carrying out the testing and examinations under Items 1 to 3 and Item 8 in the judicial authorities;
11. adopt internal rules for conduct of the integrity testing of experts with the Inspectorate and organise the conduct of such testing;
12. draw up an annual programme for scheduled inspections and an annual report on the activity thereof, which it shall submit to the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council;
13. discuss the draft budget for the Judiciary proposed by the Minister of Justice with regard to the budget of the Inspectorate and submit it to the Supreme Judicial Council;
14. make publicly available information on the activity thereof and publish the annual report on the activity thereof on the website thereof.
Rules for the organization of the activities of the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council and for the activity of the administration and the experts
Prom., SG, no. 103 of 27.12.2016, in force as of 01.01.2017.
Section II Organization and procedure for conducting plan checks

Q078-1 (2021): With the Direction of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office, issued by the Prosecutor General, the performance and quality indicators were defined, outside of the given ones, and covered the acts and actions of the public prosecutor for all types of supervision that are carried out by the Prosecutor's Office:
In criminal proceedings, including the supervision of the enforcement of penalties, the following may be added, but not exhaustively mentioned: prosecutor's acts filed with the court; terminated cases; objections against judicial acts; acts for the enforcement of sentences that have already entered into force; acts for supervision over the sentence enforcement.
Actions for resolving the competition between administrative criminal liability and criminal liability;
Within civil proceedings – claims submitted under the cases provided by the law; Within administrative proceedings – participation in trials under the cases provided by the law; Acts on the supervision of legality

Q078-1 (2020): With the Guidance of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office, issued by the Prosecutor General, the performance and quality indicators were defined, outside of the given ones, and covered the acts and actions of the public prosecutor for all types of supervisions that are carried out by the Prosecutor's Office:
In criminal proceedings, including the supervision of the enforcement of penalties, the following may be additionally, but not exhaustively mentioned: prosecutor's acts filed with the court; terminated cases; objections against judicial acts; acts for the enforcement of sentences that have already entered into force; acts for supervision over the sentence enforcement.
Actions for resolving the competition between administrative criminal liability and criminal liability;
Within civil proceedings – claims submitted under the cases provided by the law; Within administrative proceedings – participation in trials under the cases provided by the law; Acts on the supervision of legality

Q078-1 (2018): With the Guidance for the Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office, issued by the Prosecutor General, the performance and quality indicators were defined, outside of the given ones, and covered the acts and actions of the public prosecutor for all types of supervisions that are carried out by the Prosecutor's Office:
In criminal proceedings, including the supervision of the enforcement of penalties, the following may be additionally, but not exhaustively mentioned: prosecutor's acts filed with the court; terminated cases; objections against judicial acts; acts for the enforcement of sentences that have already entered into force; acts for supervision over the sentence enforcement.
Actions for resolving the competition between administrative criminal liability and criminal liability;
Within civil proceedings – claims submitted under the cases provided by the law; Within administrative proceedings – participation in trials under the cases provided by the law; Acts on the supervision of legality

Q073-3 (General Comment): With the Direction of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, all indicators for the activity of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria are regulated, as well as the obligation of all prosecutor's offices to prepare only a statistical report for the first half of the year, as well as analytical annual reports for their activity. The Rules for Measuring the Workload of the Prosecutor's Offices and the Individual Workload of Each Prosecutor and Investigator, adopted by a Decision of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 60/11.12.2014, are applied in all prosecutor's offices, investigation departments, and in the National Investigation Service. The use of the Unified Information System of the Prosecutor's Office ensures that the data is retrieved in real-time and allows for its verification and reliability. Data on the administrative and managerial workload of the administrative heads, their deputies, and the heads of the investigation departments are also provided through the system. The ratio of the number of law enforcement acts to one administrative act at the levels of the prosecutor's offices is also taken into account. The analysis of this relation is important for the efficiency/resource ratio analysis.
Within the Prosecutor's Office's Annual Report, an analysis is made for the workload of the public prosecutor's offices and the investigative bodies and it is compared to the workload of authorities of the same type and degree.
Data on the workload of public prosecutor's offices and investigative bodies are also collected every six months.
Ordinance No. 3 of 23.02.2017 on the Indicators and Methods for Assessment and the Criteria for Reporting the Workload Degree of Prosecutors, Investigators, Administrative Heads, and Their Deputies can also be mentioned (adopted by a decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 7 of 23.02.2017, promulgated in SG 21/10.03.2017).
Workload reporting is designated to ensure fairness of the assessment in terms of the volume of actual work. (The evaluation takes into account the actual workload of the relevant judicial authority, as well as the individual workload of the assessed prosecutor, investigator, administrative head, deputy administrative head, and head of the department. The workload of the respective judicial authority is compared to the workload of the bodies of the same type and degree, and the individual workload is compared to the set-out workload norm and the workload of other prosecutors or investigators from the same body of the judiciary).

Q073-4 (2021): The answer here is both "Annual" and "More frequent".

Q073-4 (2020): The answer here is both "Annual" and "More frequent" With the Direction of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, all indicators for the activity of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria are regulated, as well as the obligation of all prosecutor's offices to prepare only a statistical report for the first half of the year, as well as analytical annual reports for their activity. The Rules for Measuring the Workload of the Prosecutor's Offices and the Individual Workload of Each Prosecutor and Investigator, adopted by a Decision of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 60/11.12.2014, are applied in all prosecutor's offices, investigation departments and in the National Investigation Service. The use of the Unified Information System of the Prosecutor's Office ensures that the data is retrieved in real time and allows for its verification and reliability. Data on the administrative and managerial workload of the administrative heads, their deputies and the heads of the investigation departments is also provided through the system. The ratio of the number of law enforcement acts to one administrative act at the levels of the prosecutor's offices is also taken into account. The analysis of this relation is important for the efficiency/resource ratio analysis.
Within the Prosecutor's Office's Annual Report, an analysis is made for the workload of the public prosecutor's offices and the investigative bodies and it is compared to the workload of authorities of the same type and degree.
Data on the workload of public prosecutor's offices and investigative bodies is also collected every six months.
Ordinance No. 3 of 23.02.2017 on the Indicators and Methods for Assessment and the Criteria for Reporting the Workload Degree of Prosecutors, Investigators, Administrative Heads and Their Deputies can also be mentioned (adopted by a decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 7 of 23.02.2017, promulgated in SG 21/10.03.2017).
Workload reporting is designated to ensure fairness of the assessment in terms of the volume of actual work. (The evaluation takes into account the actual workload of the relevant judicial authority, as well as the individual workload of the assessed prosecutor, investigator, administrative head, deputy administrative head and head of department. The workload of the respective judicial authority is compared to the workload of the bodies of the same type and degree, and the individual workload is compared to the set out workload norm and the workload of other prosecutors or investigators from the same body of the judiciary).

Q073-5 (2020): The implementation of optimization within the Prosecutor's Office is in view of the data on the volume of prosecutorial activity, the workload of prosecutors, as well as the territorial scope and specifics of the region served by the respective prosecutor's office. Decisions on this optimization are made by the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC)on the basis of information periodically provided by the prosecution. On the basis of an analysis of the above indicators, the staff for the respective prosecutor's office is determined (in case of need for increase or reduction of staff, resp. in case of transfer of a full-time position from one to another prosecutor's office). The answer to questions 73-5 and 73-6 for 2020 takes into account the process of optimization of the court card started on 01.01.2019, as the Prosecutor's Office started the transformation of district prosecutor's offices into territorial divisions to district prosecutor's offices in the regional centers. Out of a total of 113 district prosecutor's offices at the end of 2018 - 11 were transformed into territorial departments from 01.01.2019, 28 were transformed into territorial departments from 01.01.12020, and as of January 1, 2021 another 38 district prosecutor's offices have been transformed into territorial divisions. The data on the workload and a set of other indicators were used for decision-making by the SJC for the indicated consolidation.

Q070-1 (General Comment): With the Direction of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office, issued by the Prosecutor General, the performance and quality indicators were defined, outside of the given ones, and covered the acts and actions of the public prosecutor for all types of supervisions that are carried out by the Prosecutor's Office:
In criminal proceedings, including the supervision of the enforcement of penalties, the following may be additionally, but not exhaustively mentioned: prosecutor's acts filed with the court; terminated cases; objections against judicial acts; acts for the enforcement of sentences that have already entered into force; acts for supervision over the sentence enforcement.
Actions for resolving the competition between administrative criminal liability and criminal liability;
Within civil proceedings – claims submitted under the cases provided by the law; Within administrative proceedings – participation in trials under the cases provided by the law; Acts on the supervision of legality.

Q070-1 (2018): "Other": percentage of returned cases

Q071 (General Comment): The duration of the court proceedings initiated by the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria is monitored, as in case of excessive delay there is a possibility to request acceleration of these proceedings through the procedure under Chapter 26 of the PPC.
Q077 (2017): incoming cases; duration of proceedings /deadlines/; completed cases; pending cases; result of appealed and protested cases.

Q120 (General Comment): The assessment is carried out in compliance with the Judicial System Act and Ordinance No. 3/23.02.2017 on the Indicators and Methods for Assessment and the Criteria for Reporting the Workload Degree of Prosecutors, Investigators, Administrative Heads and Their Deputies (adopted by a decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 7/23.02.2017, promulgated in SG 21/10.03.2017). The Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria has established an order for its implementation and for the retrieval and provision of data on prosecutors and investigators in accordance with validated performance indicators.

Croatia

Q066 (General Comment): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18), the president of the court evaluates the work of every judge according to Framework Criteria for the work of judges in the period of one year following the standards on the number of judgements delivered by a judge compared with the number of judgements that should have been delivered, according to the Framework Criteria for the work of judges, result of work in different kinds of cases, respecting deadlines in delivery of judgements and drafting of judgements, quality of judgements on the grounds of expressed remedies in legal actions and other activities of judges.
Framework criteria are adopted by the Minister of Justice on the proposal of the General Assembly of Supreme Court. The Criteria prescribe the number of decisions that need to be rendered every year by a judge.
According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette, No. 67/18), State Attorneys' and Deputy State Attorneys' performance is evaluated every three years according to the following criteria: achieved results in resolving cases (based on the number of cases assigned to work on the basis of the Framework Criteria for the Work of Deputy State Attorneys and the average work results of county or municipal state attorney's offices for the previous three-year period), the quality of decisions and the justified use of legal remedies, proper performance of the state attorney's duty - observance of deadlines during the procedure, other activities of the State Attorney and the Deputy State Attorney, experience in performing the duty of state attorney and compliance of conduct with the Code of Ethics of State Attorneys and Deputy State Attorneys. The Framework criteria are adopted by the Minister in charge of judicial affairs, with the prior opinion of the Chief State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia.

Q066 (2018): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of the court evaluates the work of every single judge according to Framework for the workload of judges in the period of one year following the standards on the number of judgements delivered by a judge compared with the number of judgements that should have been delivered, according to the Framework for the workload of judges, result of work in different kinds of cases, respecting deadlines in delivery of judgements and drafting of judgements, quality of judgements on the grounds of expressed remedies in legal actions and other activities of judges.
Framework criteria are adopted by the Minister of Justice on the proposal of the General Assembly of Supreme Court. The Criteria prescribe the number of decisions that need to be rendered every year by a judge.

Q066 (2017): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of the court evaluates the work of every single judge in his/her court for the previous year on the basis of the following standards: the number of judgements delivered by a judge compared with the number of judgements that should have been delivered, according to the Framework for the workload of judges, result of work in different kinds of cases in absolute numbers and percentages, respecting deadlines in delivery of judgements and drafting of judgements, quality of judgements on the grounds of expressed remedies in legal actions and other activities of judges.
Framework criteria are adopted by the Minister of Justice on the proposal of the General Assembly of Supreme Court. The Criteria prescribe the number of decisions that need to be rendered every year by a judge.

Q073 (2015): According to the Court Act, the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years.

The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 March for the previous year.

The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered,stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanour courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts.

Q073-0 (General Comment): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure in which lasts more than three years. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry in charge for Justice, once a year, at the latest by the 31 March for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30th April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts. The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Through Case Management system it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

Q073-0 (2019): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 82/16, 67/18, 126/19), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years. The president of the court is obliged to take special care to respect the rights and protect children in proceedings before the courts in accordance with international standards. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 January for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts.
The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanour courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

Q073-0 (2018): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 March for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts.
The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanour courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

Q073-0 (2017): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 March for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts. The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanour courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

Q073-0 (2016): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 March for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts.
The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanor courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

Q070 (2019): As regards "number of appeals", from 2019 we are able to get this data from our case management system.

Q073-3 (General Comment): According to the State Attorney's Act (Official Gazette, No. 67/18), a state attorney supervises accurate performance of all state attorney office activities in due time. A state attorney submits reports to the higher state attorney on his state attorney office performance each month and annually and reports on undertaken and planned actions in cases of special state interest or in cases with complex factual or legal issues. The General State Attorney Office submits the report on the status and trends of reported crime in the previous year, on cases related to the protection of property interests of the Republic of Croatia, legal issues in particular areas and a review of the organization and personnel in state attorney organization to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report, there can be a warning on the state and functioning of the legal system, deficiencies in the legislation and internal affairs of the state attorney's office and suggestions for improving the work.
The state attorney offices use a special information system for the management and operation of the state attorney cases, as an interactive data base in real time. Through the CTS (Case tracking system) it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of state attorney offices.

Q073-4 (2018): According to the State Attorney's Act (Official Gazette, number 76/09, 153/09, 116/10, 145/10, 57/11, 130/11, 72/13, 148/13, 33/15, 82/15), a state attorney supervises accurate performance of all state attorney office activities in due time. A state attorney submits reports to the higher state attorney on his state attorney office performance each month and annually and reports on undertaken and planned actions in cases of special state interest or in cases with complex factual or legal issues. The General State Attorney Office submits the report on the status and trends of reported crime in the previous year, on cases related to the protection of property interests of the Republic of Croatia, legal issues in particular areas and a review of the organization and personnel in state attorney organization to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report, there can be a warning on the state and functioning of the legal system, deficiencies in the legislation and internal affairs of the state attorney's office and suggestions for improving the work.
The state attorney offices use special information systems for the management and operation of the state attorney cases, as an interactive data base in real time. Through the CTS (Case tracking system) it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of state attorney offices.

Q078 (2019): As regards "number of appeals", from 2019 we are able to get this data from our case management system.

Q078 (2014): On the occasion of the 2014 evaluation, it has been explained that the productivity as a performance and quality indicator, applies only to judges (not court staff).
Q083-3 (General Comment): According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18) , the Minister in charge for Justice, upon the proposal of Prosecutor General, adopts the Framework criteria for the work of public prosecutors (Deputy State Attorneys).
Q083-3 (2020): According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18) , the Minister in charge for Justice, upon the proposal of Prosecutor General, adopts the Framework criteria for the work of public prosecutors (Deputy State Attorneys).

Q083-3 (2018): According to the State Attorney's Act, the Minister of Justice, upon the proposal of Prosecutor General, adopts the Framework criteria for the work of public prosecutors.

Cyprus

Q066 (General Comment): Quality standards are applied in practice

Q066 (2017): Quality standards are applied in practice

Q066 (2016): There are no written standards but in practice there are quality stantards.

Q066 (2015): In practice there are quality stantards

Q066 (2014): In practice there are quality stantards

Q073-0 (2021): monthly and annually

Q073-0 (2020): monthly and annually

Q073-0 (2019): monthly

Q073-0 (2018): monthly and annually

Q073-0 (2017): monthly and annually

Q073-0 (2016): monthly and annually statistics

Q073-5 (2021): This is part of the reform that is underway in the A-G Office.

Q120-1 (2021): the assessment is carried out by the AG the Deputy AG and the head of Department as part of their annual evaluation

Czech Republic

Q073-1 (2016): In 2015, a new policy from the Ministry of Justice resulted in the fact that the evaluation of the court activity is used for the later allocation of means to this court.
Q073-1 (2015): In 2015, a new policy from the Ministry of Justice resulted in the fact that the evaluation of the court activity is used for the later allocation of means to this court.
Q077 (2016): The answer should be YES - there are performance indicators such as number of cases that the judge should resolve within a month, but these are not so strictly binding.
Q120-1 (2018): The individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work take place at least once every two years.

Denmark

Q066 (2019): No, we use quantitative measures. Quality is usually measured as length of time to finalize a case.

Q066 (2016): No, we use quantitative measures. Quality is measured as length of time to finalize a case.

Q066 (2015): The only standards are objective standards for example acceptable timeframes to finalize a case.

Q067 (2019): As above

Q067 (2018): The public prosecution is not part of Danish Court Administration.

Q067 (2017): Because judges are independent, we do not interfere with a judge decision. However, there is always the possibility to appeal a court decision if either of the parties disagree with the verdict.
Q067 (2016): As above.

Q073 (2019): Weighted cases is also a way to see how much activity a court has.

Q073-0 (2021): Monthly, quarterly, half yearly and yearly.

Q073-0 (2020): Monthly, quarterly, half yearly and yearly.

Q073-0 (2019): Monthly for the district courts quarterly for other courts.

Q073-0 (2018): Monthly for the district courts. quarterly for other courts.

Q073-0 (2017): Monthly for the district courts. Quarterly for the High Courts, the Maritime and Commercial Court and the Supreme Court.
Q073-1 (2017): Definitely. Both in relation to funds but also in relation to appointment of new judges in case of vacancy. In case of vacancy, it is not necessarily the same district court where the judge will be placed. It may change to another court. At the high court and the Supreme court the law defines a fixed number of judges at each court.

Q073-2 (2020): Half yearly weighted cases and productivity figures are worked out. These data are used to allocate ressources and to find which court should have the next free judge position.
Q070 (2021): Danish Court Admininistration is typically not doing this. A responsible court follow their cases though.

Q070 (2020): We value independence high. Therefore Danish Court Administration does not evaluate the performance or productivity of individual judges. We follow overall productivity and case flow though as that is used to allocate ressources and to find the court most in need of vacant judge positions.
Q070 (2019): Courts are followed yearly in a yearly report. District courts receives monthly a report about case flow, pending cases, backlogs, weighted cases and the time it takes to finalize cases.
Q070 (2017): In Denmark we have a management system which information is updated monthly for the district courts where the points above are shown. For the High Courts and the Supreme Court, the case flow is not followed so often and in a so detailed way, but there are also much fewer cases. "Other": activity in terms of weighted cases and also pending cases

Q070 (2016): The so called "weighted cases" are measured in order to have a measure for the activity.

Q078-1 (2021): "Other": time between preliminary charge and indictment.
We do not have a performance indicator measuring length of the proceedings directly. However, we measure them indirectly, since we have performance measures on the time from a case is given to the public prosecution until the case is resolved.

Q078-1 (2020): We do not have performance indicators that measure length of proceedings directly. However, we measure them indirectly, since we have performance measures on the time from a case is given to the public prosecution until the case is resolved. Earlier we have interpreted this as an indirect measure of time-frames, but we have come to the conclusion that it is more correct to say, that we do not measure timeframes.

Q073-4 (2021): Monthly, quarterly and yearly.

Q073-4 (2020): Monthly

Q073-4 (2018): Monthly

Q070-1 (2021): The prosecution makes quarterly reports to the Ministry of Justice on data regarding number of cases, percentage of conviction etc.
Disposition time is measured indirectly through a report that measures all steps in a criminal case from arrest to imprisonment. There is no direct measure of disposition time, but it can be read from this report. The prosecution makes a biannual survey on the satisfaction of the prosecution staff.

Q070-1 (2020): The methodology of replying changed in this question.
The prosecution makes quarterly reports to the Ministry of Justice on data regarding number of cases, clearance rate, etc. Disposition time is measured indirectly through a report that measures all steps in a criminal case from arrest to imprisonment. There is no direct measure of disposition time, but it can be read from this report. Therefore we find it more correct to check this option. Satisfaction of the prosecution staff has always been measured but not by the ministry of justice. Therefore it was not checked last time. However, it is measured, and we therefore find it correct to check this option. The prosecution makes an annual survey on the satisfaction of the prosecution staff.

Q071 (2021): Danish Court Admininistration is typically not doing this. A responsible court follow their cases though.

Q071 (2020): Danish Court Administration is not doing it as a general thing. If a specific court needs help, Danish Court Administration can work out list of pending cases and list them according to age to give the court a tool to locate cases that need attention.
Q072 (2021): Danish Court Admininistration is typically not doing this. A responsible court follow their cases though. The individual courts may work out list of pending cases or worning lists when to act on a case.
Q072 (2020): Danish Court Admininistration is typically not doing this. A responsible court follow their cases though.

Q072 (2018): We monitor the overall time from the courts receive a case until it is finalized, but not what happen in between. The same goes for the prosecution
Q077 (General Comment): The data is collected for all parts of the judicial system, eg. Police, Public prosecution, courts and the prison system. The data is used to measure the performance of the individual agencies/administrations, but also - and perhaps most importantly - to measure the interplay between these.
Q077 (2017): We have for a number of categories of cases defined that a certain percentage of cases should be solved within a certain time span. It varies for the different categories of cases.
Q077 (2016): In terms of productivity figures, weighted cases and target attainments.

Q078 (2021): "Other": Number of weighted cases

Q078 (2019): Backlogs is qualified by showing the average age of pending cases to the district courts.

Q083-2 (General Comment): There is a productivity target for the prosecution as a whole, but not for each public prosecutor.

Q120 (2020): Public prosecutors go through intensive education for the first three years of them being recruited and this evaluation is structured centrally with HR at the Attorney Generals office. During that period they are individually being assessed through exams and through working with mentors. Thus they are continuously being assessed both centrally through exams as well as locally through the daily work that the mentor sees. Later in the career the assessment is not structured in such a way but all through their career the prosecutors are evaluated through their daily work and how they perform in court.

Q120-1 (General Comment): Public prosecutors go through intensive education for the first three years of them being recruited and this evaluation is structured centrally with HR at the Attorney General's office. During that period, they are individually being assessed through exams and through working with mentors. Thus, they are continuously being assessed both centrally through exams as well as locally through the daily work that the mentor sees. Later in the career the assessment is not structured in such a way but all through their career the prosecutors are evaluated through their daily work and how they perform in court.

Q120-1 (2021): More frequent during the first three years of their career. Less frequent after that.

Q120-1 (2020): See response to 120: More frequent during the first three years of their career. Less frequent after that.

Estonia

Q066 (General Comment): Estonia has developed a quality system consisting of 3 parts. The first part contains the quality standards (good practice) for the management of the court that describe activities related to the chairman of the court. The second part contains the quality standards for the administration of courts and is focused on the different roles of the parties involved in the administration of courts: directors, Ministry of Justice, Council for the Administration of Courts. The third part contains quality standards for the court proceedings and is addressed to all the judges. All of the three parts of the quality standards have been discussed and approved by the Council for Administration of Courts, respectively in 2012, 2013 and 2015.

Q073-0 (2021): 4 times a year.

Q073-0 (2020): 4 times a year.

Q073-0 (2019): 4 times a year.

Q073-0 (2017): Every 4 months but if necessary even more frequent.

Q073-1 (2016): It can be part of it but it's not a rule.

Q070 (General Comment): The scope of the monitoring system is extended to the results of proceedings; the categories of cases; the number of decisions appealed and revoked, fully or partially. The waiting time and the 'age' of pending (not solved) cases are also monitored. It is worthy of mention that every year all the courts and the Ministry of Justice enter into an agreement according to which courts should aim to carry out structural changes and to make changes in case-flow management that will ultimately ensure efficient proceedings. The content of the agreement has changed since 2017. The goals are more general and the same for all the courts (except The Supreme Court).

Q070 (2017): See previous general comments.

Q070 (2016): see general comments

Q078 (2014): In 2014, the number of old cases has been considered among the main performance and quality indicators that have been defined. In 2012, this was not an official policy. In 2014, according to the decree adopted by the Minister of Justice, any case that has been pending for longer than two years is considered as an “old case”.

Finland

Q066 (General Comment): There are quality projects covering both civil and criminal cases in the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi judicial district and in the Helsinki Court of Appeal judicial district. In a quality project, one or several working groups are set up usually for a year. There are judges from each district court within the judicial district of a court of appeal and court of appeal judges and referendaries in the working group. Depending on the topic, prosecutors, attorneys-at-law and other lawyers, public legal aid lawyers and police may also participate in the working group's work. The working group writes a report on a specific theme, for example developing conduct of the court proceedings or legal costs in criminal and civil cases. The written report is presented and discussed in a formal event and published. The aim is to provide legal professionals with practical information and guidelines on a certain topic.
In addition, there are co-operation projects between administrative courts.
Prosecution Services' system quality improvement project is underway.
The Finnish Association of Judges compiled and published Ethical Principles for Judges in 2012.

Q066 (2021): Prosecution Services' system quality improvement project is underway.

Q066 (2020): Prosecution Services' system quality improvement project is underway.

Q066 (2015): There is a Quality Project of the courts in the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi. (The jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi is the northernmost of the six appellate jurisdictions in Finland.) In 1999, the courts in the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi launched a project for improvement of quality in adjudication. The quality project covers both civil cases and criminal cases. The objective of the quality project is to develop the functioning of the courts further and further so that the proceedings meet the criteria of a fair trial, that the decisions are well reasoned and justified, and that the services of the courts are affordable to the individual customers. The main working method consists of systematic discussions among the judges and also between the judges and stakeholders. The development work is steered by the development committee of the quality project. Normally four working groups for quality are set up for each year. The membership consists of judges from each of the District Courts in the appellate jurisdiction, members of the Court of Appeal, and referendaries of the Court of Appeal. Also prosecutors, private attorneys, public legal aid attorneys and heads of pre-trial investigation may serve as members in the working groups for quality. Each working group for quality is tasked to deal with one of the development themes which have been selected. The reports of the working groups are presented at the Quality Conference, they are discussed, and quality objectives based on the reports are set for the following year. The Report of Quality, containing the final reports, is published every year.

There is also a quality project of the courts in the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Helsinki. Quality Project consists of working methods of two kind: cooperation with the University of Helsinki and working groups. Working groups for quality are set up for each year. The membership consists of judges from District Courts, members of the Court of Appeal, referendaries of the Court of Appeal, prosecutors and lawyers. Each working group for quality is tasked to address to one of the development themes which have been selected. The reports of the working groups are presented at the conference called 'Day of Jurisdiction'.

In addition there is a cooperation project between administrative courts. Some topics of the project have related to the quality standards. The reports of the project have discussed the matters like the factors of quality at administrative courts and the collection of information on quality.

It is also worth mentioning that on 15 October 2009, the presidents of Finnish Courts of Appeal proposed that the Finnish Association of Judges should begin work on drafting ethical guidelines for judges. A working group was set and the draft on ethical principles was discussed widely. The principles were formally released at the Judge Day event held in Helsinki on 12 October 2012.

Q073-0 (2021): During the annual budget negotiations the performance of each court is evaluated. However, the general performance of the courts as a whole (for example disposition times) is monitored more frequently
Q073-0 (2020): During the annual budget negotiations the performance of each court is evaluated. However, the general performance of the courts as a whole (for example disposition times) is monitored more frequently.
Q073-2 (2021): The evaluation is used for later allocation of resources in the courts but the evaluation is not the main criteria when allocating the resources.
Q073-2 (2020): The evaluation is used for later allocation of resources in the courts but the evaluation is not the main criteria when allocating the resources.
Q073-2 (2019): The evaluation is used for later allocation of resources in the courts but the evaluation is not the main criteria when allocating the resources.
Q073-2 (2018): The evaluation is used for later allocation of resources in the courts but the evaluation is not the main criteria when allocating the resources.
Q070 (General Comment): All courts keep statistics of the mentioned court activities in the operational case management systems. The National Courts Administration can access these figures through a reporting system.

Q070 (2019): satisfaction of court staff is monitored with job satisfaction surveys which are taken every second year

Q077-1 (2020): Performance yes, quality no - See answer 066

Q073-4 (2021): Biannually. The prosecution services are evaluated twice a year.

Q073-4 (2020): Biannually. The prosecution services are evaluated twice a year.

Q073-4 (2018): When necessary.

Q073-6 (2021): The Office of the Prosecutor General is responsible for the use and distribution of the appropriations of the independent and autonomous Prosecution Authority to the prosecution districts. The prosecution Authority reports on its operations twice a year to the Ministry of Justice (financial statements and half-yearly reports). In addition, the Office of the Prosecutor General monitors the activities of all prosecution districts on a monthly basis, including e.g. the number of criminal cases and their decision-making times. These have an impact on the equal distribution of resources between the prosecution districts.

Q070-1 (2021): "Backlogs": cases that have been pending for longer than a year are monitored

Q070-1 (2020): "Backlogs": cases that have been pending for longer than a year are monitored.

Q072 (2021): Within the courts, the time the case is pending in a court is monitored.
Prosecution services: The time between police investigation and prosecutor's decision (the time the case is pending in the prosecution service) is monitored.

Q072 (2020): Within the courts, the time the case is pending in a court is monitored.

Q072 (2018): Within the courts, the time the case is pending in a court is monitored.

Q077 (2019): Statistics Finland no longer collects statistical data regarding the functioning of the courts and the judiciary. The Ministry of
Justice/National Courts Administration collects data and publishes the annual operational statistics, please see for example Courts statistics 2019 (in Finnish): http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-259-912-4

Q078 (2021): Performance yes, quality no - See answer 066

Q078 (2020): Statistics Finland (until 2013) or Ministry of Justice (until 2019) no longer collect statistical data regarding the functioning of the courts and the judiciary. From 2020 onward the National Courts Administration collects data and publishes the annual operational statistics.

Q078 (2018): Statistics Finland no longer collects statistical data regarding the functioning of the courts and the judiciary. The Ministry of Justice collects data and publishes the annual operational statistics, pleaase see for example Courts statistics 2018 (in Finnish): http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-259-745-8

France

Q066 (2021): Quality standards developed for public administration are used in the judicial system. The charter of the administrations thus sets the rules for the reception of litigants in all courts and can lead to certification. There are also local initiatives aimed at setting up a "quality system" based on certification by an external body, which consists in establishing procedures describing the reception process, the organisation of work and the management of a case.
Source DSJ

Q066 (2020): "If yes, please specify: Quality standards developed for public administration are used in the judicial system. The charter of the administrations thus sets the rules for the reception of litigants in all the courts and can lead to certification. There are also local initiatives aimed at setting up a "quality system" based on certification by an external body, which consist in establishing procedures describing the reception process, the organization of work and the management of a case.
With regard to administrative justice: the rate of annulment and reversal of jurisdictional decisions must be kept below 15% and the stock of cases older than two years below 7.5% of the total stock."

Q066 (2019):
Quality standards developed for public administration are used in the judicial system. The charter of administrations thus sets out the rules for the reception of litigants in all courts and may give rise to certification. There are also local initiatives to set up a "quality system" based on certification by an external body, which consists of establishing procedures describing the process of reception, work organisation and management of a case.
Administrative justice: the rate of annulment of court decisions must be kept below 15% and the number of cases pending for more than two years.

Q066 (2016): Quality standards developed for public administration are used in the judicial system. The charter of the administrations determines the rules for the reception of litigants in all courts and may give rise to certification. There are also local initiatives aimed at setting up a "quality system" based on certification by an external body, which consists in establishing procedures describing the process of reception, organisation of work and management of a case.

Q067 (2021): Source DSJ

Q067 (2020): The answer is no for the administrative justice.

Q067 (2014): 2010: State prosecutors draw an annual report on the activity, management of their public prosecution office and on the enforcement of the law, as well as an annual report concerning the measures of custody and the condition of the custody facilities.

Q067 (2012): 2012: in French law on the judicial organisation, there is no statutory or regulatory requirement providing specialised staff in courts responsible for quality norms.
However, as part of the maintenance dialog to have operational resources, each court fills a document for the Ministry of Justice, comprising informations such as the number of handled cases, pending cases, the number of judges and administrative staff, as well as the performance objectives to reach. This document is not available on the intranet to all of the staff. Only agents of the Ministry in charge of the maintenance dialog have access to these figures thanks to appropriate softwares.

Q073 (General Comment): In the case of civil and criminal justice, it is specified "in the framework of management dialogues".
Source DSJ

Q073 (2016): Administrative courts also use dashboards on monthly basis, while civil and criminal courts receive quarterly management activity reports via a business application.
Q073 (2014): 2012, 2013, 2014: for the adminsitrative courts, the performance indicators comprised an estimate and objectives updated every three months. The activity is assessed every year in the administrative jurisdictions during management conferences. A monitoring board fo the activity is transmitted every month to the heads of administrative jurisdictions.
Q073 (2013): 2012, 2013, 2014: for the adminsitrative courts, the performance indicators comprised an estimate and objectives updated every three months. The activity is assessed every year in the administrative jurisdictions during management conferences. A monitoring board fo the activity is transmitted every month to the heads of administrative jurisdictions.
Q073 (2012): 2012, 2013, 2014: for the adminsitrative courts, the performance indicators comprised an estimate and objectives updated every three months. The activity is assessed every year in the administrative jurisdictions during management conferences. A monitoring board fo the activity is transmitted every month to the heads of administrative jurisdictions.
Q073-0 (2021): Source DSJ
Source Council of State
Q073-0 (2020):
With regard to the courts of the judicial order, there are two objectives for evaluating the performance of the courts. The first is the need to provide the heads of courts with steering elements via monthly dashboards (civil and criminal); the second consists, in the context of annual management dialogues, in proposing dashboards covering a whole year. These dashboards are freely accessible in order to allow for a very wide distribution to all the actors and thus encourage comparison, the first vector of performance analysis.

Q073-0 (2019): Concerning civil and criminal branches, there are two objectives for evaluating courts' performance. The first lies in the need to provide the heads of courts with steering elements via monthly dashboards (Civil and Criminal), the second in the context of annual management dialogues, the dashboard covering this time a whole year. These dashboards are freely accessible so that they can be widely diffused to all stakeholders and thus facilitate comparison, the latter being the primary means of analysing performance. Administrative courts also use monthly dashboards and civil and criminal courts receive quarterly reports on steering activities via a business application.

Q073-0 (2018): For judicial courts, the performance analysis is based on the PHAROS information centre used by courts (courts and prosecution services) and central administration.
The results of the management dialogues are published in July. The so-called steering returns can be updated every quarter and every month according to the disputes monitored.
For administrative courts, the frequency is annual

Q073-1 (2017): Annual management conferences (management dialogues) are held between the Ministry or the General Secretariat of the Council of State, depending on whether the court is judicial or administrative, during which the activity indicators of each court are analysed for the previous year and, in the light of the objectives achieved, the objectives and the resources in terms of credits and personnel granted for the coming year are set.

Q073-1 (2016): Annual management conferences (management dialogues) are held between the Ministry or the General Secretariat of the State Council (Conseil d'Etat), depending on whether the court is civil, criminal or administrative, during which, the activity indicators of each court are analysed for the past year, and, in the light of the objectives achieved, the objectives and the means in terms of credits and staff granted are set for the coming year.

Q073-2 (2021): Source DSJ
Source Council of State
Q073-2 (2020): No comment

Q073-2 (2019): Annual management conferences (management dialogues) are held between the Ministry or the General Secretariat of the Supreme Administrative Court (Conseil d'Etat), depending on whether the court is civil/criminal or administrative, during which the activity indicators of each court are analysed for the past year and, in the light of the objectives achieved, the objectives and the resources in terms of credits and personnel granted are set for the coming year.

Q073-2 (2018): The evaluation of a court's activity contributes in part to the subsequent allocation of resources to that court, in particular for the location of jobs for judges and civil servants.
However, the performance indicators are cross-referenced with other data (HR data, budgetary data, etc.) in the context of the allocation of human resources and the distribution of appropriations.

Q070 (2021): Source DSJ and Council of State

Q070 (2020): Judicial and administrative jurisdictions combined.

Q070 (2019): Civil and criminal justice: After the deployment of innovative applications, satisfaction questionnaires are sent to users in the courts (heads of courts, directors of registries, judges and registry officials) in order to improve change support actions and the implementation.
In addition, with regard to victims, the Ministry of Justice will conduct a satisfaction survey in the second half of 2019 among victims of criminal offences who resort to victim support associations. The results of this survey, similar to a previous survey conducted in 2011, could be published in 2020. Likewise, the Ministry of Justice is attentive to citizens' views on the way they are received in the courts. For several years now, surveys have been conducted on the reception in the courts by a service provider pretending being a litigant. In 2018, an online survey, coupled with a face-to-face survey, was conducted in seven 1st instance courts “tribunaux de grande instance” among litigants appearing in these courts. In 2019, the satisfaction survey will be carried out in all “tribunaux de grande instance” via an online survey accessible by internet address or QR code. Finally, a national survey is also under way on the reception of litigants in the courts in the specific context of the implementation of social centres within the “tribunaux de grande instance” and the integration within these courts of the three separate courts that previously dealt with these types of litigation. The survey, carried out among court staff, aims to assess the difficulties encountered by persons presenting themselves at the reception desk and to identify any corrections that could be included in the texts.
The reply to the question encompasses replies from administrative justice and civil and criminal justice.

Q070 (2018): The coverage rate of cases as well as the structure of civil or criminal litigation are used by the courts.
In addition, other indicators usefully complete the analysis: .
Share of decisions on the merits in completed cases (civil activity).
Share of referrals in completed cases (civil activity).
Theoretical time to sell off the stock.
Average age of the stock.
Percentage of cases over 12 months in stock (civil activity).

Q070 (2017): The number of cases referred is an indicator used only by administrative courts.
The courts have business applications to monitor their civil and criminal activities. At national level, data from these applications is
from these applications are collected automatically via infocentres, reprocessed and cross-referenced, then
in the form of tables or graphs. These reports can be generated on a monthly basis, except for certain activity data (court of appeal).
These reports can be generated on a monthly basis, except for certain activity data (criminal courts, juvenile court judges, enforcement of sentences), for which reports are generated annually.
These infocentres enable the courts to monitor statistics and manage their activity. They enable the central administration to
They enable the central administration to prepare management dialogues from a performance perspective.

Q070 (2016): The number of cases subject to referral is an indicator used only by administrative courts.
Courts have business applications to monitor their civil and criminal activities. At national level, data from these applications are collected automatically via info-centres, processed and cross-referenced, and then presented in the form of tables or graphs. These refunds can be generated monthly, except for certain activity data (assize court, juvenile judges, enforcement of sentences), for which the refunds are annual.
These info-centres enable courts to carry out a statistical follow-up and to monitor their activities. They allow the central administration to prepare management dialogues from a performance perspective.

Q070 (2015): The number of cases being referred is used only by administrative courts.
The rate of coverage of cases is used by judicial courts.
The state of stocks by age group is used by administrative courts.

Q070 (2014): 2013, 2014, the category "others" includes:
- the coverage rate of cases (used by judicial courts)
- the state of the stocks per age group (used bu administrative courts)
It should be noted that concerning the indicators mentioned in the question, the number of appealed cases is only used by administrative courts.

Q070 (2013): 2013, 2014, the category "others" includes:
- the coverage rate of cases (used by judicial courts)
- the state of the stocks per age group (used bu administrative courts)
It should be noted that concerning the indicators mentioned in the question, the number of appealed cases is only used by administrative courts.
Q070 (2012): 2010, 2012: the category "others" includes the state of the stocks per age group. It should be noted that concerning the indicators mentioned in the question, the number of appealed cases is only used by administrative courts

Q078-1 (2021): Source DSJ

Q078-1 (2020):
This data is not available.
Q073-4 (2021): source DSJ

Q073-6 (2021): Source DSJ

Q073-6 (2020): No additional information is available.

Q070-1 (2021): Source DSJ

Q070-1 (2020): Judicial jurisdiction.

Q071 (2021): Source DSJ and Council of State

Q071 (2020): No further indication.

Q071 (2016): In civil matters, courts of first instance (TGI), labour courts (conseils de prud'hommes) and courts of appeal can measure their stock on the basis of business applications or data returns carried out by info-centers.
The identification of cases not processed within a reasonable time is easier through business applications that offer dashboards breaking down cases in stock by age group.
In criminal matters, first instance courts (TGI) can use the Cassiopée business application to record cases in stock at the registry and the number of unedited judgments. The situation of cases in stock at the registry office cannot be measured via the info-centre, which only allows establishing the number of cases registered with the Public Prosecutor's Office and the Correctional Service.

Q072 (2021): Source DSJ, the reply concerns the civil and criminal justice.

Q072 (2020): Answer for the court.

Q078 (2021): Source DSJ and CE

Q078 (2020): No comment.

Q078 (2019): Replies from both the Directorate of Civil and Criminal Services (Direction des services judiciaires) and the Supreme Administrative Court (Conseil d'Etat) on civil, criminal and administrative justice.
Q078 (2018): The coverage rate of cases as well as the structure of civil or criminal litigation are used by the courts.
In addition, other indicators usefully complete the analysis: .
Share of decisions on the merits in completed cases (civil activity).
Share of referrals in completed cases (civil activity).
Theoretical time to sell off the stock.
Average age of the stock.
Percentage of cases over 12 months in stock (civil activity).

Q078 (2014): In 2014, the category "others" refers to the civil and criminal cassation rate for judicial justice and the annulment rate for administrative justice. Among the main performance indicators of these jurisdictions, are the rate and the time of enforcement of sentences, the criminal response rate, the use of ADR rate, the dismissal of national criminal record rate, the number of dematerialised exchanges for judicial jurisdictions. Regarding the administrative jurisdictions, there is an anticipated average time for the judgement of cases and the proportion of pending cases for more than 2 years.
Concerning the enforcement of criminal decisions, it has been decided to make a performance indicator out of it in 2014, but the available statistical tools make it impossible to produce it.

Q083-2 (2021): source DSJ

Q120 (2021): source DSJ

Q120-1 (2021): source DSJ

Germany

Q066 (General Comment): Since 2012, the reply "No" is provided depending on the answer of the majority of the respondent Landers.

Q066 (2013): For 2010, 2012 and 2013, no information was provided from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and Thuringia. Four Landers replied “Yes”, while the remaining Landers answered “No”.
In Baden-Württemberg, the performance of each court is compared against the others in regard to number and duration of proceedings. Key performance indicators on performance ability of the courts are ascertained and compared at the Lander level.
A comprehensive quality management system has been introduced in Schleswig-Holstein at all courts and public prosecution offices. All of the accessible areas of the court administration are subject to quality management. Judicial independence and the professional independence of Rechtspfleger present natural constitutional and statutory boundaries that must always be considered.
In Brandenburg, a quality management system seeks to guarantee that quality demands that are statutorily prescribed, self-imposed, or demanded by users of the system are fulfilled with an optimal use of resources. These last years, a number of strategies have been implemented for ensuring quality in the justice system by means of cost and performance accounting, a controlling system, budgeting of personnel costs, benchmark procedures, balanced scorecard, the EFQM Model, various instruments for personnel and organisation development, calculation of personnel requirements, optimisation of business processes, surveys of attorneys, citizens, and employees, and evaluation instruments both for individual judicial and public prosecution work as well as for the courts and public prosecution offices as organisational units. The increased use of modern technology (e.g. Internet) has opened up the possibility for the justice system to reach a large number of citizens and, thus, to offer court users the best possible service. Likewise, the continuous expansion of electronic legal transactions offers new opportunities for improvement in the quality of the justice system with regard to the performance characteristics public accessibility and public service. However, the developments and models named are not uniformly established in the Lander.
In Lower Saxony, a quality strategy was developed through the surveys AgiL (performance comparison of local courts) and LiVE (performance comparison of regional courts). This is based on the assumption that it is possible to compare courts by the collection of data. Following the comparison, an analysis is conducted to determine the reasons for which better numbers are achieved at one court location over another. These are then discussed in expert groups and measures are developed to promote those tools that seem likely to succeed for the duties at all court locations. The surveys do not serve to evaluate individual employees but rather to uncover structures that promote performance, which can then be transposed. This quality management concept takes place together with judicial councils and personnel representatives.

Q067 (2021): Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

Q067 (2020): Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

Q073 (2021): The situation has not changed in comparison with previous cycles. However, the methodology of replying to this question has changed in order to match the method used for replying to similar questions and in order to better reflect the answers provided by the Länder.
The majority of the Länder (10) answered "yes", 6 Länder answered "no".

Q073 (2013): In respect of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises no information was provided from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and Thuringia. Five States provided a positive reply, while the remaining Landers answered “NO”. As to Bavaria, the information varied depending on the individual court jurisdiction for which information was provided: “YES” for Bavarian fiscal courts and “NO” for the remaining Bavarian courts.
In Brandenburg, the analysis is only subject to the figures provided regarding incoming cases, conclusions, duration of proceedings, number of court persons working, etc., which could possibly be used as indicators for the assessment of the performance abilities and the quality standards of the court. In Bremen, there is a benchmarking based upon key performance indicators.
In Lower Saxony regular assessments of the activities of the courts and public prosecution offices take place through administrative supervision. Qualitative evaluation of court activities is not possible through the implemented statistics and, based upon the constitutional law guarantee of judicial independence, is not desired. Likewise, the current view in Saarland is that such an evaluation system is incompatible with judicial independence protected by the Basic Law. Moreover, in North-Rhine/Westphalia, monitoring adjudicative activities is prohibited based upon constitutional law grounds. In this Lander there is a comprehensive system for assessing internal business. In certain areas there is also a management information system with statistical core data relevant to management on the number of incoming cases, duration of proceedings, and numbers of conclusions.
Saxony-Anhalt specified that the instrument for operative and strategic management of the courts is the management report. In the conceptual (as regards content) design of the management reports, the department comparison is defined as central criteria. This approach results, on the one hand, in a comparison of one’s own department with the average of all departments and, on the other hand, in taking account of the basic idea behind benchmarking, with the average of the three best departments. Concrete measures with calculable targets are set forth in target agreements between the Ministry for Finance and the Ministry for Justice and Equality as well as in how they are structured with each budgeted department. The bases for this, among others, are indicators in the management reports.

Q073 (2012): In respect of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises no information was provided from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and Thuringia. Five States provided a positive reply, while the remaining Landers answered “NO”. As to Bavaria, the information varied depending on the individual court jurisdiction for which information was provided: “YES” for Bavarian fiscal courts and “NO” for the remaining Bavarian courts.
In Brandenburg, the analysis is only subject to the figures provided regarding incoming cases, conclusions, duration of proceedings, number of court persons working, etc., which could possibly be used as indicators for the assessment of the performance abilities and the quality standards of the court. In Bremen, there is a benchmarking based upon key performance indicators.
In Lower Saxony regular assessments of the activities of the courts and public prosecution offices take place through administrative supervision. Qualitative evaluation of court activities is not possible through the implemented statistics and, based upon the constitutional law guarantee of judicial independence, is not desired. Likewise, the current view in Saarland is that such an evaluation system is incompatible with judicial independence protected by the Basic Law. Moreover, in North-Rhine/Westphalia, monitoring adjudicative activities is prohibited based upon constitutional law grounds. In this Lander there is a comprehensive system for assessing internal business. In certain areas there is also a management information system with statistical core data relevant to management on the number of incoming cases, duration of proceedings, and numbers of conclusions.
Saxony-Anhalt specified that the instrument for operative and strategic management of the courts is the management report. In the conceptual (as regards content) design of the management reports, the department comparison is defined as central criteria. This approach results, on the one hand, in a comparison of one’s own department with the average of all departments and, on the other hand, in taking account of the basic idea behind benchmarking, with the average of the three best departments. Concrete measures with calculable targets are set forth in target agreements between the Ministry for Finance and the Ministry for Justice and Equality as well as in how they are structured with each budgeted department. The bases for this, among others, are indicators in the management reports.

Q073-0 (2021): Of the 10 Länder who answered "yes", exactly half indicated that evaluations take place annually. The other half reported that evaluations happen more frequently - in most cases quarterly.
Q073-1 (2021): The situation has not changed in comparison with previous cycles. However, the methodology of replying to this question has changed in order to match the method used for replying to similar questions and in order to better reflect the answers provided by the Länder.
A slight majority of the Länder answered "yes", 4 Länder could not provide an answer.

Q073-2 (2021): All except one of the Länder who answered "yes" selected "reallocating" resources. Other options were selected by only a few Länder. Information provided for for "other": organisational solutions
Q070 (General Comment): At the level of the Federal Government, statistics on proceedings encompass the number of incoming cases, the type of proceeding, the form of conclusion, and the time needed for conclusion. Moreover, information regarding other characteristics is also collected (legal aid in litigation and legal aid for proceedings, value of dispute, subject area, remedies, etc.) All of this information can be correlated to one another upon evaluation. The regular evaluations can be found in the publications of the Federal Statistical Office. Data regarding the business overviews usually does not contain – in that it involves manual statistics – additional information beyond the business workload, particularly as regards the duration of proceedings.
Q070 (2021): The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all Länder, the activities no. 5 and 9-13 were selcted by most Länder and the activities under "other" were only mentioned by a some Länder (5).
Q070 (2020): The monitoring activities mentioned unter "other" were reported only by some of the Länder.
Q070 (2019): Some of the Länder did mention a monitoring system concerning other court activities such as statistics on the nature of resolution are kept (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.).

Q070 (2018): Some of the Länder did mention a monitoring system concerning other court activities such as statistics on the nature of resolution are kept (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.).

Q070 (2016): other: Some of the Länder did mention a monitoring system concerning other court activities such as statistics on the nature of resolution are kept (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.).
Q070 (2014): In 2014, some of the Landers did mention a monitoring system concerning other court activities, namely statistics on the nature of resolution (e.g. in civil matters cases are dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.).

Q070 (2013): In 2013, seven Landers communicated information on their regular monitoring system. For example, Baden-Württemberg refereed to calculation of the specific personnel requirements on a mathematical-analytical basis. Bavaria mentioned the type of proceedings, form of decision, etc. for courts of labour and social jurisdiction and workload, ratio of part-time employees; average age of employees, training and sick days, duration of proceedings in months, ratio of appeals for courts of general jurisdiction. In Brandenburg, the number of pending cases and the ratio of terminated proceedings as against incoming cases are monitored.

Q070 (2012): For 2010 and 2012, five Landers did not provide any reply. Seven Landers communicated detailed information on their regular monitoring system of courts' activity. Among the main other monitored parameters are the deadlines for the drafting of judgments (Bavaria), the number of pending cases and the ratio of terminated proceedings as against incoming cases (Brandenburg), the nature of resolution – cases dealt with by contentious judgment, by acknowledgment, by settlement etc. (Hamburg), cases allocated among staff, i.e. caseload quota (Hesse); finance benchmarks, item costs, standardized deployment of person hours related to product (Saxony-Anhalt).

Q077-1 (2021): While the vast majority (13) of the Länder answered "yes", a minority of 2 Länder answered "no".

Q078-1 (2021): Just over half of the Länder answered that quality indicators have been defined for backlogs, a few reported that quality indicators for statisfaction of users, costs, clearance rate, disposition time or productivity of prosecutors and staff have also been defined.

Q078-1 (2020): Just over half of the Länder answered that quality indicators have been defined for backlogs, a few reported that quality indicators for statisfaction of users, costs, clearance rate or disposition time have also been defined.

Q073-3 (2021): The situation has not changed in comparison with previous cycles. However, the methodology of replying to this question has changed in order to match the method used for replying to similar questions and in order to better reflect the answers provided by the Länder.
A slight majority of the Länder answered "yes", one of the Länder could not provide an answer.

Q073-4 (2021): Among the Länder who answered "yes", frequencies are rather inconsistent. A slight majority of those Länder answered "more frequently" (quarterly reports)

Q073-5 (2021): Four Länder could not provide an answer. Half of the remaining Länder answered "yes" while the other half answered "no". All of the Länder who selected "yes" reported to use the evaluation for reallocating resources and most also use it for reengenineering of internal proceedures.

Q070-1 (2021): The monitoring activities no. 1-5 and 1-12 were selected by most Länder, the activity no. 9 (monitoring of costs) was selected by some (5) Länder.

Q070-1 (2020): A few Länder answered that they have also been monitoring productivity and costs.

Q071 (2021): Four of the Länder could not provide an answer. The remaining Länder monitor pending cases and backlogs for all of the case categories mentioned above.

Q071 (2020): The majority, but not all of the Länder have reported to monitor pending cases and backlogs.

Q071 (2018): In 2018, Länder have monitored the number of pending cases and the backlogs.

Q072 (2021): Courts: One of the Länder reported that waiting times are monitored with respect to ordinary courts.
Public Prosecution: While the majority of the Länder answered "no", a small minority of 3 Länder answered "yes".

Q077 (2021): While the vast majority (13) of the Länder answered "yes", a minority of 2 Länder answered "no".

Q078 (2021): Scarcely half of the Länder answered that quality indicators have been defined for backlogs, a few reported that quality indicators for costs, number of appeals, appeal ratio, clearance rate, disposition time or productivity of judges and court staff have also been defined.

Q078 (2020): Scarcely half of the Länder answered that quality indicators have been defined for backlogs, a few reported that quality indicators for costs, number of appeals, appeal ratio, clearance rate or disposition time have also been defined.

Q083-2 (2021): The vast majority of the Länder selected "no", 2 of the Länder answered "yes".

Q083-3 (2021): There are no quantitative performance targets for each public prosecutor. The 2 Länder that have quatitative performance targets answered, that the prosecutor General is responsible for setting these targets.

Q083-3 (2020): There are no quantitative performance targets for each public prosecutor

Q120 (2021): The vast majority of the Länder answered "yes", 3 answered "no".

Greece

Q066 (General Comment): Quality standards are set by the Code of Organization of Courts and Status of Judicial Officers (Law 1756/1988).

Q066 (2021): Most of the measures taken recently in greece aim at speeding up administrative justice. However, the law provides a set of quality criteria that must be taken into account when inspectors check the performance of each judge.

Q066 (2017): Most of the measures taken recently in Greece aim at speeding up Justice. However the Law provides a set of quality criteria that must be taken into account when inspectors check the performance of each judge.

Q067 (2021): It depends on the court, the answer was changed from yes to no although there are judicial services that have answered positively the majority have answered no.
Q067 (2017): The Law provides a set of quality criteria that must be taken into account when inspectors check the performance of each judge.
Q073 (2017): According to L. 1756/1988 (art. 85), supreme judges appointed as inspections for one year's term redact every year General Reports on the operation of each Court and prosecutor's Office in their district and recommend the necessary measures for the proper functioning of the service. Furthermore, data regarding the flow of cases collected by the Ministry of Justice is used for ad hoc analysis (e.g. to provide a basis for decisions regarding the function of courts or answers to questions of parliamentary control).
Q073-0 (2017): The regular evaluation activity is performed every year. Besides, the Law 1756/1988 provides for inspections. Namely, according to art. 85, supreme judges appointed as inspectors for one year term redact every year General Reports on the operation of each Court and prosecutor's Office in their district and recommend the necessary measures for the proper functioning of the service. Furthermore, data regarding the performance of courts is collected as follows:Regarding Administrative courts and Civil procedure the data is collected every quarter. Regarding penal procedure this is collected every semester.
Furthermore, ad hoc evaluations are conducted, based on the data collected every quarter and semester respectively.

Q073-1 (2017): Concerning the staff of the court, under certain circumstances, this evaluation of the Court activity could lead to a decision to increase or diminish it.
Q070 (General Comment): According to Law 1756/1988 (art. 85), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for one year’s term, redact every year general reports on the operation of each court and prosecutor's office in their district and recommend the necessary measures for the proper functioning of the service. Regarding administrative courts, this task is fulfilled by the General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts

Q070 (2019): The Greek government has introduced a new system for organizing and evaluating the planning and implementation of public sector actions and projects, which introduces among others, monitoring court activities. (L. 4622/2019 art. 49 foll.)
Q070 (2017): Regarding Administrative Courts, this task is fulfilled by the General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts. In the near future there will be a possibility for the General Commission of the state to use a business intelligence program, in order to extract composite statistical data without contacting any court [E-mail: g-epitropia-d-d@otenet.gr]
Q078-1 (2021): The number of incoming cases, number of pending cases and backlogs are refered by part of the prosecution services.
Q072 (General Comment): The waiting time during court procedures is monitored annually through the inspection process.The interval between the adjudication of the case and the issuance of the decision is watched, so that the judge does not have much pending and there is a quick delivery of justice.
Q072 (2018): There is a monitoring system regarding the length of the judicial procedure, but it does not include such kind of information.
Q072 (2016): There is a monitoring system regarding the length of the judicial procedure, but it does not include such kind of information.
Q077 (2017): N/A
Q078 (2021): The internal Regulation of each court determine a number of cases assigned to each judge and, in accordance with the law, the judge normally has to deliver his decision within eight months of the hearing, otherwise he is considered to be unduly delayed.(General Commission of ordinary and administrative courts).
- Depending on the procedure (e.g. n. 4412/2016 as in force, Article 372, procurement procedure).
- The rules of the Council of State provide for deadlines for holding a conference, for delivery of a draft decision and publication of a decision.
- The regulations of the administrative courts provide for a minimum number of charging cases for judges.(Counsil of State)
The number of incoming cases, number of pending cases and backlogs are refered by part of the Courts.

Q078 (2019): The Greek government has introduced a new system for organizing and evaluating the planning and implementation of public sector actions and projects, which envisages, among other things, the preparation of action plans that include various performance indicators. (L. 4622/2019 art. 49 foll.)

Q120 (General Comment): The court and prosecution offices Inspection and the Inspection of judges and prosecutors is being carried out by a Council and Inspection bodies, staffed by judicial officers. Inspectors draw up a separate, detailed and substantiated report for each judge of their court district. This report evaluates: the moral quality, vigor and character, scientific qualifications, judicial judgment and perception, diligence, hardworking and service (qualitative and quantitative) performance, Justice administration, wording of court decisions and procedure management capacity and concerning Prosecutors, the capacity to administer justice, both in the pre-litigation procedure and hearing, as well as their oral speech capacity, the judges' behavior in general and in the audience, as well as his social status. The inspector shall also indicate in the report whether s/he considers as eligible for promotion, the Judges of First Instance and the Deputy Prosecutors of First Instance who have completed five years of service in their grade, as well as the judges and prosecutors from the rank of the Judge President to the Court of First Instance and Prosecutor of First Instance and above, after the completion of one year in their grade. Inspectors' reports shall be submitted to the Chairman of the Council of Inspectors within two months from the end of their term of office. In the event of an extraordinary or additional inspection, the report shall be submitted immediately after it has been carried out. A copy of each report shall be submitted by the Chairman of the Inspection Council to the Minister of Justice and, as the case may be, to the President and the Prosecutor of the Supreme Court, the President of the Council of State, the President of the Court of Auditors and the Auditor General of the Court of Auditors and the General Commissioner of the General Commission of the State. A copy of the inspection report shall be placed on the individual file of the inspected person. Another copy is being handed over to the inspected person by the competent department of the Ministry of Justice.

Hungary

Q066 (General Comment): Regional courts and regional courts of appeal prepare a note on the decision and the trial procedure of the first instance court, based on professional criteria in every case. In this note, the court of appeal has to examine: the application of substantive, procedural and administrative regulations; the preparation of the hearings; the quality of the judges trial leading practice; if the coercive measures were well founded; if the hearings were set timely; if the ruling was transcribed in time; if the decision was edited correctly. The conclusions are summarized and judges of first instance courts are informed about them at least once a year.
Furthermore, at the Kúria working groups are examining judicial practice and they are responsible for examining the case-law of the courts. Examination targets shall be defined on an annual basis by the President of the Kúria, following consultation with the professional departments of the Kúria.

Q073 (2014): On the occasion of the 2013 and 2014 evaluations, it has been stressed that the statistics of the court system are carried out every quarter,semi-annualy and annualy. It is published on the central internet website of the courts every half year.
If some elements of the IT system described in 2012 have been implemented, this system is not yet able to replace the regular methods of measuring workload.
Q073 (2013): On the occasion of the 2013 and 2014 evaluations, it has been stressed that the statistics of the court system are carried out every quarter,semi-annualy and annualy. It is published on the central internet website of the courts every half year.
If some elements of the IT system described in 2012 have been implemented, this system is not yet able to replace the regular methods of measuring workload.
Q073 (2012): On the occasion of the 2012 exercise, it has been mentioned that the development of an IT system was under way which would make it possible to automatically measure and evaluate the workload of judges.
Q073-0 (2021): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.
Q073-0 (2020): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.
Q073-0 (2019): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.
Q073-0 (2018): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.
Q073-0 (2017): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.
Q073-1 (General Comment): The statistical output of a court (mainly the number of incoming and pending cases) is taken into consideration during the distribution of human resources.
Q073-2 (2019): The statistical output of a court (mainly the number of incoming and pending cases) is taken into consideration during the distribution of human resources.

Q070 (General Comment): Among others:
- individual judge's statistics, - statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- pending cases of an individual judge / court,
- the time frame of pending cases
- number of appealed cases,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q070 (2021): - statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q070 (2020): - statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q070 (2019): Other:
- statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q070 (2018): Other:
- statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q070 (2015): Among others:
- individual judge's statistics,
- statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases,
- number of tried cases per day,
- pending cases of an individual judge / court,
- the time frame of pending cases
- number of appealed cases,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q070 (2014): In 2013 and 2014, among other are quoted individual judge's statistics, statistics on the reasons of postponing trials, the number of trial days, the number of tried cases per day, the number of pending cases of an individual judge/court, the time frame of pending cases, the number of appealed cases, the subject of incoming/resolved/pending cases, the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases. Cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month, as well as cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court.

Q070 (2013): In 2013 and 2014, among other are quoted individual judge's statistics, statistics on the reasons of postponing trials, the number of trial days, the number of tried cases per day, the number of pending cases of an individual judge/court, the time frame of pending cases, the number of appealed cases, the subject of incoming/resolved/pending cases, the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases. Cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month, as well as cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court.

Q070 (2012): In 2010 and 2012, a reference is made to individual judge's statistics, statistics on the reasons of postponing trials, the number of trial days, the number of resolved cases, the number of cases scheduled within one day, the number of pending cases of an individual judge.
Q077-1 (2021): The prosecution services have recently introduced a system of performance evaluation. The system was launched in 2020, and 2021 was the first year in respect of which a full set of data was generated.
Q073-3 (2021): The prosecution services have recently introduced a system of performance evaluation. The system was launched in 2020, and 2021 was the first year in respect of which a full set of data was generated. The methodology described at Question 63-7 is capable of showing the changing trends of workload in respect of a particular prosecution service.

Q073-6 (2021): Leaders of the prosecution service use the results for determining the exact demands for human resources.

Q070-1 (2021): The BTM system (Criminal Justice Activity Indicator System) is available for the Prosecution Service of Hungary. This system requlary monitors prosecution activities (performance and quality), however, it does not contain any information about the number of incoming cases, length of proceedings, number of resolved cases, backlogs etc.

Q071 (General Comment): Judges have to report those cases on a monthly basis that are pending for more than 2 years. The president of the court can
order a fast-track procedure for a case based on the report.
Q071 (2018): Judges have to report those cases on a monthly basis that are pending for more than 2 years. The president of the court can order a fast-track procedure for a case based on the report.
Q072 (General Comment): The administrative office of the court reports those cases to the president in which there was no judicial activity in the last 30 days.
Q072 (2018): The administrative office of the court reports those cases to the president in which there was no judicial activity in the last 30 days.

Q078 (General Comment): Measuring the satisfaction of court users has been introduced in 2014.

Q078 (2021): Among others: individual judge's statistics; statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials; number of trial days in cases;
number of cases heard per day; pending cases of an individual judge / court; the time frame of pending cases; number of appealed cases;the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases; the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases; cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month; cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q078 (2020): Among others: individual judge's statistics; statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials; number of trial days in cases;
number of cases heard per day; pending cases of an individual judge / court; the time frame of pending cases; number of appealed cases;the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases; the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases; cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month; cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q078 (2019): Among others: individual judge's statistics; statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials; number of trial days in cases;
number of cases heard per day; pending cases of an individual judge / court; the time frame of pending cases; number of appealed cases; the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases; the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases; cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month; cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q078 (2018): Among others: individual judge's statistics; statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials; number of trial days in cases; number of cases heard per day; pending cases of an individual judge / court; the time frame of pending cases; number of appealed cases; the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases; the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases; cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month; cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Q083-2 (2021): For the time being, no performance targets are in place, but the development of such targets is in progress.

Q120 (General Comment): The evaluation system is defined by Articles 50-52 of the Act on the Legal Status of Prosecutors. The purpose is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's activities, his/her skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. Prosecutors, with the exception of the Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutor General, are assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first appointment, while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of 3 years following the appointment, and thereafter every 8 years. Prosecutors need not be assessed during the 6 years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age. A prosecutor shall also be assessed if: requested by the prosecutor; circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor's professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment; in the extraordinary proceeding to be completed without delay, s/he fails to meet the deadline extended by the superior prosecutor. The assessment is the duty of the person exercising the employer's rights. The official work of prosecutors assigned to the Ministry is evaluated by the Minister responsible for justice in accordance with the rules applicable to government officials. As a result, prosecutors may be awarded the following grades: excellent, suitable for promotion; excellent and fully eligible; eligible; eligible, subsequent assessment required; ineligible. In the event of an ineligible grade, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If the prosecutor is awarded a grade "eligible, subsequent assessment required", the person exercising the employer's rights identifies the deficiencies and irregularities and states the main criteria of the desired changes which shall be reviewed prior to the next assessment (within 2 years). A prosecutor shall be awarded an ineligible grade upon the next assessment if he/she fails to obtain an eligible grade. S/he may request a court of law to quash any erroneous or untrue finding.

Q120-1 (2021): Under Section 50 (1) of Act on Prosecutors, prosecutors shall be assessed on a regular basis, with the exception of the Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutors General.
In case of the first appointment, which is for a definite term, the prosecutor shall be assessed by the end of that term. In case of appointment to prosecutor for an indefinite term, the prosecutor shall be assessed within 3 years following the appointment; then the assessment shall be carried out every 8 years.
Prosecutors are do not need to be assessed within the period of six years before reaching retirement age.
Besides the above, prosecutors shall be assessed if they request so, provided that at least 2 years have elapsed since the last assessment, or in the occurrence of any circumstance which suggests professional inadequacy, or which necessitates the amendment of the results of the last assessment. The assessment procedure involves examination of case files, as set out in Sections 13A to 13F of the Prosecutor General's Order No. 4/2012.

Q120-1 (2018): The evaluation system is defined by Articles 50-52 of the Act on the Legal Status of Prosecutors. The purpose is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's activities, his/her skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. Prosecutors, with the exception of the Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutor General, are assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first appointment, while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of 3 years following the appointment, and thereafter every 8 years. Prosecutors need not be assessed during the 6 years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age. A prosecutor shall also be assessed if: requested by the prosecutor; circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor's professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment; in the extraordinary proceeding to be completed without delay, s/he fails to meet the deadline extended by the superior prosecutor. The assessment is the duty of the person exercising the employer's rights. The official work of prosecutors assigned to the Ministry is evaluated by the Minister responsible for justice in accordance with the rules applicable to government officials. As a result, prosecutors may be awarded the following grades: excellent, suitable for promotion; excellent and fully eligible; eligible; eligible, subsequent assessment required; ineligible. In the event of an ineligible grade, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If the prosecutor is awarded a grade "eligible, subsequent assessment required", the person exercising the employer's rights identifies the deficiencies and irregularities and states the main criteria of the desired changes which shall be reviewed prior to the next assessment (within 2 years). A prosecutor shall be awarded an ineligible grade upon the next assessment if he/she fails to obtain an eligible grade. S/he may request a court of law to quash any erroneous or untrue finding.

Ireland

Q066 (2021): With effect from October 1 2022, a statutory system providing for investigation and adjudication of complaints in relation to judicial conduct has been commenced pursuant to Judicial Council Act 2019.
Q067 (2021): Secretary of Judicial Council and Judicial Conduct Committee of that Committee investigate and adjudicate complaints.
Q073 (2021): The information you are seeking is not available in this format.

Q070 (2014): 2014: Since 2014 Ireland introduced a monitoring system for the length of proceedings and it is now capable of calculating average length of proceedings in first instance jurisdictions.

Q077-1 (2018): Prosecutors adhere to Code of Ethics and Guidelines of respective professional bodies .There are file reviews and regular periodic management reports in place

Q070-1 (2020): information is published in Annual Report available at: https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2020/10/AR-2019-eng.pdf

Q070-1 (2018): Information is published in Annual Report available at https://www.dppireland.ie/filestore/documents/AR2017_[eng].pdf

Q071 (2020): NAP

Q071 (2018): NAP

Q071 (2016): NAP

Q077 (2021): N/A

Q077 (2017): Waiting times for proceedings categories in the various jurisdictions are recorded and published in the Courts Service Annual Report.

Q083-2 (General Comment): Prosecutors in our directing division are allocated a specific number of files per week. Decisions must be issued within a designated time frame and this is monitored by our case management system

Q083-2 (2021): Prosecutors in our directing division are allocated a specific number of files per week. Decisions must be issued within a designated time frame and this is monitored by our case management system

Q083-2 (2018): Work is demand led by number of files submitted by external investigating agencies

Q120 (General Comment): In addition to reporting directly to their line managers in relation to their work as prosecutors, they are required to participate in the Office-and-Public-Service-wide process of Performance Management and Development conducted during each year on an individual basis between Management and Staff.

Q120-1 (2021): Performance Management System

Q120-1 (2018): Prosecutors working in-house are required to participate in Public service wide Performance Management and Development System (PMDS).

Italy

Q066 (General Comment): In Italy there is not a strict quality system as such. However, there is a regular monitoring system in place which tracks the performance of court activities.

Q073-0 (2020): Quarterly

Q073-0 (2019): Quarterly

Q073-0 (2018): Quarterly

Q073-0 (2017): Quarterly

Q073-0 (2016): Quarterly

Q073-1 (General Comment): The process of reallocation of human resources is not carried out on a regular basis. On those occasion when the staffing plan is revised, the criteria also include the court activity. In the occasion of the last exercise of this kind, it was introduced the concept of "flexible staffing plan" (some sort of "flying judges"). I.e. a group of judges who are not allocated to a specific court but to the court of appeal that has a broader regional scope. Subsequently these judges may be temporarily allocated to specific tribunals within the region to cope with specific needs arising from those tribunals.

Q073-2 (2020): The evaluation of the court activity (case flow, DT, CR, etc.) are used to draw up the staffing plan (“pianta organica”) i.e. the ideal allocation of judges and court staff among the courts. More recently, this data is used for monitoring the implementation of reforms and investments related to the Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) and the related EU Next Generation funds.

Q073-4 (2020): Quarterly

Q073-4 (2018): Quarterly

Q072 (2018): Waiting time is monitored only for Administrative Justice.

Q077 (General Comment): The performance of each court is given by different indicators such as the clearance rate, the variation of backlogs and the age of the proceeding.

Q120 (General Comment): The assessment procedure applies to both judges and public prosecutors. Every four years, the High Judicial Council (CSM) conducts a professional appraisal based on the professional skills of judges/prosecutors. The professional status of both judges and prosecutors is organized into 7 different levels. Several criteria are taken into consideration: independence, impartiality, balance, professional capacity, hardworkingness, diligence and commitment. The assessment is based on a number of acts and documents that describe all the professional aspects of the magistrate to be evaluated. The most significant are: • a “self report” where the magistrate illustrates all the elements that he/she believes are necessary or useful to be considered for the purpose of his/her appraisal; • a random sample of acts and documents produced by the magistrate during the evaluation period; • an "informative report" prepared by a superior of the magistrate; • the statistics concerning activity of the magistrate: the number of provisions drafted, the processing times of the proceedings, the time for filing the documents (even in comparison with the other magistrates of the office); • scientific publications, if any; • reports from the lawyers' council, if any.

Latvia

Q066 (General Comment): In January 15, 2020 the “Visitors service standards of the district (city) courts and regional courts” were approved. This document summarizes the general principles related to functions such as judicial reception and providing with information. The standards help court staff to raise their professionalism and understand the court visitors servicing values.

Q066 (2021): Partly yes, according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1. chief judge of a court shall plan and determine the objectives of the court work in relation to average time periods for adjudication of matters in a court (the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year in co-operation with court judges. The standard of time periods for adjudication of matters shall be determined, taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to adjudication of a matter in a reasonable time period and in conformity with other basic principles for examination of matters. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters in a court and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. A Chief Judge of a court shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard of time periods for adjudication of matters until 1 February of each year.

Q066 (2020): Partly yes, according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1. the Court President before the beginning of each calendar year,shall plan and determine the objectives of the court work in relation to average time periods for the examination of cases in a court (the standard of time periods for the examination of cases) in cooperation with court judges. The standard of time periods for the examination of cases shall be determined by taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to the examination of a case in a reasonable time period and in conformity with other basic principles for the examination of cases. The Court President shall submit the standard case examination time limits for approval to the Judicial Council until 1 February of each year.

Q066 (2019): In January 15, 2020 the “Visitors service standards of the district (city) and regional court" is adopted. This document
defines the procedure by which the employee of the district (city) and regional court shall ensure the servicing of the court visitor, the
participant in the proceedings, its representative (hereinafter - customer) (the acceptance of the client, the provision of information and
communication in person, by telephone and by electronic means) and basic customer service values, general principles and basic rules
for customer service.

Q066 (2017): According to the Law on Judicial Power Art 27.1. chief judge of a court shall plan and determine the objectives of the court work in relation to average time periods for adjudication of matters in a court (the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year in co-operation with court judges. The standard of time periods for adjudication of matters shall be determined, taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to adjudication of a matter in a reasonable time period and in conformity with other basic principles for examination of matters. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters in a court and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. A Chief Judge of a court shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard of time periods for adjudication of matters until 1 February of each year. First standarts of time periods for adjudication of matters were submitted to the Board of Justice in 2014.

Q066 (2016): Partly yes, according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1. chief judge of a court shall plan and determine the objectives of the court work in relation to average time periods for adjudication of matters in a court (the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year in co-operation with court judges. The standard of time periods for adjudication of matters shall be determined, taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to adjudication of a matter in a reasonable time period and in conformity with other basic principles for examination of matters. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters in a court and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. A Chief Judge of a court shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard of time periods for adjudication of matters until 1 February of each year.
First standarts of time periods for adjudication of matters were submitted to the Board of Justice in 2014.

Q066 (2015): Since 2008 courts apply 'The visitors service standards of the district (city) courts and regional courts'. This courts visitor's service standard summarizes the general principles of judicial reception and providing with information. Standard helps court staff to raise their professionalism and understand the court visitors servicing values.
On 2015 May 18 Council of Justice approved guidelines on communication of the court system. The aim of the guidelines is to promote the effective functioning of the judiciary and promte the public confidence in the judiciary, creating a positive Court' s image and enhance its' authority in society.

Q066 (2014): In 2014, for the first time, standards of time periods for adjudication of matters were submitted to the Board of Justice.
Q073 (2015): Latvia has the Court Information System it contains statistical data about court performance. The statistical data have been published in the e-portal: www.manas.tiesas.lv and regularly analysed by Court administration and Ministry of Justice (MoJ).
Q073-0 (General Comment): Evaluation of judicial work is carried out as necessary. Evaluation of courts activities are done mainly in two ways: every month and on a basis of request.
The evaluation can happen for a single court or instance at any time for a number of reasons.
An Annual evaluation of court staff is also carried out, which is essential for high-quality work of courts.
Q073-0 (2020): Evaluation of courts activities are done mainly in two ways: every month and on a basis of request.
The evaluation can happen for a single court or instance at any time for a number of reasons.
An Annual evaluation of court staff is also carried out, which is essential for high-quality work of courts.

Q073-0 (2019): Evaluation happens on a basis of request. The evaluation can happen for a single court or instance at any time for a number of reasons.
Q073-0 (2018): Evaluation happens on a basis of request. The evaluation can happen for a single court or instance at any time for a number of reasons.
Q073-0 (2017): Latvia has the Court Information System it contains statistical data about court performance. The statistical data have been published in the e-portal: www.tiesas.lv and regularly analysed by Court administration and MoJ.

Q073-0 (2016): Latvia has the Court Information System it contains statistical data about court performance. The statistical data have been published in the e-portal: www.tiesas.lv and regularly analysed by Court administration and MoJ.

Q073-1 (2021): Not currently, but there is a suggestion from State Audit Office and a subsequent proposition from Ministry of Justice and
Court administration to the Judiciary Council to start to take court work statistical indicators into account when planning annual budget. If necessary, based on workload data resources can be allocated later within a court.
Q073-1 (2020): Not currently, but there is a suggestion from State Audit Office and a subsequent proposition from Ministry of Justice and
Court administration to the Judiciary Council to start to take court work statistical indicators into account when planning annual budget. If necessary, based on workload data resources can be allocated later within a court.
Q073-1 (2019): Not currently, but there is a suggestion from State Audit Office and a subsequent proposition from Ministry of Justice and Court administration to the Judiciary Council to start to take court work statistical indicators into account when planning annual budget. If necessary, based on workload data resources can be allocated later within a court.

Q073-1 (2018): Not currently, but there is a suggestion from State Audit Office and a subsequent proposition from Ministry of Justice and Court administration to the Judiciary Council to start to take court work statistical indicators into account when planning annual budget. If necessary, based on workload data resources can be allocated later within a court.

Q070 (General Comment): Implemented business intelligence solution allows to very closely monitor all the mentioned court activities.
Satisfaction of court staff and users is being evaluated by regular questionnaires in courts.

Q070 (2017): Decision stability (proportion of decisions appealed in higher instance)

Q070 (2016): Decision stability (proportion of decisions appealed in higher instance)

Q073-4 (2020): In accordance with the order of the Prosecutor General, a monthly report is prepared on the results of the public prosecutor's work in pre-trial criminal proceedings and the results of the work, which are not related to the progress of pre-trial criminal proceedings.
Q073-4 (2018): Monthly reports on the results of the public prosecutor's work in pre-trial criminal proceedings and the results of work which are not related to the conduct of pre-trial criminal proceedings shall be drawn up in accordance with the order of the Prosecutor General.

Q071 (2018): We have created a specific tool for this purpose that is available also in public from https://dati.gov.lv/

Q077 (2014): First standards of time periods for adjudication of matters were submitted to the Board of Justice in 2014.

Q078 (2021): We have overestimated the "costs of the judicial procedures" indicator. In our opinion, this indicator describes the accessibility of the court, not so much the activities and quality of the courts. Therefore, this indicator is not noted in this assessment.
Q078 (2020): The indicators “productivity of judges and court staff” and “number of appeals” are taken into account when assessing the professional activity of a judge, because the objective of the assessment of the professional activities of a judge is to promote the continuous professional growth of a judge throughout his or her career, thereby improving the quality of the work of the judge and the court. An Annual evaluation of court staff is also carried out, which is essential for high-quality work of courts.
Q078 (2019): All of these indicators can and are used to evaluate different aspects of court work from efficiency, quality and stability to decision of filling out a vacancy.
First four modalities are included in the report that courts have to prepare for the Judiciary Council before the end of January.

Q078 (2018): All of these indicators can and are used to evaluate different aspects of court work from efficiency, quality and stability to decision of filling out a vacancy.
First four modalities are included in the report that courts have to prepare for the Judiciary Council before the end of January.

Q078 (2014): According to the Law on Judicial Power as amended in 2014, the chief judge of a court, in cooperation with court judges, determines prior to the beginning of each calendar year targets in relation to the average length of court proceedings.

The standard in terms of length of proceedings is determined, taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to have his/her matter adjudicated within a reasonable time period and in compliance with other basic principles guaranteeing the right to a fair trial. A chief judge of a court must approve the standard of time periods and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court.
The guidelines approved by the Judicial Council are used to establish standards of time periods for adjudication of matters.

Q083-2 (General Comment): The prosecutor provides a monthly report on the statistical indicators of his or her work. In addition, the statistical indicators of the individual work of the public prosecutor (statistical indicators for the monitoring of the investigation, prosecution, maintenance of the State prosecution and other functions of the public prosecutor) are also analysed during the process of assessing the professional activities of prosecutors (not less than once every five years).

Q120-1 (General Comment): The assessment of the professional activities of prosecutors have been commenced and is operational from 1 January 2014, within which, as for judges, the professional activities of prosecutors are assessed on a regular basis (not less than once every five years).
Q120-1 (2020): Not less than once every five years

Lithuania

Q070 (General Comment): All of these data are recorded in the Lithuanian Court Information System (LITEKO), as well as other data, related to the case, it‘s process and the parties to the proceedings.
Q073-4 (2021): Chief prosecutorsof the departments of the prosecutor's offices are regularly provided with monthly data based on basic indicators of the performance of public prosecution offices, every 3 months - with the larger scale of performance data.
Q073-4 (2020): Chief prosecutors of the departments of the prosecutor’s offices are regularly provided with monthly data based on basic indicators of the performance of public prosecution offices, every 3 months – with the larger scale of performance data.
Q073-4 (2018): Every 6 months.

Q072 (2020): courts: through administrative supervision mechanism

Q083-2 (2018): The quantitative performance targets are defined for the Prosecutor General’s Office and 5 regional Prosecutor’s Offices, but not for individual public prosecutors.

Q083-3 (2018): The quantitative performance targets are defined for the Prosecutor's Offices, but not for individual public prosecutors.
Q120-1 (General Comment): According to Article 33 of the Law on Prosecution Service, evaluation of prosecutor's individual performance, qualification and suitability is carried out by the Attestation Commission. Performance of a prosecutor who has received a positive evaluation after his/her internship, is thereafter evaluated every five years during the regular evaluation of the service. The extraordinary evaluation can be carried out by decision of the Prosecutor General: at the request of the public prosecutor him/herself, if at least half a year has passed since his/her last evaluation; in the case the prosecutor is applying for a higher position, or to the same or an equivalent post after the expiry of the term of appointment; if three years have passed since the last evaluation of his/her service; if the prosecutor's performance has repeatedly been deficient, giving rise to reasonable doubts as to his/her suitability for the position in question.

Luxembourg

Q073 (2020): "Although the technically correct answer is ""no"", the Judiciary edits every year an annual report on its activities during the
previous year. This reports is available to the public (report 2020, see https://justice.public.lu/fr/publications/juridictions-judiciaires/rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2020.html)."
Q073 (2019): Although the technically correct answer is "no", the Judiciary edits every year an annual report on its activities during the previous year. This report is available to the public (report 2019, see https://justice.public.lu/dam-assets/fr/publications/rapport-activites-judiciaires/Rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2019.pdf).

Q073 (2018): Although the technically correct answer is "no", the Judiciary edits every year an annual report on its activities during the previous year. This reports is available to the public (report 2018, see https://justice.public.lu/dam-assets/fr/publications/rapport-activites-judiciaires/Rapport-juridictions-judiciaires-2018.pdf) .

Q073 (2014): 2014: There is no regular monitoring system. Statistical tools and the court management system may be used to monitor the activity but this is not their primary function.
Q073-1 (General Comment): The figures presented by the SSJ are used on a regular basis to allocate (and ask for) means to the courts and public prosecution services.
Q073-1 (2020):
The annual report is used to the effect set out in Q. 073-1 (report 2020, see https://justice.public.lu/fr/publications/juridictions-judiciaires/rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2020.html).
Q073-1 (2019): The annual report is used to the effect set out in Q. 073-1

Q073-1 (2018): The annual report is used to the effect set out in Q. 073-1

Q073-1 (2016): The figures presented by the SSJ are used on a regular basis to allocate (and ask for) means to the courts and prosecutorial services.
Q070 (General Comment): No regular system has been implemented up to today. However, a monitoring can be done through the statistical service of the judiciary (SSJ) on an punctual basis and upon request of the competent authorities.

Q070 (2017): ??? (see comments to parent campaign)

Q070 (2016): No regular system has been implemented up to today. However, a monitoring can be done through the statistical service of the judiciary (SSJ) on an punctual basis and upon request by the competent authorities.

Q070 (2015): By using the newly implemented statistical tools, the information ticked in addition to last year's questionnaire can now be retrieved by the statistical service on an as needed basis at least for criminal cases. Identical markers are being implemented for civil and commercial cases and will available in a foreseeable future.

Q070 (2014): 2014: There is no regular monitoring system. However, new statistical tools are implemented and can provide monitoring elements when necessary without daily measurement current affairs.
Q073-3 (2020): The annual report covers both judges and prosecutors (report 2020, see https://justice.public.lu/fr/publications/juridictions-judiciaires/rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2020.html).
Q073-3 (2018): The annual report covers both judges and prosecutors.
Q073-5 (2020):
The annual report covers both judges and prosecutors (report 2020, see https://justice.public.lu/fr/publications/juridictions-judiciaires/rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2020.html).
Q073-5 (2018): The annual report covers both judges and prosecutors.

Q071 (2018): New systems of monitoring have been implemented since 2016 (JUCIV for the civil law cases and JANGA for administrative law cases)
Q071 (2016): No regular system has been implemented up to today. However, a monitoring can be done through the statistical service of the judiciary (SSJ) on an punctual basis and upon request by the competent authorities.

Q072 (2014): According to 2014 data, the newly set up statistical tools, as well as the courts' CMS, allow an "as needed" check of the waiting time.
Q083-2 (2018): NAP
Q083-3 (2018): NAP

Malta

Q066 (General Comment): There exists a Code of Ethics for the members of the Judiciary which, though not providing for the organisation and quality of the judicial work, does lay upon the members of the Judiciary certain obligations which are important in ensuring the transparency and independence of the judicial process.
Q066 (2017): There exists a Code of Ethics for the members of the Judiciary which, though not providing for the organisation and quality of the judicial work, does lay upon the members of the Judiciary certain obligations which are important in ensuring the transparency and independence of the judicial process.
Q066 (2016): There exists a Code of Ethics for the Judiciary which, though not providing for the organisation and quality of judicial work, does lay upon the members of the Judiciary, certain obligations which are important in ensuring the transparency and independence of the judicial process.
Q067 (2018): There are general quality standards that apply to the public sector, but not specific quality standards that monitor the implementation of quality standards within the judiciary or the prosecution services.
Q073 (2015): Currently, Malta carries out systematic quantitative analysis of the performance of the courts, based on established international indicators. Furthermore, ongoing internal reports, commissioned specifically to study areas of interest in the performance of certain courts, also complement the quantitative analysis, and serve to further address identified shortcomings in a more strategic manner.

Q073 (2014): On the occasion of the 2014 exercise, it has been indicated that since 2015, a system of monitoring court performance through quantitative means, using established performance indicators such as Clearance Rate and Pending caseload, has been initiated.
Q073-0 (2021): Court performance is evaluated on a quarterly basis, or as the need arises.
Q073-0 (2020): Court performance is evaluated on a quarterly basis, or as the need arises.
Q073-0 (2018): Court evaluation in terms of performance is carried out on a monthly basis, or on a case by need basis.

Q073-0 (2017): The activity of the courts is monitored on a monthly basis.
Q073-0 (2016): Court evaluation in terms of performance is carried out on a monthly basis.

Q073-1 (2017): Court performance evaluation is brought to the attention of both the Minister for Justice, Culture and Local Government as well as to the attention of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice, who is vested with the authority to effect changes in judicial duties, does make use of such performance data in the better interest of increased efficiency and expediency of the judicial process.
Q073-1 (2016): Court performance evaluation is brought to the attention of both the Minister for Justice, Culture and Local Government as well as to the attention of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice, who is vested with the authority to effect changes in judicial duties, does make use of such performance data in the better interest of increased efficiency and expediency of the judicial process.
Q073-2 (General Comment): Court performance evaluation is brought to the attention of both the Minister for Justice as well as to the attention of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice, who is vested with the authority to effect changes in judicial duties, does make use of such performance data in the better interest of increased efficiency and expediency of the judicial process.

Q073-2 (2021): As part of the digital justice strategy, internal processes are being reviewed in the courts and re-engineered accordingly, in order to increase efficiency.
Q073-2 (2020): Other refers to the Court's ability to request more financial and human resources in a bid to improve the performance on the selected indicators
Q073-2 (2018): Court performance evaluation is brought to the attention of both the Minister for Justice, Culture and Local Government as well as to the attention of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice, who is vested with the authority to effect changes in judicial duties, does make use of such performance data in the better interest of increased efficiency and expediency of the judicial process. On the other hand, the Ministry also monitors these performance evaluations and tries to assist through legislative amendments or other interventions that lie within its powers and that do not impinge on the independence of the judiciary.
Q070 (2019): Other: age of pending caseload
Q070 (2017): other: clerance rate
Q070 (2015): The monitoring of court activities also takes place through the ongoing analysis of the Clearance Rate and Disposition Time of the various courts. This data is also being published online on a monthly basis.
The category "other" refers to the monitoring of the Clearance Rate and Disposition Time of all civil courts, boards and tribunals. This exercise was started in 2015.

Q070 (2014): In 2014, the court administration was monitoring length of proceedings through the number of incoming and resolved cases, as well as through the pending caseload. The age of civil cases was another parameter that was being assessed.
On the occasion of the 2014 exercise, it has been indicated that since 2015, Malta started computing the Disposition Time and Clearance Rate of all the civil and criminal courts. By the end of 2015, for the civil courts, this information will be made available online.

Q077-1 (2018): The Office of the AG does keep a record of the number of incoming cases as well as those cases that can be considered as terminated from the Office because for example, a bill of indictment is issued. However no official statistics are kept.

Q078-1 (2021): The Office of the AG (the prosecution) has started collecting case data including length of proceedings. Over the coming years (starting from next year), they will be introducing a new case management system that will enable the Office to collect more case and performance metrics.

Q073-3 (2020): The Office of the AG has started setting up a system to assess the performance of the prosecution service, but this is still in its initial phases and more work is being planned on it to make it more integrated.

Q073-6 (2018): The workload of the Office of the AG is used for the recruitment of additional human resources.

Q070-1 (2021): The Attorney General is collecting data on length of proceedings and using it to monitor efficiency. This exercise will be refined in the coming months within the scope of an ongoing project addressing the re-engineering of processes within the Office of the AG.

Q070-1 (2018): The Office of the AG does hold a record of the number of incoming cases and terminated cases, but these are not as yet organised into official performance indictaors.

Q072 (2016): In Malta, there is no formal monitoring system. However, an “informal” monitoring used to take place. It falls mostly within the remit of the Chief Justice and the respective members of the judiciary.

Q077 (2017): Despite the on-going monitoring and evaluation of the court activities and performance, we do not have defined target indicators against which to monitor performance. In general terms, we seek to ensure that the performance of the courts improves in efficiency year after year, and we try to address various aspects of the system in order to facilitate this improvement.

Q077 (2016): Currently Malta carries out systematic quantitative analysis of the performance of the different courts, based on international standards. We are also addressing measures of quality as defined by recognised international institutions, supplemented by internal reports that are purposely commissioned to focus on specific aspects of the functioning of the justice system. These ongoing efforts at measuring the efficiency and quality of our justice system is compared with past performance, but as yet, not with established targets.
Malta does not have defined 'targets' but assesses its performance in terms of indicators defined by international institutions

Q078 (2020): Other: age of pending cases

Q078 (2019): Other: age of pending caseload

Q083-3 (2018): NA

Q120-1 (2021): The work of public prosecutors is constantly monitored by the Deputy AG and the AG herself. The monitoring is not scheduled at specific annual intervals but it is ingrained in the daily work processes in the Office.

Q120-1 (2020): The work of public prosecutors is constantly monitored by the Deputy AG and the AG herself. The monitoring is not scheduled at specific annual intervals but it is ingrained in the daily work processes in the Office.

Q120-1 (2018): Thework of public prosecutors is constantly monitored by the Deputy Attorney General (in charge of the criminal field) and the Attorney General. The monitoring is not scheduled at specific annual intervals, but is ongoing and ingrained in the daily work processes of the Office.

Netherlands

Q066 (General Comment): There are quality standards that are measured by annual statistical figures per individual court. Examples are the scores of customer satisfaction surveys, the percentage of cases judged by three instead of one judge, and case processing times (the so called ‘Kengetallen gerechten’). The Team Judicial Quality (TJK, Team Juridische Kwaliteit) studies topics in a thematic manner, on a structural basis. A team of public prosecutors participates in TJQ and assesses the judicial work of colleagues in a structured and systemic way. There is often a baseline assessment, as well as a follow-up, sometimes a second follow-up. The assessment framework is adjusted if necessary. See also www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/detail?id=2018D52900&did=2018D52900. There are professional standards too, developed to show what ‘good justice’ entails. These standards are publically available on the website of the Judiciary. See https://www.rechtspraak.nl/Organisatie-en-contact/Rechtspraak-in-Nederland/Rechters/Paginas/De-professionele-standaarden-van-de-rechters.aspx.

Q066 (2019): There is a so-called Team Judicial Quality (Team Juridische Kwaliteit), which studies topics in a theme-wise manner. This is part of the program 'Programma OM Strafvordering 2020'. A team of public prosecutors participates in TKJ and assesses the judicial work of colleagues in a structured and systematic way. There is often a first assessment (baseline) and a first follow-up assessment, and sometimes even a second follow-up. If necessary, the assessment framework is adjusted.

Q067 (General Comment): Courts: there are staff members (policy officers) within the offices that coordinate the quality in that office.
Public prosecution: At the head office of the public prosecution (Parket-General), there is personnel responsible for producing, implementing, evaluating and auditing quality measures. These are the TJQ (as mentioned in Q66), Team Processes and Information (standard processes and procedures) and the Scientific Bureau OM (national guidelines and policy regulations).

Q067 (2017): yes

Q073-0 (2021): Along with monthly reports and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.
Q073-0 (2020): Along with monthly reports and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.
Q073-0 (2019): Along with the monthly reports and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.
Q073-1 (2021): This is not a ‘hard’ rule; the outcomes of the evaluation do not directly influence the allocation of resources in the next years.
Q073-1 (2020): This is not a 'hard' rule, the outcomes of the evaluation do not directly influence the allocation of resources in the next years.
Q070 (2020): There is an annual publication that includes the appeal ratio for some case types. To call it ‘monitoring’ would be a bit too much, but it is annually checked and reported on.
Incoming cases and length of proceedings have not previously been mentioned, but these are monitored.
Q078-1 (2021): More options have been checked compared to previous years. Previous years may have been incomplete. The added indicators are important as well.
Q073-4 (2021): Along with the monthly and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.

Q073-4 (2020): Along with the monthly reports and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.
Q073-6 (General Comment): In 2019, the system Directing and Funding (Besturen en Bekostigen) was formally introduced. This system introduced more measurements and questions about allocation. Also in 2019, an internal budget allocation model was introduced for allocation of resources between parts of the public prosecution.

Q073-6 (2021): Every year, the amount of money is defined. The public prosecutors get a fixed amount and an amount of resources based on the amount of cases they have dealt with.
Q073-6 (2020): In 2019, the system Directing and Funding (Besturen en Bekostigen) was formally introduced. This system introduced more measurements and questions about allocation. Also in 2019 an internal budget allocation model was introduced for allocation of resources between parts of the public prosecution.
Q073-6 (2018): Each three years, the amount of money is defined. The public prosecutors got a fixed amount and an amount of resources based on the amount of cases they dealt with.
Q071 (2021): Public prosecution only monitors criminal law cases, the courts monitor all.

Q072 (General Comment): Waiting time can be monitored through registration in the court system.
Agreements are made across the justice chain on timeframes in which particular caseloads (sexual offences, youth cases, and specific traffic violations) should be handled. These agreements are monitored.
Government (the Second Chamber) is annually informed on the agreements via factsheet. Additionally, timeframe agreements were reached within the public prosecution on the speed with which penal orders are to be issued, the terms in which an objection is to be judged and the speed with which the first decision with attachment is to be taken.

Q072 (2020): Within the courts: Registration in the court system gives the opportunity to monitor waiting time.
Within the public prosecution services: Across the justice chain, agreements have been made on the timeframes in which particular caseloads (sexual offences, youth cases and specific traffic violations) should be handled. These agreements are monitored. Annually, the government (Second Chamber) is informed on this via the factsheet 'Strafrechtketen'. Besides this, timeframe-agreements have been reached within the public prosecution on speed with which penal orders are to be issued, terms in which an objection is to be judged and the speed with which the first decision with attachment is to be taken (eerste beslissing bij beslag).
Q072 (2013): All steps and dates are recorded in information systems of the court. But this registration does not show 'waiting times’ as such.
Q078 (2021): Satisfaction is recorded, but there are no immediate consequences for courts if satisfaction is low.

Q078 (2020): Satisfaction is monitored, but courts are not necessarily judged for that.

Q083-2 (General Comment): There is no national policy on targets for every prosecutor. An office could choose to set targets for their prosecutors (see next question), but these may vary across offices.
Q083-2 (2020): There is no national policy on targets for every prosecutor. An office (parket) could choose to set targets for their prosecutors (see next question), but this may vary across offices.
Q120 (General Comment): The public prosecution has a team Judicial Quality at the General Office that studies the quality of the criminal proceedings of the public prosecution. As part of these studies and assessments, a pool of prosecutors has been compiled, and they study the work of other public prosecutors. This is an assessment of an office, not of individual prosecutors. The results of these studies are used for quality enhancement trajectories. The studies are repeated periodically.

Q120 (2020): The public prosecution has a team Judical Quality at the General Office (Parket Generaal) that studies the quality of the criminal proceedings of the public prosecution. As part of these studies and assessments, a pool of prosecutors has been compiled, and they study the work of other public prosecutors. The results of these studies are used for quality enhancement trajectories. The studies are repeated periodically.

Q120-1 (General Comment): A regular cycle of individual assessments exists, based on certain competencies a public prosecutor should possess. The extent to which the public prosecutor possesses these competencies is assessed in performance and assessment reviews. Furthermore, each prosecutor has to obtain a certificaty implying they are ‘fit for trial’, that they have the necessary skills to represent the public prosecution at trial.

Poland

Q066 (General Comment): The Ministry of Justice collects statistical data sent by common courts concerning their current activity, and also evaluates annual information on the activity of courts, prepared by presidents of courts of appeal about the activity of courts within the area of appeals, within the scope of tasks entrusted to them. In addition, the Minister of Justice convenes a meeting with presidents of courts of appeal at least once a year to discuss issues related to exercising supervision. Within the framework of that evaluation, a multifaceted analysis of collected statistical data is conducted, inter alia, an indicator of stability of jurisprudence, an indicator of control over the inflow of court cases or time of adjudication in incoming cases. However, no legal provision defines specific quality standards for individual indicators, concerning organisational quality and/or justice quality policy, to be formulated for the justice system as a whole.

Q066 (2016): The most important indicator comes from evaluation of judgements through second instance procedure. In this purpose “judgement stability” ratio are in use as a ratio o judgements reversed or annulled in procedure of appeal.

Q067 (General Comment): Inspection departments operate in the appellate and regional courts. The task of the judges working in these departments is to perform on behalf of the president of the court activities in the scope of supervision over the administrative activity of the courts in the area of the operation of a given appellate or district court. Supervision consists in taking actions to improve the office of the courts or increase the efficiency and level of work organization culture in the courts. For this purpose, visits of departments in courts or surveys of recognized cases of a given category are carried out, the secretariats of departments in the courts are controlled.
Activities in the scope of administrative supervision can not enter the field in which judges and assessors are independent.

Q073 (2019): Every year, an analysis is made of the annual information of the presidents of the courts of appeal about the activities of the courts operating in the area of appeals containing statistical data from individual appeals and information on actions taken to ensure the best activity of the courts in the area of appeal. The Minister of Justice assesses the annual information and accepts or refuses to accept this information
The analysis of the work of courts in the areas of operation of individual appeals is also based on statistical data for the first half of each year.
Based on the obtained statistical data, the Department of Administrative Surveillance carries out, as required, data on judicial units, in particular in the context of the efficiency of proceedings and the need for appropriate action by court presidents to ensure the most effective work of their subordinate units.

Q073 (2017): The Minister of Justice regularly assesses the activities of the courts as part of external administrative supervision, by analysing the annual information provided by the Presidents of the appellate courts pursuant to art. 37b § 2 point 1 of the Act of July 27, 2001. The law on the system of common courts (i.e. Journal of Laws of 2018.23), in turn as part of internal supervision, regularly evaluates the activities of courts by presidents, by visiting and reviewing selected issues.

Q073-0 (General Comment): Annual information of the presidents of courts of appeal on the activity of courts operating within the area of appellate courts, containing statistical data from particular appellate courts and information on actions taken to ensure the best possible activity of courts within the area of appellate courts, is analyzed every year. The Minister of Justice evaluates annual information and either accepts it or refuses to accept it
The analysis of work of courts within the jurisdiction of particular appellate courts is also carried out on the basis of statistical data for the first half of each year. On the basis of statistical data collected, the Department of Administrative Supervision performs, according to the needs, an analysis of data concerning judicial units, in particular in the context of efficiency of proceedings and the need to undertake appropriate actions by presidents of courts in order to ensure the most efficient work of units subordinate to them.

Q073-0 (2021): At the level of the Minister of Justice, evaluation of efficiency is carried out at least once a year (evaluation of annual information submitted by the presidents of courts of appeal) and, if necessary, twice a year, while by internal supervisory bodies - on the basis of monthly statements, quarterly - Management Control
Q073-0 (2019): The analysis of the work of all courts is carried out cyclically for the first half of each year and after its completion, in particular based on the average duration of the procedure, control of influence and degree of residue, influence, settlement and remaining case, influence and settlement of cases on a judge according to the limit as at the last day of the statistical period, impact, settlement and remainder on staffing in versions 1 and 3. In addition, data on individual units are analyzed as required.
Q070 (2017): Supervision covers only the administrative activities of the courts. There are the internal supervision exercised by the presidents of the courts and the external supervision exercised by the Minister of Justice within the narrow scope specified in the law.
Q070 (2016): Supervision covers only the administrative activities of the courts. There are the internal supervision exercised by the presidents of the courts and the external supervision exercised by the Minister of Justice within the narrow scope specified in the law.
Q073-3 (General Comment): Pursuant to Article 30 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office, the National Public Prosecutor, but also regional and circuit public prosecutors within the area of their activities, may order a visit to an organisational unit of the public prosecution services in order to control the performance of statutory tasks by this unit within a specified scope. Pursuant to § 77 item 1 of the Ordinance of the Minister of Justice - Rules of Procedure of the universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services, visitation and inspection shall be carried out as appropriate, in particular when there are signals of significant irregularities in the activities of a given body. Visitations should be carried out at least every 5 years.
2. An inspection may be carried out to check the correctness of practices in selected sections of the operation or when there is a need to investigate the causes of shortcomings in the operation or irregularities in the operation of the given body.
3 Visitation and inspection includes:
1) the control of the performance of the statutory tasks by the bodies, and in particular the examination of the correctness of the activities undertaken and the level of work;
2) assessing the performance of proffessional duties by prosecutors and administration staff and their professional qualifications and work culture;
3) an assessment of the way in which the body is managed, the organisation of work and the division of tasks.
4) In the course of visitations and inspections, instructions shall be given as necessary to improve the operation of the audited bodies and to help solve current problems.
Conclusions from the visitations and inspections of public prosecutor's offices are considered by the regional prosecutor's office board [kolegium prokuratury regionalnej] (Article 49 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office).

Q073-4 (2021): In 2021, following the implementation of the new central ICT system PROK-SYS, managers of organisational units at all levels gained access to daily updated reports (Micorsoft POWER BI technology), which enable the ongoing monitoring of the work of the units, in particular concerning such data as the receipt of cases or the number of cases handled. There is no need for a subordinate unit to prepare data, as this data is visible by the higher level unit. Prosecutors in charge of a higher-level prosecution unit supervise proceedings in lower-level prosecution offices , so it is necessary to have detailed information on ongoing proceedings.
Q073-4 (2020): Once a month, the head of the organizational unit of the prosecutor's office shall submit to his or her superior prosecutor a report containing the number of incoming cases and the number of cases disposed of .

Q073-4 (2018): Once a month a head of the organisational unit of the public prosecution service presents to their superior public prosecutor a report which contains a number of incoming cases and number of resolved cases.

Q073-6 (2021): With regard to the reallocation of resources and the reconstruction of internal structures to improve efficiency, the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2022, item 1247, as amended) provides for several possibilities for the aforementioned changes, with a view to the rational use of the prosecutor's staff and also taking into account the dynamics of the staffing and ratification situations. Such changes include:
- delegation,
- abolition of a position, - assignment of a position to another prosecution service organisational unit, - conversion of a prosecutor's position into an assessor's position or an assessor's position into a prosecutor's position, - transfer of a prosecutor to another official position.

Q070-1 (2021): In 2021, following the implementation of the new central ICT system PROK-SYS, which provides for a modern reporting system, the possibility of obtaining data on a wide range of activities of all organisational units of the prosecution offices was created. The system provides a solution for generating types of reports on the costs of proceedings. This allows for daily supervision of the activities of the prosecution offices from every level, including the central level. Prior to 2021, data on the costs of proceedings were only collected locally.

Q072 (General Comment): Public Prosecution services
The issue of the duration of pre-trial proceedings is defined in the Code of Criminal Procedure, in Article 310 § 1 and § 2 and Article 325i § 1. Article 310 § 1 and § 2 states that the investigation shall be completed within 3 months. In justified cases the investigation period may be extended by a specified period of time by the public prosecutor supervising the investigation or the public prosecutor directly superior to the public prosecutor leading the investigation, but not longer than one year. In particularly justified cases a competent public prosecutor superior to the prosecutor supervising or leading the investigation may extend the investigation by a specified period of time.
Article 325i § 1 states that an investigation should be completed within 2 months. The prosecutor may extend this period to 3 months, and in particularly justified cases – to a longer specified period of time.
The authority empowered to order the extension of an investigation or an inquiry by a specified period of time shall monitor such proceedings with respect to their proper conduct in view of their possible length and shall assess the validity of the procedural steps taken or to be taken.
The request for the extension of an investigation or an inquiry must include the steps that need to be taken in the further course of the proceedings and indicate the reasons why they have not yet been taken.
Courts:
The presidents of the courts, in exercising internal administrative supervision over the administrative activity of the courts, control the taking of actions by judges within appropriate time limits; direct control is also exercised by the presidents of the divisions. Monitored also within the framework of management control and analysis of annual information on activities of courts operating within the area of appellate courts prepared by presidents of courts of appeal

Q072 (2021): * courts -The presidents of the courts, exercising internal administrative supervision over the administrative activity of the courts, control the taking of actions by the judges in due time; direct control is also exercised by the presidents of the divisions. Monitoring also takes place within the framework of the external administrative supervision of the Minister of Justice over the administrative activity of common courts within the framework of management control and analysis of annual information on the activity of courts operating on the territory of courts of appeal prepared by presidents of courts of appeal.
*prosecutors - In the course of pre-trial proceedings, the public prosecutor commissioning other bodies to carry out procedural actions or appointing experts to prepare an opinion shall each time set a deadline for their implementation. If the entrusted activities are not carried out in time, the prosecutor makes an enquiry as to the reasons for the delay and the deadline for carrying out the activities. The course of pre-trial proceedings is monitored both in terms of internal service supervision and external service supervision, in order to ensure their proper dynamics.
At the trial stage, if a hearing is postponed without a date being set, the prosecutor's office makes timely enquiries as to whether the reasons preventing it from being scheduled have ceased.

Q072 (2018): In the mode of external and internal administrative supervision over the administrative activity of courts by analyzing the results of the courts or departments and monitoring the efficiency of individual cases in the case of detected lengthiness.

Q078 (2021): workload of judges and registrars

Q083-3 (2020): Individual goals are set by prosecutors themselves in a way that enables them to carry out their duties effectively

Portugal

Q066 (General Comment): Law on the organisation of the judicial system (Law 62/2013 of 26 August) sets out that the High Council for the Judiciary and the Prosecutor-General, in liaison with the member of Government responsible for the justice, establish, within their respective competences, the strategic objectives for first instance courts for a three year period. These entities are also responsible for setting, every year, the strategic objectives of first instance courts for the following judicial year Taking into account the results obtained in the previous year and the strategic objectives formulated for the subsequently year, the president of the court and the public prosecutor coordinator, after hearing the judiciary administrator, articulate proposals for the procedural objectives for each court. This system is very recent, is currently being implemented, subject to improvements, and only covers civil and commercial cases.

Q066 (2021): For instance, the Prosecutor General's Directives and Instructions define good practices of functional performance at national level and their compliance may be viewed an indicator of the quality of the work developed (example, Directive 5/2019, on acting in cases of domestic violence (https://dre.pt/home/-/dre/126870404/details/maximized - text in Portuguese).
In addition to Directives and Instructions, the performance assessment system for prosecutors is based on quality criteria/performance parameters, as a rule, uniformly applied at national level.

Q066 (2020): For instance, the Prosecutor General's Directives and Instructions define good practices of functional performance at national level and their compliance may be viewed an indicator of the quality of the work developed (example, Directive 5/2019, on acting in cases of domestic violence (https://dre.pt/home/-/dre/126870404/details/maximized - text in Portuguese).
In addition to Directives and Instructions, the performance assessment system for prosecutors is based on quality criteria/performance parameters, as a rule, uniformly applied at national level.

Q067 (2021): The High Council of the Public Prosecution Service has “inspectors” (“inspectores”) who assess the quality of the work carried out by the prosecutors, applying national quality criteria or standards.

Q067 (2020): The High Council of the Public Prosecution Service has “inspectors” (“inspectores”) who assess the quality of the work carried out by the prosecutors, applying national quality criteria or standards.

Q073 (General Comment): Besides an annual report, there are also a trimestral and semestral statistics to evaluate judge’s performance.
In the case of the Administrative and Tax Courts the reports are semestral.

Q073 (2015): Every month a data collection of all courts is assembled. In addition, in first degree courts the electronical procedures allow a daily basis analysis. The website is very exhaustive and can be consulted in http://www.siej.dgpj.mj.pt/webeis/index.jsp?username=Publico&pgmWindowName=pgmWindow_633918141195530467.
Every 4 years we have a complete analysis to the work of all courts, with the local inspectors made by judges appointed by the Judicial Council.

Q073-0 (2018): Besides an annual report, there are also a trimestral and semestral statistics to evaluate judge’s performance.
In the case of the Administrative and Tax Courts the reports are semestral.

Q073-0 (2017): Every 4 months.

Q073-0 (2016): Every 6 months.

Q073-2 (2021): The Administrative High Council has been using this evaluation of the activity of the courts of the administrative jurisdiction to:
- in view of the predictable number of magistrates needed in this Jurisdiction, to propose annually to the Minister of Justice the number of vacancies that should be accommodated in the training courses for magistrates of the administrative and tax jurisdiction; and
- authorize the exercise of functions, in an accumulation regime, by magistrates in more than one administrative and fiscal court or tribunal.

Q070 (2020): we included "satisfaction of users" because one of the tasks of the president judge of the court is to monitor and evaluate the activity of the court, in particular the quality of the justice service provided to citizens, taking into account particular complaints or responses to satisfaction questionnaires. "Article 94 of Law 62/2013, 26th August, on the judicial organization"

Q070 (2019): In this evaluation cycle we included "satisfaction of users" because one of the tasks of the president judge of the court is to monitor and evaluate the activity of the court, in particular the quality of the justice service provided to citizens, taking into account particular complaints or responses to satisfaction questionnaires. "Article 94 of Law 62/2013, 26th August, on the judicial organization"

Q070 (2017): Scheduling; delays of judges and sections.

Q070 (2016): Scheduling; delays of judges and sections.

Q070 (2015): Scheduling: time delays of judges and sections of the court.

Q070-1 (2020): We included “clearance rate” and “disposition time” because one of the tasks of the public prosecutor coordinator is to monitor and evaluate the activity of the public prosecutors services, including the efficiency of procedures. Article 101 of Law 62/2013, 26th August on judicial organization.

Q072 (General Comment): Through SITAF and CITIUS (case management systems for administrative and tax courts and judicial courts, respectevly) it is possible to check waiting times during judicial proceedings.
The Portuguese Code of Criminal Procedure establishes no binding timeframes for criminal investigations. At a national level, within the public prosecution services, there is only monitoring of the judicial proceedings time during on criminal investigations, with reference to this timeframe.
At a local level, some other proceedings (such as the initial intervention of public prosecutors on protection of adults with some incapacity, requesting accompanying measures – under the legal framework of the accompanied adult [Regime Jurídico do Maior Acompanhado]) are also monitored on time duration.

Q072 (2021): Because of the Covid-19 pandemic, the courts were asked for specific elements on the steps taken in the Courts. Also, the procedural laws (e.g. civil and criminal) provides that the registry shall send to the President of the Court, on a monthly base, information detailing the cases in which three months have elapsed since the expiration of the deadline set for the performance of the judge's own act.

Q072 (2018): Through SITAF and CITIUS (case management systems) it is possible to check waiting times during judicial proceedings.

Q083-2 (General Comment): Yes for some District Prosecution's Office and No at a national level. At national level, only reference values are fixed for the purpose of placing prosecutors. Also at a national level, the fact that a prosecutor has finished more proceedings than those that he/she started is a general criterion of evaluation and compliance with general objectives, in the qualitative individual assessment of the public prosecutors’ work.

Q083-3 (2020): The local hierarchically superior public prosecutor can set individual targets for each public prosecutor.
The High Council of the Public Prosecution Service only sets reference values for the purpose of placing prosecutors and establishing how many prosecutors are needed for a particular Public Prosecution Office.

Q120 (General Comment): According to articles 141 and 143 of the Statute of the Public Prosecution Service, as a rule, a first assessment takes place three years after the beginning of the functions as a public prosecutor, then after four years and then every five years.
If a prosecutor has twice the maximum grade, he/she may be waived of the next assessment.
After the period of long-term leave, the public prosecutor is subject to a new inspection, one year after the resumption of functions

Romania

Q066 (General Comment): There are no formal standards for quality established for the whole judiciary. However, informal standards are being used (such as training, quality of the reasoning, assessment of the activity of the judges, assessment of the good reputation of the judges etc.).
More precisely, the activity of courts is evaluated and monitored periodically, on the basis of certain statistical data/performance indicators, such as those presented at question 70. The evaluation is achieved by verifications carried out by inspectors of the Judicial Inspection of the SCM, by elaborating periodical reports. The schedule and thematic of those verifications are approved every year by the SCM.
At organizational level, there are no quality standards established for courts. It may be considered that such standards exist at individual level, for each judge, by the indicators for the evaluation of professional activity.

Q066 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, a reference was made to the “Court Optimisation Project” financed by the World Bank, implemented from October 2011 to March 2013. The final recommendation included the introduction of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), such as the clearance rate, the number of cases older than one year, the number of cases solved within 1 year, and the comparative measurement system.

Q073 (2015): The courts have to carry out a monthly assessment and the Superior Council of Magistracy on the basis of individual reports as well as on the basis of the overall indicators carries out a half-yearly assessment of the judicial system.

Q073-0 (2021): biannual (twice a year)

Q073-0 (2020): biannual (twice a year)

Q073-0 (2018): BIANUAL

Q073-0 (2017): The system may be inquired and offer information in real time. On a regular basis, the information is used within the annual report of the judiciary.

Q073-0 (2016): The system may be inquired and offer information in real time. On a regular basis, the information is used within the annual report of the judiciary.

Q073-1 (2017): A periodic evaluation system of the activity (performance and result) of the court is not formally adopted (by law or by a subsequent regulatory act). SCM uses a series of performance indicators (see questions 71 and 74 below) concerning the activity of the courts. Periodical assessments are being carried out and further measures are being implemented on the highlighted results. By the decisions 1305/2014 and 149/2015, SCM has approved the reports on implementing these indicators and there were established new margins for their implementation.

Q073-1 (2016): A periodic evaluation system of the activity (performance and result) of the court is not formally adopted (by law or by a subsequent regulatory act). SCM uses a series of performance indicators (see questions 71 and 74 below) concerning the activity of the courts. Periodical assessments are being carried out and further measures are being implemented on the highlighted results. By the decisions 1305/2014 and 149/2015, SCM has approved the reports on implementing these indicators and there were established new margins for their implementation.

Q070 (General Comment): Since 2012, the category “other” subsumes the length of administrative procedures, the number of final convictions, legal aid, suspended cases etc.
Q070 (2021): ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
Q070 (2020): ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
Q070 (2019): ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
Q070 (2017): - e.g. suspended cases
Q070 (2016): - suspended cases etc.

Q071 (2021): STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
Q071 (2020): STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment
Q072 (2021): There are statistical reports developed by an IT application called Statis that monitor the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc.

Q072 (2020): There are statistical reports developed by an IT application called Statis that monitor the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc.

Q072 (2018): There are statistical reports developed by an IT application called Statis that monitor the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc.

Q072 (2016): There are statistical reports developed by an IT application called Statis that monitor the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc.

Q072 (2014): According to 2014 data, there are statistical reports developed by Statis IT application monitoring the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc. More precisely, in 2014, the Superior Council of Magistracy has established a working group that has analyzed several national and international documents on the efficiency of the courts and has developed a set of indicators that are used to make an overall assessment of the efficiency of courts, sections and, if needed panels of judges. These indicators were implemented and used in the Statis application.

Q078 (2021): e.g. suspended cases
Q078 (2020): - e.g. suspended cases
Q078 (2019): e.g. Suspended cases
Q078 (2018): - e.g. suspended cases
Q120-1 (General Comment): According to the provisions of art. 39 of the Law no. 303/2004, amended and republished in 2018, judges and prosecutors are being periodically evaluated under the observance of the professional and performance criteria. The evaluation shall envisage the quality of their activity, efficiency, integrity as well as the fulfilment of the obligation to take part in in-service professional training and on managerial activity for those judges and prosecutors in leadership positions. The periodical evaluation shall be first carried out by the end of the first 2 years of activity after the entering in profession and shall be continued every 3/4/5 years depending on the seniority in profession (5-10 years, 10-15 years, over 15 years of seniority).

Q120-1 (2020): According to the provisions of art. 39 of the Law no. 303/2004, amended and republished in 2018, judges and prosecutors are being periodically evaluated under the observance of the professional and performance criteria. The evaluation shall envisage the quality of their activity, efficiency, integrity as well as the fulfillment of the obligation to take part in in-service professional training and on managerial activity for those judges and prosecutors in leadership positions. The periodical evaluation shall be first carried out by the end of the first 2 years of activity after the entering in profession and shall be continued every 3/4/5 years depending on the seniority in profession (5-10 years, 10-15 years, over 15 years of seniority).

Q120-1 (2018): similar to judges, see Q114, 114.1 and the additional comments

Slovak Republic

Q066 (General Comment): It is a system of internal review of courts. Internal review of the court is a type of control of the court and judges, which aims to verify the current state of the judiciary, to identify the causes of shortcomings in the performance of the judiciary and to propose measures to eliminate them. The internal review is carried out by designated departments, which are made up of judges.

Q066 (2020): Internal revision of the court is a type of control of the court and judges, which aims to check the current state of the judiciary, to identify the causes of shortcomings in the performance of the judiciary and to propose measures to eliminate them.

Q066 (2014): There is a system to evaluate the overall functioning of courts with respect to the Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic for the period of 2010-2014:
http://www.vlada.gov.sk/data/files/855_the-manifesto-of-the-governmentof-the-slovak-republic-for-the-period-of-2010-2014.pdf

Q067 (General Comment): Judicial Council, Council of Prosecutors and disciplinary commissions.

Q067 (2020): Judicial Council, Council of Prosecutors and disciplinary commissions.

Q067 (2019): Judicial Council, Council of Prosecutors and disciplinary commissions

Q073 (2018): See general comment

Q070 (General Comment): https://web.ac-mssr.sk/dashboard/

Q077 (2020): The main performance and quality indicators that have been defined for courts and used in the selfevaluation reports of some
pilot courts involved Number of appeals as well. The selfevaluation reports of the courts were not repeated with the data 2019. The other indicators are used and made public in dashboards and statistical reports. The number of the appeals is published but not as a indicator of quality, only as a statistical number.

Q078 (2019): The main performance and quality indicators that have been defined for courts and used in the selfevaluation reports of some pilot courts involved Number of appeals as well. The selfevaluation reports of the courts were not repeated with the data 2019. The other indicators are used and made public in dashboards and statistical reports. The number of the appeals is published but not as a indicator of quality, only as a statistical number.

Slovenia

Q066 (General Comment): The Supreme Court's Data warehouse, containing all court cases, as well as financial data and human resources data was implemented in 2011. The data are collected based on CEPEJ Guidelines on Judicial statistics (GOJUST). A special office at the Supreme Court with specialised knowledge was introduced in order to monitor the quality and define quality policies on the level of entire judiciary and individual courts. Quality standards based on SATURN guidelines are taken into account in several predefined BI system reports.
The important role in the determination of quality standards is played by the Supreme Court's „Opening of the judicial year“ document, in which a set of priorities is determined. The priorities are subsequently monitored throughout the judicial year by automated BI tools and customised analysis at the Supreme Court.
The 2013 amendment to the Courts Act provides that the Supreme Court shall adopt the Criteria for quality of work for courts for the next (judicial) year, based on its Yearly report on efficiency and effectiveness of courts. Since 2015, the Supreme Court has been adopting the timeframes for different types of procedures as well as for different procedural phases for next year (as a part of the Criteria for quality of work).
As for public prosecution, the criteria for quality of work are defined in the Prosecution Policy (adopted by the Prosecutor General), while the quantitative aspects of work are defined in the Criteria for evaluating the performance of the state prosecutor's offices adopted by the State Prosecutorial Council.

Q066 (2015): The Supreme Court's Data warehouse, containing all court cases, as well as financial data and human resources data was implemented in 2011. The data are collected based on CEPEJ Guidelines on Judicial statistics (GOJUST). The system was awarded with Special mention in the 2012 Crystal Scales of Justice Competition and was defined as "Inspiring example" in the EC document Quality of Public Administration - A Toolbox for Practitioners - http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=sl&pubId=7757.

A special office at the Supreme Court with specialised knowledge was introduced in order to monitor the quality and define quality policies on the level of entire judiciary and individual courts.

Quality standards based on SATURN guidelines are taken into account in several predefined BI system reports.

The important role in the determination of quality standards is played by the Supreme Court's „Opening of the judicial year" document, in which a set of priorities is determined. The priorities are subsequently monitored throughout the judicial year by automated BI tools and customised analysis at the Supreme Court.

The 2013 amendment to the Courts Act provides that the Supreme Court shall adopt the Criteria for quality of work for courts for the next (judicial) year, based on its Yearly report on efficiency and effectiveness of courts. In 2015 the Supreme Court adopted the timeframes for different types of procedures as well as for different procedural phases for 2016 (as a part of the Criteria for quality of work).

Q066 (2014): 2014 A dedicated office at the Supreme Court with specialised knowledge was introduced in order to monitor the quality and define quality policies at the level of entire judiciary and individual courts level.
Quality standards based on SATURN guidelines are taken into account in several predefined BI system reports.
The recent amendment of the Courts Act provides that the Supreme Court shall adopt the Criteria for quality of work for courts for the next (judicial) year, based on its Yearly report on efficiency and effectiveness of courts. Since the amendment was adopted in the middle of 2013, the first Annual report of Supreme Court will be for 2014 (to be published in 2015). Consequently, only 2015 will be the (first) year to formally adopt the aforementioned Criteria.
The important role in the determination of quality standards is played by the Supreme Court`s „Opening of the judicial year" document, in which a set of priorities is determined. The priorities are subsequently monitored throughout the judicial year by automated BI tools and customised analysis at the Supreme Court.

Q066 (2013): 2013 According to the priorities for the whole judiciary, set by the Supreme Court in the „Opening of the judicial year" document for judicial year 2013, specific areas were monitored and the standards determined for the following areas:
1. Management of courts
2. Solving of oldest unresolved cases
3. Business process – Time management of judicial procedures and the reform of civil enforcement procedure
4. Disburdening the judges
5. Levelling of human resources

Q066 (2012): 2012: The Supreme court`s Data warehouse, containing all court cases, as well as financial data and human resources data was implemented in 2011. The data are collected based on CEPEJ Guidelines on Judicial statistics (GOJUST). The system was awarded with Special mention in the 2012 Crystal Scales of Justice Competition and was defined as Inspiring example in the EC document Quality of Public Administration - A Toolbox for Practitioners – http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=sl&pubId=7757.

Q067 (General Comment): The Office for Court Management Development at the Supreme Court promotes the improvement in leadership and management of courts and the increase in effectiveness and efficiency. It is responsible for the preparation of different reports and analysis regarding work of courts and the promotion of best practices. The Department for the Organization and Development of Management of the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Prosecution Policy and the Criteria for the Success of Prosecution of State Prosecutor's Offices.

Q073 (2014): 2014: Until, the 2013 the Judicial Council was entrusted with monitoring and evaluating the performance of courts and issuing a yearly report on the execution of judicial power (Courts Act, Article 28). With the amendment to the Courts Act (ZS-K) of the Courts Act that came in force in 2014 this responsibility is transferred to the Supreme Court.

Q070 (General Comment): In Slovenia there is a regular monitoring system in a form of collecting data on court statistics. Court statistics are collected and published four times a year by the Ministry of Justice. They include the data on the number of judges and court staff, number of incoming, resolved and pending cases, age of unresolved cases, length of proceedings, average time to resolve a case, type of decision, court backlogs, legal remedies and time to issue a court decision.
Besides that, the data on court activities are automatically on national level, thus statistical analysis are made possible. All courts have access to a wide range of special reports, generated in the Court management information system. Reports include detailed information on court activities (for example length of specific phases of a court proceeding, top 20 oldest cases in certain area of law, etc.), human resources, court performance indicators (the critical indicators are marked red for unsatisfactory performance and green when meeting the standards) that provide guidance to presidents and directors of courts. The business intelligence system that creates priority reports derives the data from the Data warehouse of the Supreme Court. The same source is used for Court statistics publications by the Ministry of Justice. Each court is able to access the above mentioned reports at any moment, while some data are quarterly collected and published on national level (as prescribed by the Court rules).
The satisfaction surveys are performed and results published bi-annually.

Q070 (2015): The data on court activities are automatically collected on national level, thus statistical analysis is made possible.

All courts have access to a wide range of special reports, generated in the Court management information system. Reports include detailed information on court activities (e.g. length of specific phases of a court proceeding, top 20 oldest cases per legal area etc.), human resources, court performance indicators (the critical indicators are marked red for unsatisfactory performance and green when meeting the standards) that provide guidance to presidents and directors of courts. These additional data available to court management officials are the reason, why we put check before “other elements”.

The business intelligence system that creates priority reports derives the data from the Data warehouse of the Supreme Court. The same source is used for Court statistics publications by the Ministry of Justice.

Each court is able to access the above mentioned reports at any moment, while some data are quarterly collected and published on national level (as prescribed by the Court rules).

Q077-1 (General Comment): The State Prosecutorial Council adopts the Criteria for evaluating the performance of the state prosecutor’s offices on the proposal of the State Prosecutor General. The criteria define indicators and their target values for the appraisal of the work efficiency and realization of prosecution policy.
Q078-1 (General Comment): The criteria for the success of the prosecution of public prosecutors determine the following indicators: the number of unresolved cases at the end of the period, clearance rate, expected solution time, time criteria for typical process actions, (from the initiative of the police to the submission of a proposal to carry out urgent investigative actions, from the receipt to the rejection of the criminal complaint, from the receipt of the criminal complaint to the submission of a request for investigation or a proposal for individual investigative actions, from the receipt of the criminal complaint (without investigation) to the filing of the indictment, from the end of the investigation or individual investigative actions until the filing of the indictment, from the receipt of the complaint to the decision of the public prosecutor on the postponed prosecution and settlement, efficiency indicator, cost-effectiveness indicator, proportions of prosecution decisions, shares of rejected complaints according to individual reasons, shares of decisions alternative to criminal prosecution, share of penal orders, share of convictions, shares of imposed criminal sanctions.

Q078-1 (2021): Other: percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions…
Q073-3 (General Comment): The quantitative indicators are defined in the Criteria for evaluating the performance of the state prosecutor’s offices adopted by the State Prosecutorial Council. General guidelines for the work of state prosecutors and priority fields of prosecution are defined in a Prosecution Policy by prosecutor general. Heads of offices implement both criteria in their Annual Work Program. Twice a year the prosecutor general, the State Prosecutorial Council and the Minister discuss the performance of state prosecutor’s offices at joint meetings held with the heads of state prosecutor’s offices and adopt and/or coordinate the measures required for implementation of annual work programmes. An evaluation of attained goals set in the adopted Annual Work Programme, Criteria and Prosecution Policy are an integral part of Annual Report of each prosecution office. The prosecutor general compiles Joint Annual Report on the work of the whole state prosecutor offices. The Minister and State Prosecutorial Council may submit their opinion to this report.

Q073-4 (2020): See general comment.

Q073-4 (2018): The quantitative indicators are defined in the Criteria for evaluating the performance of the state prosecutor's offices adopted by the State Prosecutorial Council. General guidelines for the work of state prosecutors and priority fields of prosecution are defined in a Prosecution Policy by prosecutor general. Heads of offices implement both criteria in their Annual Work Program. Twice a year the prosecutor general, the State Prosecutorial Council and the Minister discuss the performance of state prosecutor's offices at joint meetings held with the heads of state prosecutor's offices and adopt and/or coordinate the measures required for implementation of annual work programmes. An evaluation of attained goals set in the adopted Annual Work Programme, Criteria and Prosecution Policy are an integral part of Annual Report of each prosecution office. The prosecutor general compiles Joint Annual Report on the work of the whole state prosecutor offices. The Minister and State Prosecutorial Council may submit their opinion to this report.

Q073-6 (General Comment): Based on the data and analysis from the previous paragraph, the joint annual report shall contain: (1) Measures for improving the efficiency, performance and economy of work and implementation of the prosecution policy for particular and for all state prosecutor's offices together; (2) Measures for improving the efficiency of state prosecutor's offices whose results deviate considerably from the planned ones; (3) Assessment of suitability of the number of state prosecutor posts and state prosecutor personnel and other conditions including the appropriate proposals for their improvement.

Q073-6 (2018): Based on the data and analysis from the previous paragraph, the joint annual report shall contain: -Measures for improving the efficiency, performance and economy of work and implementation of the prosecution policy for particular and for all state prosecutor's offices together; -Measures for improving the efficiency of state prosecutor's offices whose results deviate considerably from the planned ones; -Assessment of suitability of the number of state prosecutor posts and state prosecutor personnel and other conditions including the appropriate proposals for their improvement.

Q070-1 (General Comment): The BI tools that use data gathered in information system of the State Prosecutor's Office provide the heads of prosecution offices with up-to-date overview of the performance of state prosecutors and the functioning of the office. Heads can customize the level and content of information presented to them for the purpose of making quantitative data supported decisions on allocation of work among prosecutors, control of the case-flow.

Q070-1 (2020): "Other": percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions…

Q072 (General Comment): In accordance with the Prosecution Policy adopted in 2017, cases in which a final court decision at first instance has not been adopted within 3 years of filing a written charge with the court, are monitored in particular.

Q077 (General Comment): The Annual work programme (see Q75) consists of the assessment of the expected number of incoming cases, timeframes for typical procedural acts and solving cases and the plan of operating results. The latter includes the expected number of resolved cases and criteria of efficiency (resolved cases to staff ratio), effectiveness (expected time to resolution) and economy (budgetary funds to solved cases ratio) (the Courts Act, art. 71.b).
The number of complaints is monitored as a performance indicator, however it is not directly considered as a measure of quality of work.
The data on satisfaction of court staff and users is collected bi-anually by the Supreme court and is taken into account by the Judicial Council when deciding on the nomination of court presidents. Consequently, the results of the aforementioned surveys have been included in the opinion of the President of the Supreme Court on the candidacy of court presidents, as well as on the data on work of courts for the purpose of assesment of judicial service for court presidents.

Q078 (2021): In 2021, the Judicial Council started taking into account the results of the statisfaction surveys of court staff and court users (performed bi-anually by the Supreme court) when deciding on the nomination of court presidents. Consequently, the results of the aforementioned surveys have been included in the opinion of the President of the Supreme Court on the candidacy of court presidents, as well as on the data on work of courts for the purpose of assesment of judicial service for court presidents. We consider that the aforementioned decision of the Judicial Council is the legal ground to include the satisfaction suveys amongst defined indicators.

Q078 (2014): According to 2014 data, the Annual work programme established by court presidents consists of the assessment of the expected number of incoming cases, timeframes for typical procedural acts and solving the cases and the plan of operating results. The latter includes the expected number of resolved cases and criteria of efficiency (resolved cases to staff ratio), effectiveness (expected time to resolution) and economy (budgetary funds to solved cases ratio). The number of complaints is monitored as a performance indicator, however it is not directly considered as a measure of quality of work.

Q078 (2012): According to 2012 data, the Judicial Council has monitored performance of courts mainly through indicators such as incoming, closed and pending cases and backlogs, productivity of judges and court staff. With the development of justice administration the attention has shifted towards indicators prescribed by the Courts Act to draft a yearly plan of operating results: criterion of efficiency – number of closed cases, divided with the number of judges and non-judge staff; criterion of effectiveness – timeframes of proceedings; criterion of economy – budget, divided with the number of closed cases.

Q083-2 (General Comment): State Prosecutorial Council adopts Criteria for the assessment of state prosecutors' performance which define quality and quantity indicators. The quantitative criteria define expected time for the resolution of cases and for typical procedural acts. The performance of the evaluated prosecutor is compared to other prosecutors at his/her office concerning the number of assigned, resolved and unresolved cases, number of attendances at the court hearings, conviction rate, pronounced sanctions and number of logged appeals.

Q083-3 (General Comment): State Prosecutorial Council adopts the Criteria for the assessment of state prosecutors' performance on the proposal of the state prosecutor general.
Q120 (General Comment): Qualitative indicators are professional knowledge, capability of logical and analytical deliberation, protection of the reputation of prosecutor's office and his/her function and the proficiency of verbal and written communication.

Q120-1 (General Comment): Regular individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work is carried out every three years. The assessment can also be carried out on demand of the State Prosecutorial Council, head of prosecutor's office, Minister or the prosecutor himself. In first three years after the appointment for the state prosecutor the assessment is carried out every single year.
Q120-1 (2018): Every three years

Spain

Q066 (2015): Every three months each Court sends statistics to the Council for the Judiciary with complete information about the activity of the Court.
Q067 (2015): Every three months each Court sends statistics to the Council for the Judiciary with complete information about the activity of the Court.
Q073-0 (2016): Every six months there is a virtual (on line) inspection of the work of the Courts.

Q070 (General Comment): The category "other" encompasses: number of enforcement procedures, number of decisions appealed, number of rogatory letters issued, received and resolved, aid between courts, pending writings, form of termination of trials, etc.
Q070 (2017): The category "other" includes many other data such appeals, aid between courts, pending writings, etc.

Q070 (2016): The category "other" includes many other data such appeals, aid between courts, pending writings, enforcement proceedings, form of termination of trials, etc.
Q077 (General Comment): The statistic report that the Court sends every three months to the Inspection Service, and the reports and studies that the General Council for the Judiciary carry out with the information provided, serve to measure and control the burden of work of the Judges, Letrados de la Administración de Justicia, and Courts in general.
On the other hand, the "Citizens' bill of rights before the law" is the document approved by the Parliament at 2002 that includes the list of rights of the citizen in their relation with the administration of justice, and the principles and good practices that must guide the service of the Justice to the citizens. It sets the principles of transparency, appropriate attention and information, gives special care and attention to the citizens who are most vulnerable (victims of crime, gender violence, minors, and other). The document is compulsory for all the professionals involved in Justice. According to this Bill of rights, the Parliament, through the Committee for Justice, will carry out a follow-up monitoring and continuous evaluation of the evolution of, and compliance with this Bill. The annual report submitted by the Council for the Judiciary to the Parliament will include a specific and sufficiently detailed reference to the claims, complaints, and suggestions made by citizens about the running of the Administration of Justice.
In addition to that, during the beginning of the implementation of the judicial offices (2010), a map of procedures and a quality management system with own indicators for this kind of offices were implemented. The model has been under review and is expected to be reviewed on the basis of electronic processing.
Finally, the hierarchical structure of the Letrados de la Administración de Justicia allow the Ministry of Justice control and ensure the compliance of standards and parameters of quality fixed, and achieve the new objectives fixed for the implementation of new measures (such the digitalization of Justice or the implementation of electronic tools right now).

Q077 (2017): On September 6 2018, the Ministry of Justice has announced a project to develop a quality plan to improve the administrative management of all the judicial offices in the territory over its competence.
In a second phase, the Ministry will apply the Evaluation, Learning and Improvement Model (EVAM) designed by the Ministry of Territorial Policy and Public Function, a model of excellence for organizations that begin their process towards the management of quality.
The culminating element of the process of implementation of quality management will be the certification of the level of excellence according to a model yet to be determined.

Q078 (2014): Judicial counsellors of each court fill a questionnaire every six months in which the personal performance is evaluated with data regarding the following: number of definitive rulings, number of cost proceedings appraisals, number of payments made to the parties, number of court fees managed and communicated to the Tax Authority, number of communications issued to the Land and Business Registries and number of seizures.

Q078 (2013): For 2014, the category “other” refers to the number of enforcement procedures, appealed decisions, rogatory letters issued, received and resolved.
Q083-3 (General Comment): In accordance with Royal Decree 432/2004, of March 12, which regulates the variable complement by objectives of the members of the Prosecution service, the State Attorney General, at the proposal of the Prosecution Inspection, after hearing the Prosecutor Council and prior the report from the Ministry of Justice, will determine for each annual period the objectives whose fulfillment will lead to the perception of the variable remuneration.

Q120 (2021): SOURCES: Royal Decree 432/2004, of March 12, which regulates the variable complement by objectives of the members of the Prosecution service.
Agreement of November 29, 2018, of the Plenary of the General Council of the Judiciary, by which Regulation 2/2018 is approved, regulating the remuneration regime Judicial caree

Indicator 1: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts and prosecution services

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

Question 066. Are quality standards determined for the judicial system at national level (are there quality systems for the judiciary and/or judicial quality policies)?
Question 067. Do you have specialised personnel entrusted with implementation of these national level quality standards?

Question 073. Do you have a system to evaluate regularly court performance based primarily on the defined indicators?

Question 073-0. If yes, please specify the frequency:

Question 073-1. Is this evaluation of the court activity used for the later allocation of resources within this court?

Question 073-2. If yes, which courses of action are taken?

Question 070. Do you regularly monitor court activities (performance and quality) concerning:

Question 077-1. Concerning public prosecution activities, have you defined performance and quality indicators?

Question 078-1. If yes, please select the main performance and quality indicators for the public prosecution services that have been defined:
Question 073-3. Do you have a system to evaluate regularly the performance of the public prosecution services based primarily on the defined indicators?
Question 073-4. If yes, please specify the frequency:

Question 073-5. Is this evaluation of the activity of public prosecution services used for the later allocation of resources within this public prosecution service?
Question 073-6. If yes, which courses of action are taken?

Question 070-1. Do you regularly monitor public prosecution activities (performance and quality) concerning:

Question 071. Do you monitor the number of pending cases and cases that are not processed within a reasonable timeframe (backlogs) for:
Question 072. Do you monitor waiting time during judicial proceedings?

Question 077. Concerning court activities, have you defined performance and quality indicators?

Question 078. If yes, please select the main performance and quality indicators that have been defined for courts:

Question 083-2. Are there quantitative performance targets defined for each public prosecutor (e.g. the number of decisions in a month or year)?
Question 083-3. Who is responsible for setting the individual targets for each public prosecutor

Question 120. Is there a system of qualitative individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work?

Question 120-1. If yes, please specify the frequency of this assessment:

Question 066

Belgium

(2021):
The College of Courts and Tribunals and its support service are working on the implementation of a quality system at the national level; there is no declination at the local level yet, but this project is in full evolution. Within the framework of the law of 14 February 2014 and the College's action plans (2018 and 2020), a quality system will be implemented in respect of judges. The intention is therefore to introduce an integrated framework of quality, internal control and (internal) audit models to replace the executive's existing ex ante control and monitoring systems.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): Ordinance № 2 from 23.02.2017 on the indicators, methodology, and procedure for appraisal of a judge, chairman, and deputy chairman of a court
Article. 4. The Ordinance aims: 1. to affirm the rule of law and ensure effective protection of the rights of judges; 2. to ensure a lawful, transparent, and fair procedure for career growth; 3. to increase the personal motivation for professional development of the judges, to maintain and improve the quality of their work; 4. to prevent corruption in the system of the judiciary; 5. to contribute to increasing the trust in the judiciary. Article 5. (1) The appraisal is an objective assessment of the professional, business, and moral qualities of a judge, chairman, and deputy chairman of a court, demonstrated in the performance of his position. (2) A unified appraisal form for a judge, chairman, and deputy chairman of a court shall be filled in according to a sample pursuant to the appendix for the assessment as a result of the appraisal. Article 6. The appraisal guarantees professional self-improvement, and equal and fair opportunities for the career growth of judges, based on the principles of legality, equality, objectivity, and transparency. Article 7. The appraisal may not affect the independence and fundamental rights of judges. Article 8. (1) The appraisal shall refer to the qualification, achievements, and professional suitability, as well as the observance of the rules for ethical behavior by a judge, chairman, and deputy chairman of a court. (2) The qualification is a set of the acquired professional knowledge, skills, and personal abilities of the appraised. (3) The achievements are the personal qualitative and quantitative results, achieved by the appraised in his practical activity. (4) Professional suitability is the specific qualification for a specifically defined position. (5) The observance of the rules for ethical conduct is conducted, compliant with the rules of the respective code of ethics.
Judiciary System Act
Article. 196. (1) Appraisal shall be carried out:
1. initial - for a three-year period as of the appointment of a judge, prosecutor, or investigator - when participating in a competition or in case of a proposal for promotion in ranking;
2. for the purpose of acquiring tenure: upon completion of five years of service as a judge, prosecutor, or investigating magistrate;
3. periodic - for a 5-year period as of the attestation for the tenure of a judge, prosecutor, and investigator, of an administrative head and a deputy administrative head;
4. extraordinarily: in the cases under Article 197 (5).
(2) Junior judges, junior prosecutors, and junior investigators shall not undergo an initial appraisal. A report on their work shall be drawn up by the supervisor for the second year of their appointment.
Article. 197. (1) Advance appraisal shall have as an object to assess the qualities and professional competence of judges, prosecutors, and investigating magistrate after the appointment to the respective position, as well as compliance with the rules of the relevant code of ethics. Any such appraisal shall be carried out under the criteria established in this Act and in the ordinance under Article 209b.
(3) Appraisal for the purpose of acquiring tenure shall have as an object to make an objective evaluation of the professional qualification and of compliance with the rules of the relevant code of ethics after the completion of five years of service in the position of a judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate. Upon an appraisal for the purposes of acquiring tenure, the results of the advance appraisal of a judge, prosecutor, or investigating magistrate shall be taken into consideration in cases where an

(2021): Please see the General Comments

(2020): Judiciary system Act:
Article. 198 (1) The criteria for the appraisal of a judge, prosecutor or an investigating magistrate shall be:
1. legal knowledge and skills of applying it;
2. skill of analysing legally relevant facts;
3. skill of making optimum working arrangements;
4. efficiency and discipline;
5. compliance with the rules of ethical behaviour.
(2) In the course of the appraisal under Paragraph (1) the following indicators shall be taken into account:
1. keeping deadlines;
2. number of instruments upheld and reversed and the grounds for this;
3. the results of inspections carried out by the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council,
4. the overall caseload of the respective judicial district and judicial authority, as well as the workload of the appraised judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate compared to other judges, prosecutors or investigating magistrates in the same judicial authority.
(4) The time served by the judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate as a permanent trainer at the National Institute of Justice shall also be included in the appraisal period. The evaluation of the work performance as a trainer shall be given by the Managing Board.
(5) The time served by the judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate as an European Delegated Prosecutor shall also be included in the appraisal period. The evaluation of the results of their work under Regulation (EU) 2017/1939 shall become part of their appraisal.
Article. 199. (1) A judge shall be appraised under the following specific criteria:
1. complying with the schedule for conduct of court hearings;
2. skill of conducting a court hearing and drawing up a record of proceedings;
3. administrating cases and appeals, preparing for a court hearing;
4. number of appealed judicial instruments from among the appealable judicial instruments, appealed judicial instruments upheld, judicial instruments reversed or invalidated, in whole or in part, and the grounds for it; the ability to reason and justify judicial instruments and to analyse evidence shall be subject to evaluation.
(2) A prosecutor shall be appraised under the following specific criteria:
1. skills of planning and structuring steps in pre-trial and trial proceedings;
2. complying with the written instructions and orders of the superior prosecutor;
3. ability to make working arrangements and direct the investigating authorities and the teams participating in pre-trial proceedings;
4.number of unappealed prosecutorial instruments, including warrants to terminate and suspend criminal proceedings, number of final judicial instruments rendered on instruments submitted by the prosecutor appraised, as well as the final judicial instruments returning cases for the rectification of procedural breaches, and the reasons for this, number of appeals granted, the prosecutorial instruments upheld, modified and reversed upon an instance and ex officio review. (2) An investigating

Croatia

(General Comment): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18), the president of the court evaluates the work of every judge according to Framework Criteria for the work of judges in the period of one year following the standards on the number of judgements delivered by a judge compared with the number of judgements that should have been delivered, according to the Framework Criteria for the work of judges, result of work in different kinds of cases, respecting deadlines in delivery of judgements and drafting of judgements, quality of judgements on the grounds of expressed remedies in legal actions and other activities of judges.
Framework criteria are adopted by the Minister of Justice on the proposal of the General Assembly of Supreme Court. The Criteria prescribe the number of decisions that need to be rendered every year by a judge.
According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette, No. 67/18), State Attorneys' and Deputy State Attorneys' performance is evaluated every three years according to the following criteria: achieved results in resolving cases (based on the number of cases assigned to work on the basis of the Framework Criteria for the Work of Deputy State Attorneys and the average work results of county or municipal state attorney's offices for the previous three-year period), the quality of decisions and the justified use of legal remedies, proper performance of the state attorney's duty - observance of deadlines during the procedure, other activities of the State Attorney and the Deputy State Attorney, experience in performing the duty of state attorney and compliance of conduct with the Code of Ethics of State Attorneys and Deputy State Attorneys. The Framework criteria are adopted by the Minister in charge of judicial affairs, with the prior opinion of the Chief State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia.

(2018): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of the court evaluates the work of every single judge according to Framework for the workload of judges in the period of one year following the standards on the number of judgements delivered by a judge compared with the number of judgements that should have been delivered, according to the Framework for the workload of judges, result of work in different kinds of cases, respecting deadlines in delivery of judgements and drafting of judgements, quality of judgements on the grounds of expressed remedies in legal actions and other activities of judges.
Framework criteria are adopted by the Minister of Justice on the proposal of the General Assembly of Supreme Court. The Criteria prescribe the number of decisions that need to be rendered every year by a judge.

(2017): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of the court evaluates the work of every single judge in his/her court for the previous year on the basis of the following standards: the number of judgements delivered by a judge compared with the number of judgements that should have been delivered, according to the Framework for the workload of judges, result of work in different kinds of cases in absolute numbers and percentages, respecting deadlines in delivery of judgements and drafting of judgements, quality of judgements on the grounds of expressed remedies in legal actions and other activities of judges.
Framework criteria are adopted by the Minister of Justice on the proposal of the General Assembly of Supreme Court. The Criteria prescribe the number of decisions that need to be rendered every year by a judge.

Cyprus

(General Comment): Quality standards are applied in practice

(2017): Quality standards are applied in practice

(2016): There are no written standards but in practice there are quality stantards.

(2015): In practice there are quality stantards

(2014): In practice there are quality stantards

Denmark

(2019): No, we use quantitative measures. Quality is usually measured as length of time to finalize a case.

(2016): No, we use quantitative measures. Quality is measured as length of time to finalize a case.

(2015): The only standards are objective standards for example acceptable timeframes to finalize a case.

Estonia

(General Comment): Estonia has developed a quality system consisting of 3 parts. The first part contains the quality standards (good practice) for the management of the court that describe activities related to the chairman of the court. The second part contains the quality standards for the administration of courts and is focused on the different roles of the parties involved in the administration of courts: directors, Ministry of Justice, Council for the Administration of Courts. The third part contains quality standards for the court proceedings and is addressed to all the judges. All of the three parts of the quality standards have been discussed and approved by the Council for Administration of Courts, respectively in 2012, 2013 and 2015.

Finland

(General Comment): There are quality projects covering both civil and criminal cases in the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi judicial district and in the Helsinki Court of Appeal judicial district. In a quality project, one or several working groups are set up usually for a year. There are judges from each district court within the judicial district of a court of appeal and court of appeal judges and referendaries in the working group. Depending on the topic, prosecutors, attorneys-at-law and other lawyers, public legal aid lawyers and police may also participate in the working group's work. The working group writes a report on a specific theme, for example developing conduct of the court proceedings or legal costs in criminal and civil cases. The written report is presented and discussed in a formal event and published. The aim is to provide legal professionals with practical information and guidelines on a certain topic.
In addition, there are co-operation projects between administrative courts.
Prosecution Services' system quality improvement project is underway.
The Finnish Association of Judges compiled and published Ethical Principles for Judges in 2012.

(2021): Prosecution Services' system quality improvement project is underway.

(2020): Prosecution Services' system quality improvement project is underway.

(2015): There is a Quality Project of the courts in the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi. (The jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi is the northernmost of the six appellate jurisdictions in Finland.) In 1999, the courts in the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi launched a project for improvement of quality in adjudication. The quality project covers both civil cases and criminal cases. The objective of the quality project is to develop the functioning of the courts further and further so that the proceedings meet the criteria of a fair trial, that the decisions are well reasoned and justified, and that the services of the courts are affordable to the individual customers. The main working method consists of systematic discussions among the judges and also between the judges and stakeholders. The development work is steered by the development committee of the quality project. Normally four working groups for quality are set up for each year. The membership consists of judges from each of the District Courts in the appellate jurisdiction, members of the Court of Appeal, and referendaries of the Court of Appeal. Also prosecutors, private attorneys, public legal aid attorneys and heads of pre-trial investigation may serve as members in the working groups for quality. Each working group for quality is tasked to deal with one of the development themes which have been selected. The reports of the working groups are presented at the Quality Conference, they are discussed, and quality objectives based on the reports are set for the following year. The Report of Quality, containing the final reports, is published every year.

There is also a quality project of the courts in the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Helsinki. Quality Project consists of working methods of two kind: cooperation with the University of Helsinki and working groups. Working groups for quality are set up for each year. The membership consists of judges from District Courts, members of the Court of Appeal, referendaries of the Court of Appeal, prosecutors and lawyers. Each working group for quality is tasked to address to one of the development themes which have been selected. The reports of the working groups are presented at the conference called 'Day of Jurisdiction'.

In addition there is a cooperation project between administrative courts. Some topics of the project have related to the quality standards. The reports of the project have discussed the matters like the factors of quality at administrative courts and the collection of information on quality.

It is also worth mentioning that on 15 October 2009, the presidents of Finnish Courts of Appeal proposed that the Finnish Association of Judges should begin work on drafting ethical guidelines for judges. A working group was set and the draft on ethical principles was discussed widely. The principles were formally released at the Judge Day event held in Helsinki on 12 October 2012.

France

(2021): Quality standards developed for public administration are used in the judicial system. The charter of the administrations thus sets the rules for the reception of litigants in all courts and can lead to certification. There are also local initiatives aimed at setting up a "quality system" based on certification by an external body, which consists in establishing procedures describing the reception process, the organisation of work and the management of a case.
Source DSJ

(2020): "If yes, please specify: Quality standards developed for public administration are used in the judicial system. The charter of the administrations thus sets the rules for the reception of litigants in all the courts and can lead to certification. There are also local initiatives aimed at setting up a "quality system" based on certification by an external body, which consist in establishing procedures describing the reception process, the organization of work and the management of a case.
With regard to administrative justice: the rate of annulment and reversal of jurisdictional decisions must be kept below 15% and the stock of cases older than two years below 7.5% of the total stock."

(2019):
Quality standards developed for public administration are used in the judicial system. The charter of administrations thus sets out the rules for the reception of litigants in all courts and may give rise to certification. There are also local initiatives to set up a "quality system" based on certification by an external body, which consists of establishing procedures describing the process of reception, work organisation and management of a case.
Administrative justice: the rate of annulment of court decisions must be kept below 15% and the number of cases pending for more than two years.

(2016): Quality standards developed for public administration are used in the judicial system. The charter of the administrations determines the rules for the reception of litigants in all courts and may give rise to certification. There are also local initiatives aimed at setting up a "quality system" based on certification by an external body, which consists in establishing procedures describing the process of reception, organisation of work and management of a case.

Germany

(General Comment): Since 2012, the reply “No” is provided depending on the answer of the majority of the respondent Landers.

(2013): For 2010, 2012 and 2013, no information was provided from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and Thuringia. Four Landers replied “Yes”, while the remaining Landers answered “No”.
In Baden-Württemberg, the performance of each court is compared against the others in regard to number and duration of proceedings. Key performance indicators on performance ability of the courts are ascertained and compared at the Lander level.
A comprehensive quality management system has been introduced in Schleswig-Holstein at all courts and public prosecution offices. All of the accessible areas of the court administration are subject to quality management. Judicial independence and the professional independence of Rechtspfleger present natural constitutional and statutory boundaries that must always be considered.
In Brandenburg, a quality management system seeks to guarantee that quality demands that are statutorily prescribed, self-imposed, or demanded by users of the system are fulfilled with an optimal use of resources. These last years, a number of strategies have been implemented for ensuring quality in the justice system by means of cost and performance accounting, a controlling system, budgeting of personnel costs, benchmark procedures, balanced scorecard, the EFQM Model, various instruments for personnel and organisation development, calculation of personnel requirements, optimisation of business processes, surveys of attorneys, citizens, and employees, and evaluation instruments both for individual judicial and public prosecution work as well as for the courts and public prosecution offices as organisational units. The increased use of modern technology (e.g. Internet) has opened up the possibility for the justice system to reach a large number of citizens and, thus, to offer court users the best possible service. Likewise, the continuous expansion of electronic legal transactions offers new opportunities for improvement in the quality of the justice system with regard to the performance characteristics public accessibility and public service. However, the developments and models named are not uniformly established in the Lander.
In Lower Saxony, a quality strategy was developed through the surveys AgiL (performance comparison of local courts) and LiVE (performance comparison of regional courts). This is based on the assumption that it is possible to compare courts by the collection of data. Following the comparison, an analysis is conducted to determine the reasons for which better numbers are achieved at one court location over another. These are then discussed in expert groups and measures are developed to promote those tools that seem likely to succeed for the duties at all court locations. The surveys do not serve to evaluate individual employees but rather to uncover structures that promote performance, which can then be transposed. This quality management concept takes place together with judicial councils and personnel representatives.

Greece

(General Comment): Quality standards are set by the Code of Organization of Courts and Status of Judicial Officers (Law 1756/1988).

(2021): Most of the measures taken recently in greece aim at speeding up administrative justice. However, the law provides a set of quality criteria that must be taken into account when inspectors check the performance of each judge.

(2017): Most of the measures taken recently in Greece aim at speeding up Justice. However the Law provides a set of quality criteria that must be taken into account when inspectors check the performance of each judge.

Hungary

(General Comment): Regional courts and regional courts of appeal prepare a note on the decision and the trial procedure of the first instance court, based on professional criteria in every case. In this note, the court of appeal has to examine: the application of substantive, procedural and administrative regulations; the preparation of the hearings; the quality of the judges trial leading practice; if the coercive measures were well founded; if the hearings were set timely; if the ruling was transcribed in time; if the decision was edited correctly. The conclusions are summarized and judges of first instance courts are informed about them at least once a year.
Furthermore, at the Kúria working groups are examining judicial practice and they are responsible for examining the case-law of the courts. Examination targets shall be defined on an annual basis by the President of the Kúria, following consultation with the professional departments of the Kúria.

Ireland

(2021): With effect from October 1 2022, a statutory system providing for investigation and adjudication of complaints in relation to judicial conduct has been commenced pursuant to Judicial Council Act 2019.

Italy

(General Comment): In Italy there is not a strict quality system as such. However, there is a regular monitoring system in place which tracks the performance of court activities.

Latvia

(General Comment): In January 15, 2020 the “Visitors service standards of the district (city) courts and regional courts” were approved. This document summarizes the general principles related to functions such as judicial reception and providing with information. The standards help court staff to raise their professionalism and understand the court visitors servicing values.

(2021): Partly yes, according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1. chief judge of a court shall plan and determine the objectives of the court work in relation to average time periods for adjudication of matters in a court (the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year in co-operation with court judges. The standard of time periods for adjudication of matters shall be determined, taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to adjudication of a matter in a reasonable time period and in conformity with other basic principles for examination of matters. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters in a court and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. A Chief Judge of a court shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard of time periods for adjudication of matters until 1 February of each year.

(2020): Partly yes, according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1. the Court President before the beginning of each calendar year,shall plan and determine the objectives of the court work in relation to average time periods for the examination of cases in a court (the standard of time periods for the examination of cases) in cooperation with court judges. The standard of time periods for the examination of cases shall be determined by taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to the examination of a case in a reasonable time period and in conformity with other basic principles for the examination of cases. The Court President shall submit the standard case examination time limits for approval to the Judicial Council until 1 February of each year.

(2019): In January 15, 2020 the “Visitors service standards of the district (city) and regional court" is adopted. This document defines the procedure by which the employee of the district (city) and regional court shall ensure the servicing of the court visitor, the
participant in the proceedings, its representative (hereinafter - customer) (the acceptance of the client, the provision of information and
communication in person, by telephone and by electronic means) and basic customer service values, general principles and basic rules
for customer service.

(2017): According to the Law on Judicial Power Art 27.1. chief judge of a court shall plan and determine the objectives of the court work in relation to average time periods for adjudication of matters in a court (the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year in co-operation with court judges. The standard of time periods for adjudication of matters shall be determined, taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to adjudication of a matter in a reasonable time period and in conformity with other basic principles for examination of matters. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters in a court and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. A Chief Judge of a court shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard of time periods for adjudication of matters until 1 February of each year. First standarts of time periods for adjudication of matters were submitted to the Board of Justice in 2014.

(2016): Partly yes, according to the Law on Judicial Power Section 27.1. chief judge of a court shall plan and determine the objectives of the court work in relation to average time periods for adjudication of matters in a court (the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters) prior to the beginning of each calendar year in co-operation with court judges. The standard of time periods for adjudication of matters shall be determined, taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to adjudication of a matter in a reasonable time period and in conformity with other basic principles for examination of matters. A Chief Judge of a court shall approve the standard of time periods for adjudication of matters in a court and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court. A Chief Judge of a court shall submit information to the Board of Justice regarding the approved standard of time periods for adjudication of matters until 1 February of each year.
First standarts of time periods for adjudication of matters were submitted to the Board of Justice in 2014.

(2015): Since 2008 courts apply 'The visitors service standards of the district (city) courts and regional courts'. This courts visitor's service standard summarizes the general principles of judicial reception and providing with information. Standard helps court staff to raise their professionalism and understand the court visitors servicing values.
On 2015 May 18 Council of Justice approved guidelines on communication of the court system. The aim of the guidelines is to promote the effective functioning of the judiciary and promte the public confidence in the judiciary, creating a positive Court’ s image and enhance its’ authority in society.

(2014): In 2014, for the first time, standards of time periods for adjudication of matters were submitted to the Board of Justice.

Malta

(General Comment): There exists a Code of Ethics for the members of the Judiciary which, though not providing for the organisation and quality of the judicial work, does lay upon the members of the Judiciary certain obligations which are important in ensuring the transparency and independence of the judicial process.

(2017): There exists a Code of Ethics for the members of the Judiciary which, though not providing for the organisation and quality of the judicial work, does lay upon the members of the Judiciary certain obligations which are important in ensuring the transparency and independence of the judicial process.

(2016): There exists a Code of Ethics for the Judiciary which, though not providing for the organisation and quality of judicial work, does lay upon the members of the Judiciary, certain obligations which are important in ensuring the transparency and independence of the judicial process.

Netherlands

(General Comment): There are quality standards that are measured by annual statistical figures per individual court. Examples are the scores of customer satisfaction surveys, the percentage of cases judged by three instead of one judge, and case processing times (the so called 'Kengetallen gerechten'). The Team Judicial Quality (TJK, Team Juridische Kwaliteit) studies topics in a thematic manner, on a structural basis. A team of public prosecutors participates in TJQ and assesses the judicial work of colleagues in a structured and systemic way. There is often a baseline assessment, as well as a follow-up, sometimes a second follow-up. The assessment framework is adjusted if necessary. See also www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/detail?id=2018D52900&did=2018D52900. There are professional standards too, developed to show what 'good justice' entails. These standards are publically available on the website of the Judiciary. See https://www.rechtspraak.nl/Organisatie-en-contact/Rechtspraak-in-Nederland/Rechters/Paginas/De-professionele-standaarden-van-de-rechters.aspx.

(2019): There is a so-called Team Judicial Quality (Team Juridische Kwaliteit), which studies topics in a theme-wise manner. This is part of the program 'Programma OM Strafvordering 2020'. A team of public prosecutors participates in TKJ and assesses the judicial work of colleagues in a structured and systematic way. There is often a first assessment (baseline) and a first follow-up assessment, and sometimes even a second follow-up. If necessary, the assessment framework is adjusted.

Poland

(General Comment): The Ministry of Justice collects statistical data sent by common courts concerning their current activity, and also evaluates annual information on the activity of courts, prepared by presidents of courts of appeal about the activity of courts within the area of appeals, within the scope of tasks entrusted to them. In addition, the Minister of Justice convenes a meeting with presidents of courts of appeal at least once a year to discuss issues related to exercising supervision. Within the framework of that evaluation, a multifaceted analysis of collected statistical data is conducted, inter alia, an indicator of stability of jurisprudence, an indicator of control over the inflow of court cases or time of adjudication in incoming cases. However, no legal provision defines specific quality standards for individual indicators, concerning organisational quality and/or justice quality policy, to be formulated for the justice system as a whole.

(2016): The most important indicator comes from evaluation of judgements through second instance procedure. In this purpose "judgement stability" ratio are in use as a ratio o judgements reversed or annulled in procedure of appeal.

Portugal

(General Comment): Law on the organisation of the judicial system (Law 62/2013 of 26 August) sets out that the High Council for the Judiciary and the Prosecutor-General, in liaison with the member of Government responsible for the justice, establish, within their respective competences, the strategic objectives for first instance courts for a three year period. These entities are also responsible for setting, every year, the strategic objectives of first instance courts for the following judicial year Taking into account the results obtained in the previous year and the strategic objectives formulated for the subsequently year, the president of the court and the public prosecutor coordinator, after hearing the judiciary administrator, articulate proposals for the procedural objectives for each court. This system is very recent, is currently being implemented, subject to improvements, and only covers civil and commercial cases.

(2021): For instance, the Prosecutor General's Directives and Instructions define good practices of functional performance at national level and their compliance may be viewed an indicator of the quality of the work developed (example, Directive 5/2019, on acting in cases of domestic violence (https://dre.pt/home/-/dre/126870404/details/maximized - text in Portuguese). In addition to Directives and Instructions, the performance assessment system for prosecutors is based on quality criteria/performance parameters, as a rule, uniformly applied at national level.

(2020): For instance, the Prosecutor General's Directives and Instructions define good practices of functional performance at national level and their compliance may be viewed an indicator of the quality of the work developed (example, Directive 5/2019, on acting in cases of domestic violence (https://dre.pt/home/-/dre/126870404/details/maximized - text in Portuguese). In addition to Directives and Instructions, the performance assessment system for prosecutors is based on quality criteria/performance parameters, as a rule, uniformly applied at national level.

Romania

(General Comment): There are no formal standards for quality established for the whole judiciary. However, informal standards are being used (such as training, quality of the reasoning, assessment of the activity of the judges, assessment of the good reputation of the judges etc.).
More precisely, the activity of courts is evaluated and monitored periodically, on the basis of certain statistical data/performance indicators, such as those presented at question 70. The evaluation is achieved by verifications carried out by inspectors of the Judicial Inspection of the SCM, by elaborating periodical reports. The schedule and thematic of those verifications are approved every year by the SCM.
At organizational level, there are no quality standards established for courts. It may be considered that such standards exist at individual level, for each judge, by the indicators for the evaluation of professional activity.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, a reference was made to the “Court Optimisation Project” financed by the World Bank, implemented from October 2011 to March 2013. The final recommendation included the introduction of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), such as the clearance rate, the number of cases older than one year, the number of cases solved within 1 year, and the comparative measurement system.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): It is a system of internal review of courts. Internal review of the court is a type of control of the court and judges, which aims to verify the current state of the judiciary, to identify the causes of shortcomings in the performance of the judiciary and to propose measures to eliminate them. The internal review is carried out by designated departments, which are made up of judges.

(2020): Internal revision of the court is a type of control of the court and judges, which aims to check the current state of the judiciary, to identify the causes of shortcomings in the performance of the judiciary and to propose measures to eliminate them.

(2014): There is a system to evaluate the overall functioning of courts with respect to the Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic for the period of 2010-2014:
http://www.vlada.gov.sk/data/files/855_the-manifesto-of-the-governmentof-the-slovak-republic-for-the-period-of-2010-2014.pdf

Slovenia

(General Comment): The Supreme Court's Data warehouse, containing all court cases, as well as financial data and human resources data was implemented in 2011. The data are collected based on CEPEJ Guidelines on Judicial statistics (GOJUST).
A special office at the Supreme Court with specialised knowledge was introduced in order to monitor the quality and define quality policies on the level of entire judiciary and individual courts. Quality standards based on SATURN guidelines are taken into account in several predefined BI system reports.
The important role in the determination of quality standards is played by the Supreme Court's „Opening of the judicial year" document, in which a set of priorities is determined. The priorities are subsequently monitored throughout the judicial year by automated BI tools and customised analysis at the Supreme Court.
The 2013 amendment to the Courts Act provides that the Supreme Court shall adopt the Criteria for quality of work for courts for the next (judicial) year, based on its Yearly report on efficiency and effectiveness of courts. Since 2015, the Supreme Court has been adopting the timeframes for different types of procedures as well as for different procedural phases for next year (as a part of the Criteria for quality of work).
As for public prosecution, the criteria for quality of work are defined in the Prosecution Policy (adopted by the Prosecutor General), while the quantitative aspects of work are defined in the Criteria for evaluating the performance of the state prosecutor's offices adopted by the State Prosecutorial Council.

(2015): The Supreme Court's Data warehouse, containing all court cases, as well as financial data and human resources data was implemented in 2011. The data are collected based on CEPEJ Guidelines on Judicial statistics (GOJUST). The system was awarded with Special mention in the 2012 Crystal Scales of Justice Competition and was defined as "Inspiring example" in the EC document Quality of Public Administration - A Toolbox for Practitioners - http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=sl&pubId=7757.

A special office at the Supreme Court with specialised knowledge was introduced in order to monitor the quality and define quality policies on the level of entire judiciary and individual courts.

Quality standards based on SATURN guidelines are taken into account in several predefined BI system reports.

The important role in the determination of quality standards is played by the Supreme Court's „Opening of the judicial year" document, in which a set of priorities is determined. The priorities are subsequently monitored throughout the judicial year by automated BI tools and customised analysis at the Supreme Court.

The 2013 amendment to the Courts Act provides that the Supreme Court shall adopt the Criteria for quality of work for courts for the next (judicial) year, based on its Yearly report on efficiency and effectiveness of courts. In 2015 the Supreme Court adopted the timeframes for different types of procedures as well as for different procedural phases for 2016 (as a part of the Criteria for quality of work).

(2014): 2014 A dedicated office at the Supreme Court with specialised knowledge was introduced in order to monitor the quality and define quality policies at the level of entire judiciary and individual courts level.
Quality standards based on SATURN guidelines are taken into account in several predefined BI system reports.
The recent amendment of the Courts Act provides that the Supreme Court shall adopt the Criteria for quality of work for courts for the next (judicial) year, based on its Yearly report on efficiency and effectiveness of courts. Since the amendment was adopted in the middle of 2013, the first Annual report of Supreme Court will be for 2014 (to be published in 2015). Consequently, only 2015 will be the (first) year to formally adopt the aforementioned Criteria.
The important role in the determination of quality standards is played by the Supreme Court`s „Opening of the judicial year" document, in which a set of priorities is determined. The priorities are subsequently monitored throughout the judicial year by automated BI tools and customised analysis at the Supreme Court.

(2013): 2013 According to the priorities for the whole judiciary, set by the Supreme Court in the „Opening of the judicial year" document for judicial year 2013, specific areas were monitored and the standards determined for the following areas:
1. Management of courts
2. Solving of oldest unresolved cases
3. Business process – Time management of judicial procedures and the reform of civil enforcement procedure
4. Disburdening the judges
5. Levelling of human resources

(2012): 2012: The Supreme court`s Data warehouse, containing all court cases, as well as financial data and human resources data was implemented in 2011. The data are collected based on CEPEJ Guidelines on Judicial statistics (GOJUST). The system was awarded with Special mention in the 2012 Crystal Scales of Justice Competition and was defined as Inspiring example in the EC document Quality of Public Administration - A Toolbox for Practitioners – http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=sl&pubId=7757.

Spain

(2015): Every three months each Court sends statistics to the Council for the Judiciary with complete information about the activity of the Court.

Question 067

Belgium

(2021): The College of Courts and Tribunals is working on the implementation of a quality system. This system is based on international scientific references and will be broken down into ten or so themes that constitute the management modules of an organisation. These management modules cover all aspects of an organisation, including organisational management, process management, human resources management, organisational culture, information and communication, financial management, facility management and information and communication technologies. The College of Courts and Tribunals and the steering committees work together to develop their maturity in these different areas.

Bulgaria

(2020): The Supreme Judicial Council, through its Commission for Attestation/Appraisal and Competitions at the Judges College/Chamber of the Supreme Judicial Council and the Commission for Attestation/Appraisal and Competitions at the Prosecutorial College/Chamber, are the bodies that perform an objective assessment of the professional, business and moral qualities of magistrates.

Denmark

(2019): As above

(2018): The public prosecution is not part of Danish Court Administration.

(2017): Because judges are independent, we do not interfere with a judge decision. However, there is always the possibility to appeal a court decision if either of the parties disagree with the verdict.

(2016): As above.

France

(2021): Source DSJ

(2020): The answer is no for the administrative justice.

(2014): 2010: State prosecutors draw an annual report on the activity, management of their public prosecution office and on the enforcement of the law, as well as an annual report concerning the measures of custody and the condition of the custody facilities.

(2012): 2012: in French law on the judicial organisation, there is no statutory or regulatory requirement providing specialised staff in courts responsible for quality norms.
However, as part of the maintenance dialog to have operational resources, each court fills a document for the Ministry of Justice, comprising informations such as the number of handled cases, pending cases, the number of judges and administrative staff, as well as the performance objectives to reach. This document is not available on the intranet to all of the staff. Only agents of the Ministry in charge of the maintenance dialog have access to these figures thanks to appropriate softwares.

Germany

(2021): Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

(2020): Due to judicial independence, there are no national level quality standards.

Greece

(2021): It depends on the court, the answer was changed from yes to no although there are judicial services that have answered positively the majority have answered no.

(2017): The Law provides a set of quality criteria that must be taken into account when inspectors check the performance of each judge.

Ireland

(2021): Secretary of Judicial Council and Judicial Conduct Committee of that Committee investigate and adjudicate complaints.

Malta

(2018): There are general quality standards that apply to the public sector, but not specific quality standards that monitor the implementation of quality standards within the judiciary or the prosecution services.

Netherlands

(General Comment): Courts: there are staff members (policy officers) within the offices that coordinate the quality in that office.
Public prosecution: At the head office of the public prosecution (Parket-General), there is personnel responsible for producing, implementing, evaluating and auditing quality measures. These are the TJQ (as mentioned in Q66), Team Processes and Information (standard processes and procedures) and the Scientific Bureau OM (national guidelines and policy regulations).

(2017): yes

Poland

(General Comment): Inspection departments operate in the appellate and regional courts. The task of the judges working in these departments is to perform on behalf of the president of the court activities in the scope of supervision over the administrative activity of the courts in the area of the operation of a given appellate or district court. Supervision consists in taking actions to improve the office of the courts or increase the efficiency and level of work organization culture in the courts. For this purpose, visits of departments in courts or surveys of recognized cases of a given category are carried out, the secretariats of departments in the courts are controlled.
Activities in the scope of administrative supervision can not enter the field in which judges and assessors are independent.

Portugal

(2021): The High Council of the Public Prosecution Service has “inspectors” (“inspectores”) who assess the quality of the work carried out by the prosecutors, applying national quality criteria or standards.

(2020): The High Council of the Public Prosecution Service has “inspectors” (“inspectores”) who assess the quality of the work carried out by the prosecutors, applying national quality criteria or standards.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): Judicial Council, Council of Prosecutors and disciplinary commissions.

(2020): Judicial Council, Council of Prosecutors and disciplinary commissions.

(2019): Judicial Council, Council of Prosecutors and disciplinary commissions

Slovenia

(General Comment): The Office for Court Management Development at the Supreme Court promotes the improvement in leadership and management of courts and the increase in effectiveness and efficiency. It is responsible for the preparation of different reports and analysis regarding work of courts and the promotion of best practices. The Department for the Organization and Development of Management of the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Prosecution Policy and the Criteria for the Success of Prosecution of State Prosecutor's Offices.

Spain

(2015): Every three months each Court sends statistics to the Council for the Judiciary with complete information about the activity of the Court.

Question 073

Belgium

(2017): There are ad hoc evaluation systems within the courts. But there is not yet a central or coordinated system.

(2016): There are ad hoc evaluation systems within the courts. But there is no central or coordinated system.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) is a body of the judicial system of the Republic of Bulgaria established under the art. 132a of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria /published in State Gazette N.12 from 6th February 2007/. The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council is an independent body with the primary function of examining the operation of the judicial bodies without affecting their independence. Art. 54, para. 1 of the Judicial System Act assigns powers to the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council.
The Inspectorate annually, not later than the end of March of the current year, adopts a program for the planned inspections.

(2019): The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) is a body of the judicial system of the Republic of Bulgaria created with art. 132a of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria /published in State Gazette N.12 from 6th February 2007/. The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council is an independent body with the primary function of examining the operation of the judicial bodies without affecting their independence. The powers of the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council are provided for in Art. 54, para. 1 of the Judiciary System Act.
Rules for the organization of the activities of the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council and for the activity of the administration and the experts
Section II Organization and procedure for conducting plan checks
Art. 53. (1) The Inspectorate annually, not later than the end of March of the current year, adopts a program for the planned inspections.
(2) The Annual Program for the planned inspections contains:
1. the appellate areas and the bodies of the judiciary in which a complex inspection will be carried out;
2. the bodies of the judiciary in which thematic and control inspections will be carried out;
3. an indicative timetable for carrying out the inspections.
(3) The annual program may be supplemented and amended by a decision of the Inspectorate. (4) The annual program is announced on the website of the Inspectorate.
Art. 54. (1) The planned inspections may be complex, thematic and control inspections. (2) The complex inspections relate to the overall activity of the body of the judiciary. (3) Thematic inspections are conducted on a specific topic on the application of the law by a judicial authority during the period under review, a judge, a prosecutor or an investigating magistrate.
(4) Control inspections are carried out after a complex or thematic inspection, which provides recommendations for overcoming negative practices. Art. 55. (1) Immediately after the adoption of the annual program, by lot ensuring random allocation, the chief inspector in the presence of all inspectors determines the specific judicial authority that will be inspected, and the teams that will carry out the inspection.

Croatia

(2015): According to the Court Act, the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years.

The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 March for the previous year.

The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered,stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanour courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts.

Denmark

(2019): Weighted cases is also a way to see how much activity a court has.

France

(General Comment): In the case of civil and criminal justice, it is specified "in the framework of management dialogues". Source DSJ

(2016): Administrative courts also use dashboards on monthly basis, while civil and criminal courts receive quarterly management activity reports via a business application.

(2014): 2012, 2013, 2014: for the adminsitrative courts, the performance indicators comprised an estimate and objectives updated every three months. The activity is assessed every year in the administrative jurisdictions during management conferences. A monitoring board fo the activity is transmitted every month to the heads of administrative jurisdictions.

(2013): 2012, 2013, 2014: for the adminsitrative courts, the performance indicators comprised an estimate and objectives updated every three months. The activity is assessed every year in the administrative jurisdictions during management conferences. A monitoring board fo the activity is transmitted every month to the heads of administrative jurisdictions.

(2012): 2012, 2013, 2014: for the adminsitrative courts, the performance indicators comprised an estimate and objectives updated every three months. The activity is assessed every year in the administrative jurisdictions during management conferences. A monitoring board fo the activity is transmitted every month to the heads of administrative jurisdictions.

Germany

(2021): The situation has not changed in comparison with previous cycles. However, the methodology of replying to this question has changed in order to match the method used for replying to similar questions and in order to better reflect the answers provided by the Länder.
The majority of the Länder (10) answered "yes", 6 Länder answered "no".

(2013): In respect of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises no information was provided from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and Thuringia. Five States provided a positive reply, while the remaining Landers answered “NO”. As to Bavaria, the information varied depending on the individual court jurisdiction for which information was provided: “YES” for Bavarian fiscal courts and “NO” for the remaining Bavarian courts.
In Brandenburg, the analysis is only subject to the figures provided regarding incoming cases, conclusions, duration of proceedings, number of court persons working, etc., which could possibly be used as indicators for the assessment of the performance abilities and the quality standards of the court. In Bremen, there is a benchmarking based upon key performance indicators.
In Lower Saxony regular assessments of the activities of the courts and public prosecution offices take place through administrative supervision. Qualitative evaluation of court activities is not possible through the implemented statistics and, based upon the constitutional law guarantee of judicial independence, is not desired. Likewise, the current view in Saarland is that such an evaluation system is incompatible with judicial independence protected by the Basic Law. Moreover, in North-Rhine/Westphalia, monitoring adjudicative activities is prohibited based upon constitutional law grounds. In this Lander there is a comprehensive system for assessing internal business. In certain areas there is also a management information system with statistical core data relevant to management on the number of incoming cases, duration of proceedings, and numbers of conclusions.
Saxony-Anhalt specified that the instrument for operative and strategic management of the courts is the management report. In the conceptual (as regards content) design of the management reports, the department comparison is defined as central criteria. This approach results, on the one hand, in a comparison of one’s own department with the average of all departments and, on the other hand, in taking account of the basic idea behind benchmarking, with the average of the three best departments. Concrete measures with calculable targets are set forth in target agreements between the Ministry for Finance and the Ministry for Justice and Equality as well as in how they are structured with each budgeted department. The bases for this, among others, are indicators in the management reports.

(2012): In respect of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises no information was provided from Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and Thuringia. Five States provided a positive reply, while the remaining Landers answered “NO”. As to Bavaria, the information varied depending on the individual court jurisdiction for which information was provided: “YES” for Bavarian fiscal courts and “NO” for the remaining Bavarian courts.
In Brandenburg, the analysis is only subject to the figures provided regarding incoming cases, conclusions, duration of proceedings, number of court persons working, etc., which could possibly be used as indicators for the assessment of the performance abilities and the quality standards of the court. In Bremen, there is a benchmarking based upon key performance indicators.
In Lower Saxony regular assessments of the activities of the courts and public prosecution offices take place through administrative supervision. Qualitative evaluation of court activities is not possible through the implemented statistics and, based upon the constitutional law guarantee of judicial independence, is not desired. Likewise, the current view in Saarland is that such an evaluation system is incompatible with judicial independence protected by the Basic Law. Moreover, in North-Rhine/Westphalia, monitoring adjudicative activities is prohibited based upon constitutional law grounds. In this Lander there is a comprehensive system for assessing internal business. In certain areas there is also a management information system with statistical core data relevant to management on the number of incoming cases, duration of proceedings, and numbers of conclusions.
Saxony-Anhalt specified that the instrument for operative and strategic management of the courts is the management report. In the conceptual (as regards content) design of the management reports, the department comparison is defined as central criteria. This approach results, on the one hand, in a comparison of one’s own department with the average of all departments and, on the other hand, in taking account of the basic idea behind benchmarking, with the average of the three best departments. Concrete measures with calculable targets are set forth in target agreements between the Ministry for Finance and the Ministry for Justice and Equality as well as in how they are structured with each budgeted department. The bases for this, among others, are indicators in the management reports.

Greece

(2017): According to L. 1756/1988 (art. 85), supreme judges appointed as inspections for one year's term redact every year General Reports on the operation of each Court and prosecutor's Office in their district and recommend the necessary measures for the proper functioning of the service. Furthermore, data regarding the flow of cases collected by the Ministry of Justice is used for ad hoc analysis (e.g. to provide a basis for decisions regarding the function of courts or answers to questions of parliamentary control).

Hungary

(2014): On the occasion of the 2013 and 2014 evaluations, it has been stressed that the statistics of the court system are carried out every quarter,semi-annualy and annualy. It is published on the central internet website of the courts every half year.

If some elements of the IT system described in 2012 have been implemented, this system is not yet able to replace the regular methods of measuring workload.

(2013): On the occasion of the 2013 and 2014 evaluations, it has been stressed that the statistics of the court system are carried out every quarter,semi-annualy and annualy. It is published on the central internet website of the courts every half year.

If some elements of the IT system described in 2012 have been implemented, this system is not yet able to replace the regular methods of measuring workload.

(2012): On the occasion of the 2012 exercise, it has been mentioned that the development of an IT system was under way which would make it possible to automatically measure and evaluate the workload of judges.

Ireland

(2021): The information you are seeking is not available in this format.

Latvia

(2015): Latvia has the Court Information System it contains statistical data about court performance. The statistical data have been published in the e-portal: www.manas.tiesas.lv and regularly analysed by Court administration and Ministry of Justice (MoJ).

Luxembourg

(2020): "Although the technically correct answer is ""no"", the Judiciary edits every year an annual report on its activities during the
previous year. This reports is available to the public (report 2020, see https://justice.public.lu/fr/publications/juridictions-judiciaires/rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2020.html)."

(2019): Although the technically correct answer is "no", the Judiciary edits every year an annual report on its activities during the previous year. This report is available to the public (report 2019, see https://justice.public.lu/dam-assets/fr/publications/rapport-activites-judiciaires/Rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2019.pdf).

(2018): Although the technically correct answer is "no", the Judiciary edits every year an annual report on its activities during the previous year. This reports is available to the public (report 2018, see https://justice.public.lu/dam-assets/fr/publications/rapport-activites-judiciaires/Rapport-juridictions-judiciaires-2018.pdf) .

(2014): 2014: There is no regular monitoring system. Statistical tools and the court management system may be used to monitor the activity but this is not their primary function.

Malta

(2015): Currently, Malta carries out systematic quantitative analysis of the performance of the courts, based on established international indicators. Furthermore, ongoing internal reports, commissioned specifically to study areas of interest in the performance of certain courts, also complement the quantitative analysis, and serve to further address identified shortcomings in a more strategic manner.

(2014): On the occasion of the 2014 exercise, it has been indicated that since 2015, a system of monitoring court performance through quantitative means, using established performance indicators such as Clearance Rate and Pending caseload, has been initiated.

Poland

(2019): Every year, an analysis is made of the annual information of the presidents of the courts of appeal about the activities of the courts operating in the area of appeals containing statistical data from individual appeals and information on actions taken to ensure the best activity of the courts in the area of appeal. The Minister of Justice assesses the annual information and accepts or refuses to accept this information
The analysis of the work of courts in the areas of operation of individual appeals is also based on statistical data for the first half of each year.
Based on the obtained statistical data, the Department of Administrative Surveillance carries out, as required, data on judicial units, in particular in the context of the efficiency of proceedings and the need for appropriate action by court presidents to ensure the most effective work of their subordinate units.

(2017): The Minister of Justice regularly assesses the activities of the courts as part of external administrative supervision, by analysing the annual information provided by the Presidents of the appellate courts pursuant to art. 37b § 2 point 1 of the Act of July 27, 2001. The law on the system of common courts (i.e. Journal of Laws of 2018.23), in turn as part of internal supervision, regularly evaluates the activities of courts by presidents, by visiting and reviewing selected issues.

Portugal

(General Comment): Besides an annual report, there are also a trimestral and semestral statistics to evaluate judge's performance.
In the case of the Administrative and Tax Courts the reports are semestral.

(2015): Every month a data collection of all courts is assembled. In addition, in first degree courts the electronical procedures allow a daily basis analysis. The website is very exhaustive and can be consulted in http://www.siej.dgpj.mj.pt/webeis/index.jsp?username=Publico&pgmWindowName=pgmWindow_633918141195530467.
Every 4 years we have a complete analysis to the work of all courts, with the local inspectors made by judges appointed by the Judicial Council.

Romania

(2015): The courts have to carry out a monthly assessment and the Superior Council of Magistracy on the basis of individual reports as well as on the basis of the overall indicators carries out a half-yearly assessment of the judicial system.

Slovak Republic

(2018): See general comment

Slovenia

(2014): 2014: Until, the 2013 the Judicial Council was entrusted with monitoring and evaluating the performance of courts and issuing a yearly report on the execution of judicial power (Courts Act, Article 28). With the amendment to the Courts Act (ZS-K) of the Courts Act that came in force in 2014 this responsibility is transferred to the Supreme Court.

Question 073-0

Austria

(2021): monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (more frequent); periodic check lists (annual), Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)

(2020): monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (more frequent)
Periodic check lists (annual)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)

(2019): Operational Information System (BIS) annually
Periodic check lists
Less frequent:
Internal Audit all 4 to 7 years
More frequent:
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases ("Kurzstatistik")

(2018): Operational Information System (BIS) annually
Periodic check lists (on October 1st of every year)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases ("Kurzstatistik") (more frequent)

(2017): Operational Information System (BIS) annually
Periodic check lists (on October 1st of every year)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases ("Kurzstatistik") (more frequent)

(2016): Operational Information System (BIS) annually
Periodic check lists (on October 1st of every year)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases ("Kurzstatistik") (more frequent)

Bulgaria

(2017): The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council (ISJC) is a body of the judicial system of the Republic of Bulgaria created with art. 132a of the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria /published in State Gazette N..12 from 6th February 2007/. The Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council is an independent body with the primary function of examining the operation of the judicial bodies without affecting their independence. Art. 54, para. 1 of the Judicial Power Act assigns to the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council the following powers:
1. check the organisation of administrative operation of the courts, prosecution offices and investigating authorities;
2. check the arrangements made for the institution and progress of court, prosecutorial and investigative cases, as well as the disposal thereof within the established time limits;
3. analyse and summarise the cases that have been disposed of by virtue of an enforceable judicial instrument, as well as the case files and cases disposed of by prosecutors and investigating magistrates;
4. in the presence of conflicting case-law, the existence of which has been found in carrying out the activity under Paragraph (3), it shall alert the competent authorities of the need to request the rendition of interpretative judgements or interpretative decrees;
5. upon breaches identified in the implementation of the activities under Items 1 to 3, it shall alert the administrative head of the judicial authority concerned and the respective chamber of the Supreme Judicial Council;
6. make proposals for the imposition of disciplinary sanctions on judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates and on the administrative heads of judicial authorities;
7. address alerts, proposals and reports to other state bodies, including the competent judicial authorities;
8. carry out integrity testing and examinations for conflict of interest of judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates, verifications of the financial interests disclosure declarations, as well as checks for identifying actions damaging the prestige of the Judiciary and such related to impairment of the independence of judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates;
9. examine applications against an infringement of the right to have a case examined and disposed of within a reasonable time;
10. adopt internal rules for carrying out the testing and examinations under Items 1 to 3 and Item 8 in the judicial authorities;
11. adopt internal rules for conduct of the integrity testing of experts with the Inspectorate and organise the conduct of such testing;
12. draw up an annual programme for scheduled inspections and an annual report on the activity thereof, which it shall submit to the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council;
13. discuss the draft budget for the Judiciary proposed by the Minister of Justice with regard to the budget of the Inspectorate and submit it to the Supreme Judicial Council;
14. make publicly available information on the activity thereof and publish the annual report on the activity thereof on the website thereof.
Rules for the organization of the activities of the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council and for the activity of the administration and the experts
Prom., SG, no. 103 of 27.12.2016, in force as of 01.01.2017.
Section II Organization and procedure for conducting plan checks

Croatia

(General Comment): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 67/18), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure in which lasts more than three years. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry in charge for Justice, once a year, at the latest by the 31 March for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30th April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts. The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Through Case Management system it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

(2019): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15, 82/16, 67/18, 126/19), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years. The president of the court is obliged to take special care to respect the rights and protect children in proceedings before the courts in accordance with international standards. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 January for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts.
The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanour courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

(2018): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 March for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts.
The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanour courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

(2017): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 March for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts. The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanour courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

(2016): According to the Courts Act (Official Gazette, number 28/13, 33/15, 82/15), the president of court supervises accurate performance of court activities in due time. The president of court has a duty to write a report on the performed supervision and its results, as well as on the measures taken, at least once a month. The report has to be inserted into a case file of judicial administration. The president of court is obliged to ensure court efficiency in the resolution of cases, especially when it comes to the resolution of cases the procedure of which lasts more than three years. The president of court, except for the president of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, has a duty to submit a report on the performed tasks of judicial administration, measures and activities undertaken to improve work and efficiency of the court in the resolution of cases. The report is to be submitted directly to a court of higher instance, to the State Judicial Council and the Ministry of Justice, once a year, at least before 31 March for the previous year.
The president of the Supreme Court submits the report on the state of judiciary to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report the president of the Supreme Court can report on the state and actions of the judiciary, organizational problems in courts and legislation shortcomings as well as give suggestions for the improvement of the work of courts.
The courts use special information systems for the management and operation of the courts' cases, which consist of standard applications, computer and telecommunications equipment and infrastructure, system software and tools and all the data that are entered, stored and transmitted in all of the registers of the system. Misdemeanor courts operate using JCMS (Joint Case Management System), while other courts of general jurisdiction and commercial courts use ICMS (Integrated Case Management System). Through these systems it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of courts for the Ministry of Justice and the courts themselves.

Cyprus

(2021): monthly and annually

(2020): monthly and annually

(2019): monthly

(2018): monthly and annually

(2017): monthly and annually

(2016): monthly and annually statistics

Denmark

(2021): Monthly, quarterly, half yearly and yearly.

(2020): Monthly, quarterly, half yearly and yearly.

(2019): Monthly for the district courts quarterly for other courts.

(2018): Monthly for the district courts. quarterly for other courts.

(2017): Monthly for the district courts. Quarterly for the High Courts, the Maritime and Commercial Court and the Supreme Court.

Estonia

(2021): 4 times a year.

(2020): 4 times a year.

(2019): 4 times a year.

(2017): Every 4 months but if necessary even more frequent.

Finland

(2021): During the annual budget negotiations the performance of each court
is evaluated. However, the general performance of the courts as a whole (for example disposition times) is monitored more frequently

(2020): During the annual budget negotiations the performance of each court is evaluated. However, the general performance of the courts as a whole (for example disposition times) is monitored more frequently.

France

(2021): Source DSJ
Source Council of State

(2020):
With regard to the courts of the judicial order, there are two objectives for evaluating the performance of the courts. The first is the need to provide the heads of courts with steering elements via monthly dashboards (civil and criminal); the second consists, in the context of annual management dialogues, in proposing dashboards covering a whole year. These dashboards are freely accessible in order to allow for a very wide distribution to all the actors and thus encourage comparison, the first vector of performance analysis.

(2019): Concerning civil and criminal branches, there are two objectives for evaluating courts' performance. The first lies in the need to provide the heads of courts with steering elements via monthly dashboards (Civil and Criminal), the second in the context of annual management dialogues, the dashboard covering this time a whole year. These dashboards are freely accessible so that they can be widely diffused to all stakeholders and thus facilitate comparison, the latter being the primary means of analysing performance. Administrative courts also use monthly dashboards and civil and criminal courts receive quarterly reports on steering activities via a business application.

(2018): For judicial courts, the performance analysis is based on the PHAROS information centre used by courts (courts and prosecution services) and central administration.
The results of the management dialogues are published in July. The so-called steering returns can be updated every quarter and every month according to the disputes monitored.
For administrative courts, the frequency is annual

Germany

(2021): Of the 10 Länder who answered "yes", exactly half indicated that evaluations take place annually. The other half reported that evaluations happen more frequently - in most cases quarterly.

Greece

(2017): The regular evaluation activity is performed every year. Besides, the Law 1756/1988 provides for inspections. Namely, according to art. 85, supreme judges appointed as inspectors for one year term redact every year General Reports on the operation of each Court and prosecutor's Office in their district and recommend the necessary measures for the proper functioning of the service. Furthermore, data regarding the performance of courts is collected as follows:Regarding Administrative courts and Civil procedure the data is collected every quarter. Regarding penal procedure this is collected every semester.
Furthermore, ad hoc evaluations are conducted, based on the data collected every quarter and semester respectively.

Hungary

(2021): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.

(2020): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.

(2019): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.

(2018): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.

(2017): The statistics of the court system are composed in every quarter, half and whole year. It is published on the central internet website of the courts in every half year.

Italy

(2020): Quarterly

(2019): Quarterly

(2018): Quarterly

(2017): Quarterly

(2016): Quarterly

Latvia

(General Comment): Evaluation of judicial work is carried out as necessary. Evaluation of courts activities are done mainly in two ways: every month and on a basis of request.
The evaluation can happen for a single court or instance at any time for a number of reasons.
An Annual evaluation of court staff is also carried out, which is essential for high-quality work of courts.

(2020): Evaluation of courts activities are done mainly in two ways: every month and on a basis of request.
The evaluation can happen for a single court or instance at any time for a number of reasons.
An Annual evaluation of court staff is also carried out, which is essential for high-quality work of courts.

(2019): Evaluation happens on a basis of request. The evaluation can happen for a single court or instance at any time for a number of reasons.

(2018): Evaluation happens on a basis of request. The evaluation can happen for a single court or instance at any time for a number of reasons.

(2017): Latvia has the Court Information System it contains statistical data about court performance. The statistical data have been published in the e-portal: www.tiesas.lv and regularly analysed by Court administration and MoJ.

(2016): Latvia has the Court Information System it contains statistical data about court performance. The statistical data have been published in the e-portal: www.tiesas.lv and regularly analysed by Court administration and MoJ.

Malta

(2021): Court performance is evaluated on a quarterly basis, or as the need arises.

(2020): Court performance is evaluated on a quarterly basis, or as the need arises.

(2018): Court evaluation in terms of performance is carried out on a monthly basis, or on a case by need basis.

(2017): The activity of the courts is monitored on a monthly basis.

(2016): Court evaluation in terms of performance is carried out on a monthly basis.

Netherlands

(2021): Along with monthly reports and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.

(2020): Along with monthly reports and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.

(2019): Along with the monthly reports and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.

Poland

(General Comment): Annual information of the presidents of courts of appeal on the activity of courts operating within the area of appellate courts, containing statistical data from particular appellate courts and information on actions taken to ensure the best possible activity of courts within the area of appellate courts, is analyzed every year. The Minister of Justice evaluates annual information and either accepts it or refuses to accept it
The analysis of work of courts within the jurisdiction of particular appellate courts is also carried out on the basis of statistical data for the first half of each year. On the basis of statistical data collected, the Department of Administrative Supervision performs, according to the needs, an analysis of data concerning judicial units, in particular in the context of efficiency of proceedings and the need to undertake appropriate actions by presidents of courts in order to ensure the most efficient work of units subordinate to them.

(2021): At the level of the Minister of Justice, evaluation of efficiency is carried out at least once a year (evaluation of annual information submitted by the presidents of courts of appeal) and, if necessary, twice a year, while by internal supervisory bodies - on the basis of monthly statements, quarterly - Management Control

(2019): The analysis of the work of all courts is carried out cyclically for the first half of each year and after its completion, in particular based on the average duration of the procedure, control of influence and degree of residue, influence, settlement and remaining case, influence and settlement of cases on a judge according to the limit as at the last day of the statistical period, impact, settlement and remainder on staffing in versions 1 and 3. In addition, data on individual units are analyzed as required.

Portugal

(2018): Besides an annual report, there are also a trimestral and semestral statistics to evaluate judge's performance.
In the case of the Administrative and Tax Courts the reports are semestral.

(2017): Every 4 months.

(2016): Every 6 months.

Romania

(2021): biannual (twice a year)

(2020): biannual (twice a year)

(2018): BIANUAL

(2017): The system may be inquired and offer information in real time. On a regular basis, the information is used within the annual report of the judiciary.

(2016): The system may be inquired and offer information in real time. On a regular basis, the information is used within the annual report of the judiciary.

Spain

(2016): Every six months there is a virtual (on line) inspection of the work of the Courts.

Question 073-1

Belgium

(2021): No, allocation of resources between courts is carried out based on a methodology defined by the College of courts and tribunals, independently of the performance evaluation.

Czech Republic

(2016): In 2015, a new policy from the Ministry of Justice resulted in the fact that the evaluation of the court activity is used for the later allocation of means to this court.

(2015): In 2015, a new policy from the Ministry of Justice resulted in the fact that the evaluation of the court activity is used for the later allocation of means to this court.

Denmark

(2017): Definitely. Both in relation to funds but also in relation to appointment of new judges in case of vacancy. In case of vacancy, it is not necessarily the same district court where the judge will be placed. It may change to another court. At the high court and the Supreme court the law defines a fixed number of judges at each court.

Estonia

(2016): It can be part of it but it's not a rule.

France

(2017): Annual management conferences (management dialogues) are held between the Ministry or the General Secretariat of the Council of State, depending on whether the court is judicial or administrative, during which the activity indicators of each court are analysed for the previous year and, in the light of the objectives achieved, the objectives and the resources in terms of credits and personnel granted for the coming year are set.

(2016): Annual management conferences (management dialogues) are held between the Ministry or the General Secretariat of the State Council (Conseil d'Etat), depending on whether the court is civil, criminal or administrative, during which, the activity indicators of each court are analysed for the past year, and, in the light of the objectives achieved, the objectives and the means in terms of credits and staff granted are set for the coming year.

Germany

(2021): The situation has not changed in comparison with previous cycles. However, the methodology of replying to this question has changed in order to match the method used for replying to similar questions and in order to better reflect the answers provided by the Länder.
A slight majority of the Länder answered "yes", 4 Länder could not provide an answer.

Greece

(2017): Concerning the staff of the court, under certain circumstances, this evaluation of the Court activity could lead to a decision to increase or diminish it.

Hungary

(General Comment): The statistical output of a court (mainly the number of incoming and pending cases) is taken into consideration during the distribution of human resources.

Italy

(General Comment): The process of reallocation of human resources is not carried out on a regular basis. On those occasion when the staffing plan is revised, the criteria also include the court activity. In the occasion of the last exercise of this kind, it was introduced the concept of "flexible staffing plan" (some sort of "flying judges"). I.e. a group of judges who are not allocated to a specific court but to the court of appeal that has a broader regional scope. Subsequently these judges may be temporarily allocated to specific tribunals within the region to cope with specific needs arising from those tribunals.

Latvia

(2021): Not currently, but there is a suggestion from State Audit Office and a subsequent proposition from Ministry of Justice and
Court administration to the Judiciary Council to start to take court work statistical indicators into account when planning annual budget. If necessary, based on workload data resources can be allocated later within a court.

(2020): Not currently, but there is a suggestion from State Audit Office and a subsequent proposition from Ministry of Justice and
Court administration to the Judiciary Council to start to take court work statistical indicators into account when planning annual budget. If necessary, based on workload data resources can be allocated later within a court.

(2019): Not currently, but there is a suggestion from State Audit Office and a subsequent proposition from Ministry of Justice and Court administration to the Judiciary Council to start to take court work statistical indicators into account when planning annual budget. If necessary, based on workload data resources can be allocated later within a court.

(2018): Not currently, but there is a suggestion from State Audit Office and a subsequent proposition from Ministry of Justice and Court administration to the Judiciary Council to start to take court work statistical indicators into account when planning annual budget. If necessary, based on workload data resources can be allocated later within a court.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The figures presented by the SSJ are used on a regular basis to allocate (and ask for) means to the courts and public prosecution services.

(2020):
The annual report is used to the effect set out in Q. 073-1 (report 2020, see https://justice.public.lu/fr/publications/juridictions-judiciaires/rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2020.html).

(2019): The annual report is used to the effect set out in Q. 073-1

(2018): The annual report is used to the effect set out in Q. 073-1

(2016): The figures presented by the SSJ are used on a regular basis to allocate (and ask for) means to the courts and prosecutorial services.

Malta

(2017): Court performance evaluation is brought to the attention of both the Minister for Justice, Culture and Local Government as well as to the attention of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice, who is vested with the authority to effect changes in judicial duties, does make use of such performance data in the better interest of increased efficiency and expediency of the judicial process.

(2016): Court performance evaluation is brought to the attention of both the Minister for Justice, Culture and Local Government as well as to the attention of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice, who is vested with the authority to effect changes in judicial duties, does make use of such performance data in the better interest of increased efficiency and expediency of the judicial process.

Netherlands

(2021): This is not a ‘hard’ rule; the outcomes of the evaluation do not directly influence the allocation of resources in the next years.

(2020): This is not a 'hard' rule, the outcomes of the evaluation do not directly influence the allocation of resources in the next years.

Romania

(2017): A periodic evaluation system of the activity (performance and result) of the court is not formally adopted (by law or by a subsequent regulatory act). SCM uses a series of performance indicators (see questions 71 and 74 below) concerning the activity of the courts. Periodical assessments are being carried out and further measures are being implemented on the highlighted results. By the decisions 1305/2014 and 149/2015, SCM has approved the reports on implementing these indicators and there were established new margins for their implementation.

(2016): A periodic evaluation system of the activity (performance and result) of the court is not formally adopted (by law or by a subsequent regulatory act). SCM uses a series of performance indicators (see questions 71 and 74 below) concerning the activity of the courts. Periodical assessments are being carried out and further measures are being implemented on the highlighted results. By the decisions 1305/2014 and 149/2015, SCM has approved the reports on implementing these indicators and there were established new margins for their implementation.

Question 073-2

Denmark

(2020): Half yearly weighted cases and productivity figures are worked out. These data are used to allocate ressources and to find which court should have the next free judge position.

Finland

(2021): The evaluation is used for later allocation of resources in the courts but the evaluation is not the main criteria when allocating
the resources.

(2020): The evaluation is used for later allocation of resources in the courts but the evaluation is not the main criteria when allocating
the resources.

(2019): The evaluation is used for later allocation of resources in the courts but the evaluation is not the main criteria when allocating
the resources.

(2018): The evaluation is used for later allocation of resources in the courts but the evaluation is not the main criteria when allocating the resources.

France

(2021): Source DSJ
Source Council of State

(2020): No comment

(2019): Annual management conferences (management dialogues) are held between the Ministry or the General Secretariat of the Supreme Administrative Court (Conseil d'Etat), depending on whether the court is civil/criminal or administrative, during which the activity indicators of each court are analysed for the past year and, in the light of the objectives achieved, the objectives and the resources in terms of credits and personnel granted are set for the coming year.

(2018): The evaluation of a court's activity contributes in part to the subsequent allocation of resources to that court, in particular for the location of jobs for judges and civil servants.
However, the performance indicators are cross-referenced with other data (HR data, budgetary data, etc.) in the context of the allocation of human resources and the distribution of appropriations.

Germany

(2021): All except one of the Länder who answered "yes" selected "reallocating" resources. Other options were selected by only a few Länder. Information provided for for "other": organisational solutions

Hungary

(2019): The statistical output of a court (mainly the number of incoming and pending cases) is taken into consideration during the distribution of human resources.

Italy

(2020): The evaluation of the court activity (case flow, DT, CR, etc.) are used to draw up the staffing plan ("pianta organica") i.e. the ideal allocation of judges and court staff among the courts. More recently, this data is used for monitoring the implementation of reforms and investments related to the Recovery and Resilience Plan (PNRR) and the related EU Next Generation funds.

Malta

(General Comment): Court performance evaluation is brought to the attention of both the Minister for Justice as well as to the attention of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice, who is vested with the authority to effect changes in judicial duties, does make use of such performance data in the better interest of increased efficiency and expediency of the judicial process.

(2021): As part of the digital justice strategy, internal processes are being reviewed in the courts and re-engineered accordingly, in order to increase efficiency.

(2020): Other refers to the Court's ability to request more financial and human resources in a bid to improve the performance on the selected indicators

(2018): Court performance evaluation is brought to the attention of both the Minister for Justice, Culture and Local Government as well as to the attention of the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice, who is vested with the authority to effect changes in judicial duties, does make use of such performance data in the better interest of increased efficiency and expediency of the judicial process. On the other hand, the Ministry also monitors these performance evaluations and tries to assist through legislative amendments or other interventions that lie within its powers and that do not impinge on the independence of the judiciary.

Portugal

(2021): The Administrative High Council has been using this evaluation of the activity of the courts of the administrative jurisdiction to:
- in view of the predictable number of magistrates needed in this Jurisdiction, to propose annually to the Minister of Justice the number of vacancies that should be accommodated in the training courses for magistrates of the administrative and tax jurisdiction; and
- authorize the exercise of functions, in an accumulation regime, by magistrates in more than one administrative and fiscal court or tribunal.

Question 070

Austria

(General Comment): .

(2017): "other": e.g. certain kinds of decisions, clearance rate (annually)

Belgium

(2021): In 2021, the College of Courts and Tribunals has started a project to make a central inventory of the backlog in the courts and tribunals using indicators such as length of proceedings, number of pending cases, Disposition time, backlogs.

(2017): There are ad hoc systems for monitoring activities within the courts. There is a central service responsible for the collection of statistics which ensures the annual publication of statistics. The Central Statistical Service is developing a uniform and coordinated policy, but there is (as yet) no central system for regular monitoring of activities.

(2016): There are ad hoc systems for monitoring activities within the courts. There is a central service responsible for the collection of statistics which ensures the annual publication of statistics. But there is no (yet) central system for regular monitoring of activities.

Croatia

(2019): As regards "number of appeals", from 2019 we are able to get this data from our case management system.

Denmark

(2021): Danish Court Admininistration is typically not doing this. A responsible court follow their cases though.

(2020): We value independence high. Therefore Danish Court Administration does not evaluate the performance or productivity of individual judges. We follow overall productivity and case flow though as that is used to allocate ressources and to find the court most in need of vacant judge positions.

(2019): Courts are followed yearly in a yearly report. District courts receives monthly a report about case flow, pending cases, backlogs, weighted cases and the time it takes to finalize cases.

(2017): In Denmark we have a management system which information is updated monthly for the district courts where the points above are shown. For the High Courts and the Supreme Court, the case flow is not followed so often and in a so detailed way, but there are also much fewer cases. "Other": activity in terms of weighted cases and also pending cases

(2016): The so called "weighted cases" are measured in order to have a measure for the activity.

Estonia

(General Comment): The scope of the monitoring system is extended to the results of proceedings; the categories of cases; the number of decisions appealed and revoked, fully or partially. The waiting time and the 'age' of pending (not solved) cases are also monitored. It is worthy of mention that every year all the courts and the Ministry of Justice enter into an agreement according to which courts should aim to carry out structural changes and to make changes in case-flow management that will ultimately ensure efficient proceedings. The content of the agreement has changed since 2017. The goals are more general and the same for all the courts (except The Supreme Court).

(2017): See previous general comments.

(2016): see general comments

Finland

(General Comment): All courts keep statistics of the mentioned court activities in the operational case management systems. The National Courts Administration can access these figures through a reporting system.

(2019): satisfaction of court staff is monitored with job satisfaction surveys which are taken every second year

France

(2021): Source DSJ and Council of State

(2020): Judicial and administrative jurisdictions combined.

(2019): Civil and criminal justice: After the deployment of innovative applications, satisfaction questionnaires are sent to users in the courts (heads of courts, directors of registries, judges and registry officials) in order to improve change support actions and the implementation.
In addition, with regard to victims, the Ministry of Justice will conduct a satisfaction survey in the second half of 2019 among victims of criminal offences who resort to victim support associations. The results of this survey, similar to a previous survey conducted in 2011, could be published in 2020. Likewise, the Ministry of Justice is attentive to citizens' views on the way they are received in the courts. For several years now, surveys have been conducted on the reception in the courts by a service provider pretending being a litigant. In 2018, an online survey, coupled with a face-to-face survey, was conducted in seven 1st instance courts “tribunaux de grande instance” among litigants appearing in these courts. In 2019, the satisfaction survey will be carried out in all “tribunaux de grande instance” via an online survey accessible by internet address or QR code. Finally, a national survey is also under way on the reception of litigants in the courts in the specific context of the implementation of social centres within the “tribunaux de grande instance” and the integration within these courts of the three separate courts that previously dealt with these types of litigation. The survey, carried out among court staff, aims to assess the difficulties encountered by persons presenting themselves at the reception desk and to identify any corrections that could be included in the texts.
The reply to the question encompasses replies from administrative justice and civil and criminal justice.

(2018): The coverage rate of cases as well as the structure of civil or criminal litigation are used by the courts.
In addition, other indicators usefully complete the analysis: .
Share of decisions on the merits in completed cases (civil activity).
Share of referrals in completed cases (civil activity).
Theoretical time to sell off the stock.
Average age of the stock.
Percentage of cases over 12 months in stock (civil activity).

(2017): The number of cases referred is an indicator used only by administrative courts.
The courts have business applications to monitor their civil and criminal activities. At national level, data from these applications is
from these applications are collected automatically via infocentres, reprocessed and cross-referenced, then
in the form of tables or graphs. These reports can be generated on a monthly basis, except for certain activity data (court of appeal).
These reports can be generated on a monthly basis, except for certain activity data (criminal courts, juvenile court judges, enforcement of sentences), for which reports are generated annually.
These infocentres enable the courts to monitor statistics and manage their activity. They enable the central administration to
They enable the central administration to prepare management dialogues from a performance perspective.

(2016): The number of cases subject to referral is an indicator used only by administrative courts.
Courts have business applications to monitor their civil and criminal activities. At national level, data from these applications are collected automatically via info-centres, processed and cross-referenced, and then presented in the form of tables or graphs. These refunds can be generated monthly, except for certain activity data (assize court, juvenile judges, enforcement of sentences), for which the refunds are annual.
These info-centres enable courts to carry out a statistical follow-up and to monitor their activities. They allow the central administration to prepare management dialogues from a performance perspective.

(2015): The number of cases being referred is used only by administrative courts.
The rate of coverage of cases is used by judicial courts.
The state of stocks by age group is used by administrative courts.

(2014): 2013, 2014, the category "others" includes:
- the coverage rate of cases (used by judicial courts)
- the state of the stocks per age group (used bu administrative courts)
It should be noted that concerning the indicators mentioned in the question, the number of appealed cases is only used by administrative courts.

(2013): 2013, 2014, the category "others" includes:
- the coverage rate of cases (used by judicial courts)
- the state of the stocks per age group (used bu administrative courts)
It should be noted that concerning the indicators mentioned in the question, the number of appealed cases is only used by administrative courts.

(2012): 2010, 2012: the category "others" includes the state of the stocks per age group. It should be noted that concerning the indicators mentioned in the question, the number of appealed cases is only used by administrative courts

Germany

(General Comment): At the level of the Federal Government, statistics on proceedings encompass the number of incoming cases, the type of proceeding, the form of conclusion, and the time needed for conclusion. Moreover, information regarding other characteristics is also collected (legal aid in litigation and legal aid for proceedings, value of dispute, subject area, remedies, etc.) All of this information can be correlated to one another upon evaluation. The regular evaluations can be found in the publications of the Federal Statistical Office. Data regarding the business overviews usually does not contain – in that it involves manual statistics – additional information beyond the business workload, particularly as regards the duration of proceedings.

(2021): The monitoring activities no. 1-4 were selected by all Länder, the activities no. 5 and 9-13 were selcted by most Länder and the activities under "other" were only mentioned by a some Länder (5).

(2020): The monitoring activities mentioned unter "other" were reported only by some of the Länder.

(2019): Some of the Länder did mention a monitoring system concerning other court activities such as statistics on the nature of resolution are kept (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.).

(2018): Some of the Länder did mention a monitoring system concerning other court activities such as statistics on the nature of resolution are kept (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.).

(2016): other: Some of the Länder did mention a monitoring system concerning other court activities such as statistics on the nature of resolution are kept (e.g. in civil cases: dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.).

(2014): In 2014, some of the Landers did mention a monitoring system concerning other court activities, namely statistics on the nature of resolution (e.g. in civil matters cases are dealt with by contentious judgment/by acknowledgement/by settlement, etc.).

(2013): In 2013, seven Landers communicated information on their regular monitoring system. For example, Baden-Württemberg refereed to calculation of the specific personnel requirements on a mathematical-analytical basis. Bavaria mentioned the type of proceedings, form of decision, etc. for courts of labour and social jurisdiction and workload, ratio of part-time employees; average age of employees, training and sick days, duration of proceedings in months, ratio of appeals for courts of general jurisdiction. In Brandenburg, the number of pending cases and the ratio of terminated proceedings as against incoming cases are monitored.

(2012): For 2010 and 2012, five Landers did not provide any reply. Seven Landers communicated detailed information on their regular monitoring system of courts' activity. Among the main other monitored parameters are the deadlines for the drafting of judgments (Bavaria), the number of pending cases and the ratio of terminated proceedings as against incoming cases (Brandenburg), the nature of resolution – cases dealt with by contentious judgment, by acknowledgment, by settlement etc. (Hamburg), cases allocated among staff, i.e. caseload quota (Hesse); finance benchmarks, item costs, standardized deployment of person hours related to product (Saxony-Anhalt).

Greece

(General Comment): According to Law 1756/1988 (art. 85), supreme judges appointed as inspectors for one year's term, redact every year general reports on the operation of each court and prosecutor's office in their district and recommend the necessary measures for the proper functioning of the service. Regarding administrative courts, this task is fulfilled by the General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts

(2019): The Greek government has introduced a new system for organizing and evaluating the planning and implementation of public sector actions and projects, which introduces among others, monitoring court activities. (L. 4622/2019 art. 49 foll.)

(2017): Regarding Administrative Courts, this task is fulfilled by the General Commission of the State for ordinary administrative courts. In the near future there will be a possibility for the General Commission of the state to use a business intelligence program, in order to extract composite statistical data without contacting any court [E-mail: g-epitropia-d-d@otenet.gr]

Hungary

(General Comment): Among others:
- individual judge's statistics, - statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- pending cases of an individual judge / court,
- the time frame of pending cases
- number of appealed cases,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2021): - statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2020): - statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2019): Other:
- statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2018): Other:
- statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases, - number of tried cases per day,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2015): Among others:
- individual judge's statistics,
- statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials,
- number of trial days in cases,
- number of tried cases per day,
- pending cases of an individual judge / court,
- the time frame of pending cases
- number of appealed cases,
- the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases,
- the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases,
- cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month
- cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2014): In 2013 and 2014, among other are quoted individual judge's statistics, statistics on the reasons of postponing trials, the number of trial days, the number of tried cases per day, the number of pending cases of an individual judge/court, the time frame of pending cases, the number of appealed cases, the subject of incoming/resolved/pending cases, the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases. Cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month, as well as cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court.

(2013): In 2013 and 2014, among other are quoted individual judge's statistics, statistics on the reasons of postponing trials, the number of trial days, the number of tried cases per day, the number of pending cases of an individual judge/court, the time frame of pending cases, the number of appealed cases, the subject of incoming/resolved/pending cases, the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases. Cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month, as well as cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court.

(2012): In 2010 and 2012, a reference is made to individual judge's statistics, statistics on the reasons of postponing trials, the number of trial days, the number of resolved cases, the number of cases scheduled within one day, the number of pending cases of an individual judge.

Ireland

(2014): 2014: Since 2014 Ireland introduced a monitoring system for the length of proceedings and it is now capable of calculating average length of proceedings in first instance jurisdictions.

Latvia

(General Comment): Implemented business intelligence solution allows to very closely monitor all the mentioned court activities.
Satisfaction of court staff and users is being evaluated by regular questionnaires in courts.

(2017): Decision stability (proportion of decisions appealed in higher instance)

(2016): Decision stability (proportion of decisions appealed in higher instance)

Lithuania

(General Comment): All of these data are recorded in the Lithuanian Court Information System (LITEKO), as well as other data, related to the case, it‘s process and the parties to the proceedings.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): No regular system has been implemented up to today. However, a monitoring can be done through the statistical service of the judiciary (SSJ) on an punctual basis and upon request of the competent authorities.

(2017): ??? (see comments to parent campaign)

(2016): No regular system has been implemented up to today. However, a monitoring can be done through the statistical service of the judiciary (SSJ) on an punctual basis and upon request by the competent authorities.

(2015): By using the newly implemented statistical tools, the information ticked in addition to last year's questionnaire can now be retrieved by the statistical service on an as needed basis at least for criminal cases. Identical markers are being implemented for civil and commercial cases and will available in a foreseeable future.

(2014): 2014: There is no regular monitoring system. However, new statistical tools are implemented and can provide monitoring elements when necessary without daily measurement current affairs.

Malta

(2019): Other: age of pending caseload

(2017): other: clerance rate

(2015): The monitoring of court activities also takes place through the ongoing analysis of the Clearance Rate and Disposition Time of the various courts. This data is also being published online on a monthly basis.
The category "other" refers to the monitoring of the Clearance Rate and Disposition Time of all civil courts, boards and tribunals. This exercise was started in 2015.

(2014): In 2014, the court administration was monitoring length of proceedings through the number of incoming and resolved cases, as well as through the pending caseload. The age of civil cases was another parameter that was being assessed.
On the occasion of the 2014 exercise, it has been indicated that since 2015, Malta started computing the Disposition Time and Clearance Rate of all the civil and criminal courts. By the end of 2015, for the civil courts, this information will be made available online.

Netherlands

(2020): There is an annual publication that includes the appeal ratio for some case types. To call it ‘monitoring’ would be a bit too much, but it is annually checked and reported on.
Incoming cases and length of proceedings have not previously been mentioned, but these are monitored.

Poland

(2017): Supervision covers only the administrative activities of the courts. There are the internal supervision exercised by the presidents of the courts and the external supervision exercised by the Minister of Justice within the narrow scope specified in the law.

(2016): Supervision covers only the administrative activities of the courts. There are the internal supervision exercised by the presidents of the courts and the external supervision exercised by the Minister of Justice within the narrow scope specified in the law.

Portugal

(2020): we included "satisfaction of users" because one of the tasks of the president judge of the court is to monitor and evaluate the activity of the court, in particular the quality of the justice service provided to citizens, taking into account particular complaints or responses to satisfaction questionnaires. "Article 94 of Law 62/2013, 26th August, on the judicial organization"

(2019): In this evaluation cycle we included "satisfaction of users" because one of the tasks of the president judge of the court is to monitor and evaluate the activity of the court, in particular the quality of the justice service provided to citizens, taking into account particular complaints or responses to satisfaction questionnaires. "Article 94 of Law 62/2013, 26th August, on the judicial organization"

(2017): Scheduling; delays of judges and sections.

(2016): Scheduling; delays of judges and sections.

(2015): Scheduling: time delays of judges and sections of the court.

Romania

(General Comment): Since 2012, the category “other” subsumes the length of administrative procedures, the number of final convictions, legal aid, suspended cases etc.

(2021): ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

(2020): ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

(2019): ECRIS - case management and STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

(2017): - e.g. suspended cases

(2016): - suspended cases etc.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): https://web.ac-mssr.sk/dashboard/

Slovenia

(General Comment): In Slovenia there is a regular monitoring system in a form of collecting data on court statistics. Court statistics are collected and published four times a year by the Ministry of Justice. They include the data on the number of judges and court staff, number of incoming, resolved and pending cases, age of unresolved cases, length of proceedings, average time to resolve a case, type of decision, court backlogs, legal remedies and time to issue a court decision.
Besides that, the data on court activities are automatically on national level, thus statistical analysis are made possible. All courts have access to a wide range of special reports, generated in the Court management information system. Reports include detailed information on court activities (for example length of specific phases of a court proceeding, top 20 oldest cases in certain area of law, etc.), human resources, court performance indicators (the critical indicators are marked red for unsatisfactory performance and green when meeting the standards) that provide guidance to presidents and directors of courts. The business intelligence system that creates priority reports derives the data from the Data warehouse of the Supreme Court. The same source is used for Court statistics publications by the Ministry of Justice. Each court is able to access the above mentioned reports at any moment, while some data are quarterly collected and published on national level (as prescribed by the Court rules).
The satisfaction surveys are performed and results published bi-annually.

(2015): The data on court activities are automatically collected on national level, thus statistical analysis is made possible.

All courts have access to a wide range of special reports, generated in the Court management information system. Reports include detailed information on court activities (e.g. length of specific phases of a court proceeding, top 20 oldest cases per legal area etc.), human resources, court performance indicators (the critical indicators are marked red for unsatisfactory performance and green when meeting the standards) that provide guidance to presidents and directors of courts. These additional data available to court management officials are the reason, why we put check before “other elements”.

The business intelligence system that creates priority reports derives the data from the Data warehouse of the Supreme Court. The same source is used for Court statistics publications by the Ministry of Justice.

Each court is able to access the above mentioned reports at any moment, while some data are quarterly collected and published on national level (as prescribed by the Court rules).

Spain

(General Comment): The category “other” encompasses: number of enforcement procedures, number of decisions appealed, number of rogatory letters issued, received and resolved, aid between courts, pending writings, form of termination of trials, etc.

(2017): The category “other” includes many other data such appeals, aid between courts, pending writings, etc.

(2016): The category “other” includes many other data such appeals, aid between courts, pending writings, enforcement proceedings, form of termination of trials, etc.

Question 077-1

Finland

(2020): Performance yes, quality no - See answer 066

Germany

(2021): While the vast majority (13) of the Länder answered "yes", a minority of 2 Länder answered "no".

Hungary

(2021): The prosecution services have recently introduced a system of performance evaluation. The system was launched in 2020, and 2021 was the first year in respect of which a full set of data was generated.

Ireland

(2018): Prosecutors adhere to Code of Ethics and Guidelines of respective professional bodies .There are file reviews and regular periodic management reports in place

Malta

(2018): The Office of the AG does keep a record of the number of incoming cases as well as those cases that can be considered as terminated from the Office because for example, a bill of indictment is issued. However no official statistics are kept.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The State Prosecutorial Council adopts the Criteria for evaluating the performance of the state prosecutor's offices on the proposal of the State Prosecutor General. The criteria define indicators and their target values for the appraisal of the work efficiency and realization of prosecution policy.

Question 078-1

Bulgaria

(2021): With the Direction of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office, issued by the Prosecutor General, the performance and quality indicators were defined, outside of the given ones, and covered the acts and actions of the public prosecutor for all types of supervision that are carried out by the Prosecutor's Office:
In criminal proceedings, including the supervision of the enforcement of penalties, the following may be added, but not exhaustively mentioned: prosecutor's acts filed with the court; terminated cases; objections against judicial acts; acts for the enforcement of sentences that have already entered into force; acts for supervision over the sentence enforcement.
Actions for resolving the competition between administrative criminal liability and criminal liability;
Within civil proceedings – claims submitted under the cases provided by the law; Within administrative proceedings – participation in trials under the cases provided by the law; Acts on the supervision of legality

(2020): With the Guidance of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office, issued by the Prosecutor General, the performance and quality indicators were defined, outside of the given ones, and covered the acts and actions of the public prosecutor for all types of supervisions that are carried out by the Prosecutor's Office:
In criminal proceedings, including the supervision of the enforcement of penalties, the following may be additionally, but not exhaustively mentioned: prosecutor's acts filed with the court; terminated cases; objections against judicial acts; acts for the enforcement of sentences that have already entered into force; acts for supervision over the sentence enforcement.
Actions for resolving the competition between administrative criminal liability and criminal liability;
Within civil proceedings – claims submitted under the cases provided by the law; Within administrative proceedings – participation in trials under the cases provided by the law; Acts on the supervision of legality

(2018): With the Guidance for the Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office, issued by the Prosecutor General, the performance and quality indicators were defined, outside of the given ones, and covered the acts and actions of the public prosecutor for all types of supervisions that are carried out by the Prosecutor's Office:
In criminal proceedings, including the supervision of the enforcement of penalties, the following may be additionally, but not exhaustively mentioned: prosecutor's acts filed with the court; terminated cases; objections against judicial acts; acts for the enforcement of sentences that have already entered into force; acts for supervision over the sentence enforcement.
Actions for resolving the competition between administrative criminal liability and criminal liability;
Within civil proceedings – claims submitted under the cases provided by the law; Within administrative proceedings – participation in trials under the cases provided by the law; Acts on the supervision of legality

Denmark

(2021): "Other": time between preliminary charge and indictment.
We do not have a performance indicator measuring length of the proceedings directly. However, we measure them indirectly, since we have performance measures on the time from a case is given to the public prosecution until the case is resolved.

(2020): We do not have performance indicators that measure length of proceedings directly. However, we measure them indirectly, since we have performance measures on the time from a case is given to the public prosecution until the case is resolved. Earlier we have interpreted this as an indirect measure of time-frames, but we have come to the conclusion that it is more correct to say, that we do not measure timeframes.

France

(2021): Source DSJ

(2020):
This data is not available.

Germany

(2021): Just over half of the Länder answered that quality indicators have been defined for backlogs, a few reported that quality indicators for statisfaction of users, costs, clearance rate, disposition time or productivity of prosecutors and staff have also been defined.

(2020): Just over half of the Länder answered that quality indicators have been defined for backlogs, a few reported that quality indicators for statisfaction of users, costs, clearance rate or disposition time have also been defined.

Greece

(2021): The number of incoming cases, number of pending cases and backlogs are refered by part of the prosecution services.

Malta

(2021): The Office of the AG (the prosecution) has started collecting case data including length of proceedings. Over the coming years (starting from next year), they will be introducing a new case management system that will enable the Office to collect more case and performance metrics.

Netherlands

(2021): More options have been checked compared to previous years. Previous years may have been incomplete. The added indicators are important as well.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The criteria for the success of the prosecution of public prosecutors determine the following indicators: the number of unresolved cases at the end of the period, clearance rate, expected solution time, time criteria for typical process actions, (from the initiative of the police to the submission of a proposal to carry out urgent investigative actions, from the receipt to the rejection of the criminal complaint, from the receipt of the criminal complaint to the submission of a request for investigation or a proposal for individual investigative actions, from the receipt of the criminal complaint (without investigation) to the filing of the indictment, from the end of the investigation or individual investigative actions until the filing of the indictment, from the receipt of the complaint to the decision of the public prosecutor on the postponed prosecution and settlement, efficiency indicator, cost-effectiveness indicator, proportions of prosecution decisions, shares of rejected complaints according to individual reasons, shares of decisions alternative to criminal prosecution, share of penal orders, share of convictions, shares of imposed criminal sanctions.

(2021): Other: percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions…

Question 073-3

Bulgaria

(General Comment): With the Direction of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, all indicators for the activity of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria are regulated, as well as the obligation of all prosecutor's offices to prepare only a statistical report for the first half of the year, as well as analytical annual reports for their activity. The Rules for Measuring the Workload of the Prosecutor's Offices and the Individual Workload of Each Prosecutor and Investigator, adopted by a Decision of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 60/11.12.2014, are applied in all prosecutor's offices, investigation departments, and in the National Investigation Service. The use of the Unified Information System of the Prosecutor's Office ensures that the data is retrieved in real-time and allows for its verification and reliability. Data on the administrative and managerial workload of the administrative heads, their deputies, and the heads of the investigation departments are also provided through the system. The ratio of the number of law enforcement acts to one administrative act at the levels of the prosecutor's offices is also taken into account. The analysis of this relation is important for the efficiency/resource ratio analysis.
Within the Prosecutor's Office's Annual Report, an analysis is made for the workload of the public prosecutor's offices and the investigative bodies and it is compared to the workload of authorities of the same type and degree.
Data on the workload of public prosecutor's offices and investigative bodies are also collected every six months.
Ordinance No. 3 of 23.02.2017 on the Indicators and Methods for Assessment and the Criteria for Reporting the Workload Degree of Prosecutors, Investigators, Administrative Heads, and Their Deputies can also be mentioned (adopted by a decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 7 of 23.02.2017, promulgated in SG 21/10.03.2017).
Workload reporting is designated to ensure fairness of the assessment in terms of the volume of actual work. (The evaluation takes into account the actual workload of the relevant judicial authority, as well as the individual workload of the assessed prosecutor, investigator, administrative head, deputy administrative head, and head of the department. The workload of the respective judicial authority is compared to the workload of the bodies of the same type and degree, and the individual workload is compared to the set-out workload norm and the workload of other prosecutors or investigators from the same body of the judiciary).

Croatia

(General Comment): According to the State Attorney's Act (Official Gazette, No. 67/18), a state attorney supervises accurate performance of all state attorney office activities in due time. A state attorney submits reports to the higher state attorney on his state attorney office performance each month and annually and reports on undertaken and planned actions in cases of special state interest or in cases with complex factual or legal issues. The General State Attorney Office submits the report on the status and trends of reported crime in the previous year, on cases related to the protection of property interests of the Republic of Croatia, legal issues in particular areas and a review of the organization and personnel in state attorney organization to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report, there can be a warning on the state and functioning of the legal system, deficiencies in the legislation and internal affairs of the state attorney's office and suggestions for improving the work.
The state attorney offices use a special information system for the management and operation of the state attorney cases, as an interactive data base in real time. Through the CTS (Case tracking system) it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of state attorney offices.

Germany

(2021): The situation has not changed in comparison with previous cycles. However, the methodology of replying to this question has changed in order to match the method used for replying to similar questions and in order to better reflect the answers provided by the Länder.
A slight majority of the Länder answered "yes", one of the Länder could not provide an answer.

Hungary

(2021): The prosecution services have recently introduced a system of performance evaluation. The system was launched in 2020, and 2021 was the first year in respect of which a full set of data was generated. The methodology described at Question 63-7 is capable of showing the changing trends of workload in respect of a particular prosecution service.

Luxembourg

(2020): The annual report covers both judges and prosecutors (report 2020, see https://justice.public.lu/fr/publications/juridictions-judiciaires/rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2020.html).

(2018): The annual report covers both judges and prosecutors.

Malta

(2020): The Office of the AG has started setting up a system to assess the performance of the prosecution service, but this is still in its initial phases and more work is being planned on it to make it more integrated.

Poland

(General Comment): Pursuant to Article 30 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office, the National Public Prosecutor, but also regional and circuit public prosecutors within the area of their activities, may order a visit to an organisational unit of the public prosecution services in order to control the performance of statutory tasks by this unit within a specified scope. Pursuant to § 77 item 1 of the Ordinance of the Minister of Justice - Rules of Procedure of the universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services, visitation and inspection shall be carried out as appropriate, in particular when there are signals of significant irregularities in the activities of a given body. Visitations should be carried out at least every 5 years.
2. An inspection may be carried out to check the correctness of practices in selected sections of the operation or when there is a need to investigate the causes of shortcomings in the operation or irregularities in the operation of the given body.
3 Visitation and inspection includes:
1) the control of the performance of the statutory tasks by the bodies, and in particular the examination of the correctness of the activities undertaken and the level of work;
2) assessing the performance of proffessional duties by prosecutors and administration staff and their professional qualifications and work culture;
3) an assessment of the way in which the body is managed, the organisation of work and the division of tasks.
4) In the course of visitations and inspections, instructions shall be given as necessary to improve the operation of the audited bodies and to help solve current problems.
Conclusions from the visitations and inspections of public prosecutor's offices are considered by the regional prosecutor's office board [kolegium prokuratury regionalnej] (Article 49 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office).

Slovenia

(General Comment): The quantitative indicators are defined in the Criteria for evaluating the performance of the state prosecutor's offices adopted by the State Prosecutorial Council. General guidelines for the work of state prosecutors and priority fields of prosecution are defined in a Prosecution Policy by prosecutor general. Heads of offices implement both criteria in their Annual Work Program. Twice a year the prosecutor general, the State Prosecutorial Council and the Minister discuss the performance of state prosecutor's offices at joint meetings held with the heads of state prosecutor's offices and adopt and/or coordinate the measures required for implementation of annual work programmes. An evaluation of attained goals set in the adopted Annual Work Programme, Criteria and Prosecution Policy are an integral part of Annual Report of each prosecution office. The prosecutor general compiles Joint Annual Report on the work of the whole state prosecutor offices. The Minister and State Prosecutorial Council may submit their opinion to this report.

Question 073-4

Austria

(2021): Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (more frequent); periodic check lists (annual); Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)

(2020): Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases (more frequent)
Periodic check lists (annual)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)

(2018): Operational Information System (Sta-BIS) annually
Periodic check lists (on October 1st of every year)
Internal audit examination all 4 to 7 years (less frequent)
Monthly statistics about incoming and closed cases ("Kurzstatistik") (more frequent)

Belgium

(2021): By means of monthly statistics on the number of processed cases (general prosecution offices).
On the basis of bi-monthly dashboards (public F75 offices).
Quarterly at the Attorney General's meetings with the King prosecutors and the labour auditors.

(2020): "More frequent :
- by means of monthly statistics on the number of cases handled (general prosecutors' offices)
- on the basis of bi-monthly dashboards (public prosecutors' offices)
- quarterly at the meetings of the public prosecutor with the public prosecutors and the labour auditors".

Bulgaria

(2021): The answer here is both "Annual" and "More frequent".

(2020): The answer here is both "Annual" and "More frequent" With the Direction of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria, all indicators for the activity of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria are regulated, as well as the obligation of all prosecutor's offices to prepare only a statistical report for the first half of the year, as well as analytical annual reports for their activity. The Rules for Measuring the Workload of the Prosecutor's Offices and the Individual Workload of Each Prosecutor and Investigator, adopted by a Decision of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 60/11.12.2014, are applied in all prosecutor's offices, investigation departments and in the National Investigation Service. The use of the Unified Information System of the Prosecutor's Office ensures that the data is retrieved in real time and allows for its verification and reliability. Data on the administrative and managerial workload of the administrative heads, their deputies and the heads of the investigation departments is also provided through the system. The ratio of the number of law enforcement acts to one administrative act at the levels of the prosecutor's offices is also taken into account. The analysis of this relation is important for the efficiency/resource ratio analysis.
Within the Prosecutor's Office's Annual Report, an analysis is made for the workload of the public prosecutor's offices and the investigative bodies and it is compared to the workload of authorities of the same type and degree.
Data on the workload of public prosecutor's offices and investigative bodies is also collected every six months.
Ordinance No. 3 of 23.02.2017 on the Indicators and Methods for Assessment and the Criteria for Reporting the Workload Degree of Prosecutors, Investigators, Administrative Heads and Their Deputies can also be mentioned (adopted by a decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 7 of 23.02.2017, promulgated in SG 21/10.03.2017).
Workload reporting is designated to ensure fairness of the assessment in terms of the volume of actual work. (The evaluation takes into account the actual workload of the relevant judicial authority, as well as the individual workload of the assessed prosecutor, investigator, administrative head, deputy administrative head and head of department. The workload of the respective judicial authority is compared to the workload of the bodies of the same type and degree, and the individual workload is compared to the set out workload norm and the workload of other prosecutors or investigators from the same body of the judiciary).

Croatia

(2018): According to the State Attorney's Act (Official Gazette, number 76/09, 153/09, 116/10, 145/10, 57/11, 130/11, 72/13, 148/13, 33/15, 82/15), a state attorney supervises accurate performance of all state attorney office activities in due time. A state attorney submits reports to the higher state attorney on his state attorney office performance each month and annually and reports on undertaken and planned actions in cases of special state interest or in cases with complex factual or legal issues. The General State Attorney Office submits the report on the status and trends of reported crime in the previous year, on cases related to the protection of property interests of the Republic of Croatia, legal issues in particular areas and a review of the organization and personnel in state attorney organization to the Croatian Parliament, once a year, at the latest by the 30 April for the previous year. In this yearly report, there can be a warning on the state and functioning of the legal system, deficiencies in the legislation and internal affairs of the state attorney's office and suggestions for improving the work.
The state attorney offices use special information systems for the management and operation of the state attorney cases, as an interactive data base in real time. Through the CTS (Case tracking system) it is possible to regularly monitor and evaluate the activity, performance and output of state attorney offices.

Denmark

(2021): Monthly, quarterly and yearly.

(2020): Monthly

(2018): Monthly

Finland

(2021): Biannually. The prosecution services are evaluated twice a year.

(2020): Biannually. The prosecution services are evaluated twice a year.

(2018): When necessary.

France

(2021): source DSJ

Germany

(2021): Among the Länder who answered "yes", frequencies are rather inconsistent. A slight majority of those Länder answered "more frequently" (quarterly reports)

Italy

(2020): Quarterly

(2018): Quarterly

Latvia

(2020): In accordance with the order of the Prosecutor General, a monthly report is prepared on the results of the public prosecutor's work in pre-trial criminal proceedings and the results of the work, which are not related to the progress of pre-trial criminal proceedings.

(2018): Monthly reports on the results of the public prosecutor's work in pre-trial criminal proceedings and the results of work which are not related to the conduct of pre-trial criminal proceedings shall be drawn up in accordance with the order of the Prosecutor General.

Lithuania

(2021): Chief prosecutorsof the departments of the prosecutor's offices are regularly provided with monthly data based on basic indicators of the performance of public prosecution offices, every 3 months - with the larger scale of performance data.

(2020): Chief prosecutors of the departments of the prosecutor’s offices are regularly provided with monthly data based on basic indicators of the performance of public prosecution offices, every 3 months – with the larger scale of performance data.

(2018): Every 6 months.

Netherlands

(2021): Along with the monthly and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.

(2020): Along with the monthly reports and quarterly reports, there are annual reports which are more thorough and elaborate.

Poland

(2021): In 2021, following the implementation of the new central ICT system PROK-SYS, managers of organisational units at all levels gained access to daily updated reports (Micorsoft POWER BI technology), which enable the ongoing monitoring of the work of the units, in particular concerning such data as the receipt of cases or the number of cases handled. There is no need for a subordinate unit to prepare data, as this data is visible by the higher level unit. Prosecutors in charge of a higher-level prosecution unit supervise proceedings in lower-level prosecution offices , so it is necessary to have detailed information on ongoing proceedings.

(2020): Once a month, the head of the organizational unit of the prosecutor's office shall submit to his or her superior prosecutor a report containing the number of incoming cases and the number of cases disposed of .

(2018): Once a month a head of the organisational unit of the public prosecution service presents to their superior public prosecutor a report which contains a number of incoming cases and number of resolved cases.

Slovenia

(2020): See general comment.

(2018): The quantitative indicators are defined in the Criteria for evaluating the performance of the state prosecutor’s offices adopted by the State Prosecutorial Council. General guidelines for the work of state prosecutors and priority fields of prosecution are defined in a Prosecution Policy by prosecutor general. Heads of offices implement both criteria in their Annual Work Program. Twice a year the prosecutor general, the State Prosecutorial Council and the Minister discuss the performance of state prosecutor’s offices at joint meetings held with the heads of state prosecutor’s offices and adopt and/or coordinate the measures required for implementation of annual work programmes. An evaluation of attained goals set in the adopted Annual Work Programme, Criteria and Prosecution Policy are an integral part of Annual Report of each prosecution office. The prosecutor general compiles Joint Annual Report on the work of the whole state prosecutor offices. The Minister and State Prosecutorial Council may submit their opinion to this report.

Question 073-5

Belgium

(General Comment): Comment on Q73-5:
Evaluation used at local level (public prosecutor's offices, labour auditorates, general public prosecutor's offices).

Bulgaria

(2020): The implementation of optimization within the Prosecutor's Office is in view of the data on the volume of prosecutorial activity, the workload of prosecutors, as well as the territorial scope and specifics of the region served by the respective prosecutor's office. Decisions on this optimization are made by the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC)on the basis of information periodically provided by the prosecution. On the basis of an analysis of the above indicators, the staff for the respective prosecutor's office is determined (in case of need for increase or reduction of staff, resp. in case of transfer of a full-time position from one to another prosecutor's office). The answer to questions 73-5 and 73-6 for 2020 takes into account the process of optimization of the court card started on 01.01.2019, as the Prosecutor's Office started the transformation of district prosecutor's offices into territorial divisions to district prosecutor's offices in the regional centers. Out of a total of 113 district prosecutor's offices at the end of 2018 - 11 were transformed into territorial departments from 01.01.2019, 28 were transformed into territorial departments from 01.01.12020, and as of January 1, 2021 another 38 district prosecutor's offices have been transformed into territorial divisions. The data on the workload and a set of other indicators were used for decision-making by the SJC for the indicated consolidation.

Cyprus

(2021): This is part of the reform that is underway in the A-G Office.

Germany

(2021): Four Länder could not provide an answer. Half of the remaining Länder answered "yes" while the other half answered "no". All of the Länder who selected "yes" reported to use the evaluation for reallocating resources and most also use it for reengenineering of internal proceedures.

Luxembourg

(2020):
The annual report covers both judges and prosecutors (report 2020, see https://justice.public.lu/fr/publications/juridictions-judiciaires/rapports-juridictions-judiciaires-2020.html).

(2018): The annual report covers both judges and prosecutors.

Question 073-6

Belgium

(2021): There is an evaluation at local level (public prosecutor's offices, labour auditorates, general public prosecutor's offices).

(2020): "comments for question 73-5:
Evaluation used at the local level (public prosecutor's offices, labor auditorates, general prosecutor's offices)"

Finland

(2021): The Office of the Prosecutor General is responsible for the use and distribution of the appropriations of the independent and autonomous Prosecution Authority to the prosecution districts. The prosecution Authority reports on its operations twice a year to the Ministry of Justice (financial statements and half-yearly reports). In addition, the Office of the Prosecutor General monitors the activities of all prosecution districts on a monthly basis, including e.g. the number of criminal cases and their decision-making times. These have an impact on the equal distribution of resources between the prosecution districts.

France

(2021): Source DSJ

(2020): No additional information is available.

Hungary

(2021): Leaders of the prosecution service use the results for determining the exact demands for human resources.

Malta

(2018): The workload of the Office of the AG is used for the recruitment of additional human resources.

Netherlands

(General Comment): In 2019, the system Directing and Funding (Besturen en Bekostigen) was formally introduced. This system introduced more measurements and questions about allocation. Also in 2019, an internal budget allocation model was introduced for allocation of resources between parts of the public prosecution.

(2021): Every year, the amount of money is defined. The public prosecutors get a fixed amount and an amount of resources based on the amount of cases they have dealt with.

(2020): In 2019, the system Directing and Funding (Besturen en Bekostigen) was formally introduced. This system introduced more measurements and questions about allocation. Also in 2019 an internal budget allocation model was introduced for allocation of resources between parts of the public prosecution.

(2018): Each three years, the amount of money is defined. The public prosecutors got a fixed amount and an amount of resources based on the amount of cases they dealt with.

Poland

(2021): With regard to the reallocation of resources and the reconstruction of internal structures to improve efficiency, the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2022, item 1247, as amended) provides for several possibilities for the aforementioned changes, with a view to the rational use of the prosecutor's staff and also taking into account the dynamics of the staffing and ratification situations. Such changes include:
- delegation,
- abolition of a position, - assignment of a position to another prosecution service organisational unit, - conversion of a prosecutor's position into an assessor's position or an assessor's position into a prosecutor's position, - transfer of a prosecutor to another official position.

Slovenia

(General Comment): Based on the data and analysis from the previous paragraph, the joint annual report shall contain: (1) Measures for improving the efficiency, performance and economy of work and implementation of the prosecution policy for particular and for all state prosecutor’s offices together; (2) Measures for improving the efficiency of state prosecutor’s offices whose results deviate considerably from the planned ones; (3) Assessment of suitability of the number of state prosecutor posts and state prosecutor personnel and other conditions including the appropriate proposals for their improvement.

(2018): Based on the data and analysis from the previous paragraph, the joint annual report shall contain: -Measures for improving the efficiency, performance and economy of work and implementation of the prosecution policy for particular and for all state prosecutor’s offices together; -Measures for improving the efficiency of state prosecutor’s offices whose results deviate considerably from the planned ones; -Assessment of suitability of the number of state prosecutor posts and state prosecutor personnel and other conditions including the appropriate proposals for their improvement.

Question 070-1

Bulgaria

(General Comment): With the Direction of Organization of the Information Activities at the Prosecutor’s Office, issued by the Prosecutor General, the performance and quality indicators were defined, outside of the given ones, and covered the acts and actions of the public prosecutor for all types of supervisions that are carried out by the Prosecutor’s Office:
In criminal proceedings, including the supervision of the enforcement of penalties, the following may be additionally, but not exhaustively mentioned: prosecutor’s acts filed with the court; terminated cases; objections against judicial acts; acts for the enforcement of sentences that have already entered into force; acts for supervision over the sentence enforcement.
Actions for resolving the competition between administrative criminal liability and criminal liability;
Within civil proceedings – claims submitted under the cases provided by the law; Within administrative proceedings – participation in trials under the cases provided by the law; Acts on the supervision of legality.

(2018): "Other": percentage of returned cases

Denmark

(2021): The prosecution makes quarterly reports to the Ministry of Justice on data regarding number of cases, percentage of conviction etc.
Disposition time is measured indirectly through a report that measures all steps in a criminal case from arrest to imprisonment. There is no direct measure of disposition time, but it can be read from this report. The prosecution makes a biannual survey on the satisfaction of the prosecution staff.

(2020): The methodology of replying changed in this question.
The prosecution makes quarterly reports to the Ministry of Justice on data regarding number of cases, clearance rate, etc. Disposition time is measured indirectly through a report that measures all steps in a criminal case from arrest to imprisonment. There is no direct measure of disposition time, but it can be read from this report. Therefore we find it more correct to check this option. Satisfaction of the prosecution staff has always been measured but not by the ministry of justice. Therefore it was not checked last time. However, it is measured, and we therefore find it correct to check this option. The prosecution makes an annual survey on the satisfaction of the prosecution staff.

Finland

(2021): "Backlogs": cases that have been pending for longer than a year are monitored

(2020): "Backlogs": cases that have been pending for longer than a year are monitored.

France

(2021): Source DSJ

(2020): Judicial jurisdiction.

Germany

(2021): The monitoring activities no. 1-5 and 1-12 were selected by most Länder, the activity no. 9 (monitoring of costs) was selected by some (5) Länder.

(2020): A few Länder answered that they have also been monitoring productivity and costs.

Hungary

(2021): The BTM system (Criminal Justice Activity Indicator System) is available for the Prosecution Service of Hungary. This system requlary monitors prosecution activities (performance and quality), however, it does not contain any information about the number of incoming cases, length of proceedings, number of resolved cases, backlogs etc.

Ireland

(2020): information is published in Annual Report available at: https://www.dppireland.ie/app/uploads/2020/10/AR-2019-eng.pdf

(2018): Information is published in Annual Report available at https://www.dppireland.ie/filestore/documents/AR2017_[eng].pdf

Malta

(2021): The Attorney General is collecting data on length of proceedings and using it to monitor efficiency. This exercise will be refined in the coming months within the scope of an ongoing project addressing the re-engineering of processes within the Office of the AG.

(2018): The Office of the AG does hold a record of the number of incoming cases and terminated cases, but these are not as yet organised into official performance indictaors.

Poland

(2021): In 2021, following the implementation of the new central ICT system PROK-SYS, which provides for a modern reporting system, the possibility of obtaining data on a wide range of activities of all organisational units of the prosecution offices was created. The system provides a solution for generating types of reports on the costs of proceedings. This allows for daily supervision of the activities of the prosecution offices from every level, including the central level. Prior to 2021, data on the costs of proceedings were only collected locally.

Portugal

(2020): We included “clearance rate” and “disposition time” because one of the tasks of the public prosecutor coordinator is to monitor and evaluate the activity of the public prosecutors services, including the efficiency of procedures. Article 101 of Law 62/2013, 26th August on judicial organization.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The BI tools that use data gathered in information system of the State Prosecutor's Office provide the heads of prosecution offices with up-to-date overview of the performance of state prosecutors and the functioning of the office. Heads can customize the level and content of information presented to them for the purpose of making quantitative data supported decisions on allocation of work among prosecutors, control of the case-flow.

(2020): "Other": percentage of different types of decisions, value of proceeds of crime under freezing order, pronounced criminal sanctions…

Question 071

Belgium

(2016): There are ad hoc evaluation systems within the courts. But there is no central or coordinated system.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The duration of the court proceedings initiated by the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Bulgaria is monitored, as in case of excessive delay there is a possibility to request acceleration of these proceedings through the procedure under Chapter 26 of the PPC.

Denmark

(2021): Danish Court Admininistration is typically not doing this. A responsible court follow their cases though.

(2020): Danish Court Administration is not doing it as a general thing. If a specific court needs help, Danish Court Administration can work out list of pending cases and list them according to age to give the court a tool to locate cases that need attention.

France

(2021): Source DSJ and Council of State

(2020): No further indication.

(2016): In civil matters, courts of first instance (TGI), labour courts (conseils de prud'hommes) and courts of appeal can measure their stock on the basis of business applications or data returns carried out by info-centers.
The identification of cases not processed within a reasonable time is easier through business applications that offer dashboards breaking down cases in stock by age group.
In criminal matters, first instance courts (TGI) can use the Cassiopée business application to record cases in stock at the registry and the number of unedited judgments. The situation of cases in stock at the registry office cannot be measured via the info-centre, which only allows establishing the number of cases registered with the Public Prosecutor's Office and the Correctional Service.

Germany

(2021): Four of the Länder could not provide an answer. The remaining Länder monitor pending cases and backlogs for all of the case categories mentioned above.

(2020): The majority, but not all of the Länder have reported to monitor pending cases and backlogs.

(2018): In 2018, Länder have monitored the number of pending cases and the backlogs.

Hungary

(General Comment): Judges have to report those cases on a monthly basis that are pending for more than 2 years. The president of the court can
order a fast-track procedure for a case based on the report.

(2018): Judges have to report those cases on a monthly basis that are pending for more than 2 years. The president of the court can order a fast-track procedure for a case based on the report.

Ireland

(2020): NAP

(2018): NAP

(2016): NAP

Latvia

(2018): We have created a specific tool for this purpose that is available also in public from https://dati.gov.lv/

Luxembourg

(2018): New systems of monitoring have been implemented since 2016 (JUCIV for the civil law cases and JANGA for administrative law cases)

(2016): No regular system has been implemented up to today. However, a monitoring can be done through the statistical service of the judiciary (SSJ) on an punctual basis and upon request by the competent authorities.

Netherlands

(2021): Public prosecution only monitors criminal law cases, the courts monitor all.

Romania

(2021): STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

(2020): STATIS - statistics monitoring application including for court's efficiency assessment

Question 072

Austria

(2016): Supreme administrative Court: Statistic of incoming cases, number of decisions delivered, number of postpones cases, length of proceedings (timeframes) and age of cases

Belgium

(2021): Public Prosecutor's Office: Monitoring mechanism via dashboards for the public prosecution services.

(2020): Monitoring mechanism via dashboards for prosecution services.

Denmark

(2021): Danish Court Admininistration is typically not doing this. A responsible court follow their cases though. The individual courts may work out list of pending cases or worning lists when to act on a case.

(2020): Danish Court Admininistration is typically not doing this. A responsible court follow their cases though.

(2018): We monitor the overall time from the courts receive a case until it is finalized, but not what happen in between. The same goes for the prosecution

Finland

(2021): Within the courts, the time the case is pending in a court is monitored.
Prosecution services: The time between police investigation and prosecutor’s decision (the time the case is pending in the prosecution service) is monitored.

(2020): Within the courts, the time the case is pending in a court is monitored.

(2018): Within the courts, the time the case is pending in a court is monitored.

France

(2021): Source DSJ, the reply concerns the civil and criminal justice.

(2020): Answer for the court.

Germany

(2021): Courts: One of the Länder reported that waiting times are monitored with respect to ordinary courts.
Public Prosecution: While the majority of the Länder answered "no", a small minority of 3 Länder answered "yes".

Greece

(General Comment): The waiting time during court procedures is monitored annually through the inspection process.The interval between the adjudication of the case and the issuance of the decision is watched, so that the judge does not have much pending and there is a quick delivery of justice.

(2018): There is a monitoring system regarding the length of the judicial procedure, but it does not include such kind of information.

(2016): There is a monitoring system regarding the length of the judicial procedure, but it does not include such kind of information.

Hungary

(General Comment): The administrative office of the court reports those cases to the president in which there was no judicial activity in the last 30 days.

(2018): The administrative office of the court reports those cases to the president in which there was no judicial activity in the last 30 days.

Italy

(2018): Waiting time is monitored only for Administrative Justice.

Lithuania

(2020): courts: through administrative supervision mechanism

Luxembourg

(2014): According to 2014 data, the newly set up statistical tools, as well as the courts' CMS, allow an "as needed" check of the waiting time.

Malta

(2016): In Malta, there is no formal monitoring system. However, an "informal" monitoring used to take place. It falls mostly within the remit of the Chief Justice and the respective members of the judiciary.

Netherlands

(General Comment): Waiting time can be monitored through registration in the court system.
Agreements are made across the justice chain on timeframes in which particular caseloads (sexual offences, youth cases, and specific traffic violations) should be handled. These agreements are monitored.
Government (the Second Chamber) is annually informed on the agreements via factsheet. Additionally, timeframe agreements were reached within the public prosecution on the speed with which penal orders are to be issued, the terms in which an objection is to be judged and the speed with which the first decision with attachment is to be taken.

(2020): Within the courts: Registration in the court system gives the opportunity to monitor waiting time.
Within the public prosecution services: Across the justice chain, agreements have been made on the timeframes in which particular caseloads (sexual offences, youth cases and specific traffic violations) should be handled. These agreements are monitored. Annually, the government (Second Chamber) is informed on this via the factsheet 'Strafrechtketen'. Besides this, timeframe-agreements have been reached within the public prosecution on speed with which penal orders are to be issued, terms in which an objection is to be judged and the speed with which the first decision with attachment is to be taken (eerste beslissing bij beslag).

(2013): All steps and dates are recorded in information systems of the court. But this registration does not show 'waiting times' as such.

Poland

(General Comment): Public Prosecution services
The issue of the duration of pre-trial proceedings is defined in the Code of Criminal Procedure, in Article 310 § 1 and § 2 and Article 325i § 1. Article 310 § 1 and § 2 states that the investigation shall be completed within 3 months. In justified cases the investigation period may be extended by a specified period of time by the public prosecutor supervising the investigation or the public prosecutor directly superior to the public prosecutor leading the investigation, but not longer than one year. In particularly justified cases a competent public prosecutor superior to the prosecutor supervising or leading the investigation may extend the investigation by a specified period of time.
Article 325i § 1 states that an investigation should be completed within 2 months. The prosecutor may extend this period to 3 months, and in particularly justified cases – to a longer specified period of time.
The authority empowered to order the extension of an investigation or an inquiry by a specified period of time shall monitor such proceedings with respect to their proper conduct in view of their possible length and shall assess the validity of the procedural steps taken or to be taken.
The request for the extension of an investigation or an inquiry must include the steps that need to be taken in the further course of the proceedings and indicate the reasons why they have not yet been taken.
Courts:
The presidents of the courts, in exercising internal administrative supervision over the administrative activity of the courts, control the taking of actions by judges within appropriate time limits; direct control is also exercised by the presidents of the divisions. Monitored also within the framework of management control and analysis of annual information on activities of courts operating within the area of appellate courts prepared by presidents of courts of appeal

(2021): * courts -The presidents of the courts, exercising internal administrative supervision over the administrative activity of the courts, control the taking of actions by the judges in due time; direct control is also exercised by the presidents of the divisions. Monitoring also takes place within the framework of the external administrative supervision of the Minister of Justice over the administrative activity of common courts within the framework of management control and analysis of annual information on the activity of courts operating on the territory of courts of appeal prepared by presidents of courts of appeal.
*prosecutors - In the course of pre-trial proceedings, the public prosecutor commissioning other bodies to carry out procedural actions or appointing experts to prepare an opinion shall each time set a deadline for their implementation. If the entrusted activities are not carried out in time, the prosecutor makes an enquiry as to the reasons for the delay and the deadline for carrying out the activities. The course of pre-trial proceedings is monitored both in terms of internal service supervision and external service supervision, in order to ensure their proper dynamics.
At the trial stage, if a hearing is postponed without a date being set, the prosecutor's office makes timely enquiries as to whether the reasons preventing it from being scheduled have ceased.

(2018): In the mode of external and internal administrative supervision over the administrative activity of courts by analyzing the results of the courts or departments and monitoring the efficiency of individual cases in the case of detected lengthiness.

Portugal

(General Comment): Through SITAF and CITIUS (case management systems for administrative and tax courts and judicial courts, respectevly) it is possible to check waiting times during judicial proceedings.
The Portuguese Code of Criminal Procedure establishes no binding timeframes for criminal investigations. At a national level, within the public prosecution services, there is only monitoring of the judicial proceedings time during on criminal investigations, with reference to this timeframe.
At a local level, some other proceedings (such as the initial intervention of public prosecutors on protection of adults with some incapacity, requesting accompanying measures – under the legal framework of the accompanied adult [Regime Jurídico do Maior Acompanhado]) are also monitored on time duration.

(2021): Because of the Covid-19 pandemic, the courts were asked for specific elements on the steps taken in the Courts. Also, the procedural laws (e.g. civil and criminal) provides that the registry shall send to the President of the Court, on a monthly base, information detailing the cases in which three months have elapsed since the expiration of the deadline set for the performance of the judge's own act.

(2018): Through SITAF and CITIUS (case management systems) it is possible to check waiting times during judicial proceedings.

Romania

(2021): There are statistical reports developed by an IT application called Statis that monitor the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc.

(2020): There are statistical reports developed by an IT application called Statis that monitor the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc.

(2018): There are statistical reports developed by an IT application called Statis that monitor the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc.

(2016): There are statistical reports developed by an IT application called Statis that monitor the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc.

(2014): According to 2014 data, there are statistical reports developed by Statis IT application monitoring the duration of a court trial on different levels - total time, preliminary proceedings, delays between the sessions, time for drafting the decision etc. More precisely, in 2014, the Superior Council of Magistracy has established a working group that has analyzed several national and international documents on the efficiency of the courts and has developed a set of indicators that are used to make an overall assessment of the efficiency of courts, sections and, if needed panels of judges. These indicators were implemented and used in the Statis application.

Slovenia

(General Comment): In accordance with the Prosecution Policy adopted in 2017, cases in which a final court decision at first instance has not been adopted within 3 years of filing a written charge with the court, are monitored in particular.

Question 077

Bulgaria

(2017): incoming cases; duration of proceedings /deadlines/; completed cases; pending cases; result of appealed and protested cases.

Czech Republic

(2016): The answer should be YES - there are performance indicators such as number of cases that the judge should resolve within a month, but these are not so strictly binding.

Denmark

(General Comment): The data is collected for all parts of the judicial system, eg. Police, Public prosecution, courts and the prison system. The data is used to measure the performance of the individual agencies/administrations, but also - and perhaps most importantly - to measure the interplay between these.

(2017): We have for a number of categories of cases defined that a certain percentage of cases should be solved within a certain time span. It varies for the different categories of cases.

(2016): In terms of productivity figures, weighted cases and target attainments.

Finland

(2019): Statistics Finland no longer collects statistical data regarding the functioning of the courts and the judiciary. The Ministry of
Justice/National Courts Administration collects data and publishes the annual operational statistics, please see for example Courts statistics 2019 (in Finnish): http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-259-912-4

Germany

(2021): While the vast majority (13) of the Länder answered "yes", a minority of 2 Länder answered "no".

Greece

(2017): N/A

Ireland

(2021): N/A

(2017): Waiting times for proceedings categories in the various jurisdictions are recorded and published in the Courts Service Annual Report.

Italy

(General Comment): The performance of each court is given by different indicators such as the clearance rate, the variation of backlogs and the age of the proceeding.

Latvia

(2014): First standards of time periods for adjudication of matters were submitted to the Board of Justice in 2014.

Malta

(2017): Despite the on-going monitoring and evaluation of the court activities and performance, we do not have defined target indicators against which to monitor performance. In general terms, we seek to ensure that the performance of the courts improves in efficiency year after year, and we try to address various aspects of the system in order to facilitate this improvement.

(2016): Currently Malta carries out systematic quantitative analysis of the performance of the different courts, based on international standards. We are also addressing measures of quality as defined by recognised international institutions, supplemented by internal reports that are purposely commissioned to focus on specific aspects of the functioning of the justice system. These ongoing efforts at measuring the efficiency and quality of our justice system is compared with past performance, but as yet, not with established targets.
Malta does not have defined 'targets' but assesses its performance in terms of indicators defined by international institutions

Slovak Republic

(2020): The main performance and quality indicators that have been defined for courts and used in the selfevaluation reports of some
pilot courts involved Number of appeals as well. The selfevaluation reports of the courts were not repeated with the data 2019. The other indicators are used and made public in dashboards and statistical reports. The number of the appeals is published but not as a indicator of quality, only as a statistical number.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The Annual work programme (see Q75) consists of the assessment of the expected number of incoming cases, timeframes for typical procedural acts and solving cases and the plan of operating results. The latter includes the expected number of resolved cases and criteria of efficiency (resolved cases to staff ratio), effectiveness (expected time to resolution) and economy (budgetary funds to solved cases ratio) (the Courts Act, art. 71.b).
The number of complaints is monitored as a performance indicator, however it is not directly considered as a measure of quality of work.
The data on satisfaction of court staff and users is collected bi-anually by the Supreme court and is taken into account by the Judicial Council when deciding on the nomination of court presidents. Consequently, the results of the aforementioned surveys have been included in the opinion of the President of the Supreme Court on the candidacy of court presidents, as well as on the data on work of courts for the purpose of assesment of judicial service for court presidents.

Spain

(General Comment): The statistic report that the Court sends every three months to the Inspection Service, and the reports and studies that the General Council for the Judiciary carry out with the information provided, serve to measure and control the burden of work of the Judges, Letrados de la Administración de Justicia, and Courts in general.
On the other hand, the “Citizens’ bill of rights before the law” is the document approved by the Parliament at 2002 that includes the list of rights of the citizen in their relation with the administration of justice, and the principles and good practices that must guide the service of the Justice to the citizens. It sets the principles of transparency, appropriate attention and information, gives special care and attention to the citizens who are most vulnerable (victims of crime, gender violence, minors, and other). The document is compulsory for all the professionals involved in Justice. According to this Bill of rights, the Parliament, through the Committee for Justice, will carry out a follow-up monitoring and continuous evaluation of the evolution of, and compliance with this Bill. The annual report submitted by the Council for the Judiciary to the Parliament will include a specific and sufficiently detailed reference to the claims, complaints, and suggestions made by citizens about the running of the Administration of Justice.
In addition to that, during the beginning of the implementation of the judicial offices (2010), a map of procedures and a quality management system with own indicators for this kind of offices were implemented. The model has been under review and is expected to be reviewed on the basis of electronic processing.
Finally, the hierarchical structure of the Letrados de la Administración de Justicia allow the Ministry of Justice control and ensure the compliance of standards and parameters of quality fixed, and achieve the new objectives fixed for the implementation of new measures (such the digitalization of Justice or the implementation of electronic tools right now).

(2017): On September 6 2018, the Ministry of Justice has announced a project to develop a quality plan to improve the administrative management of all the judicial offices in the territory over its competence.
In a second phase, the Ministry will apply the Evaluation, Learning and Improvement Model (EVAM) designed by the Ministry of Territorial Policy and Public Function, a model of excellence for organizations that begin their process towards the management of quality.
The culminating element of the process of implementation of quality management will be the certification of the level of excellence according to a model yet to be determined.

Question 078

Belgium

(2021): The operational work reports provide the above-mentioned indicators. However, qualitative data are not available for all types of courts. The statistics are based on data extracted from the different computer applications used by the registries of the courts and tribunals and calculated by means of counting rules validated by experts.

Croatia

(2019): As regards "number of appeals", from 2019 we are able to get this data from our case management system.

(2014): On the occasion of the 2014 evaluation, it has been explained that the productivity as a performance and quality indicator, applies only to judges (not court staff).

Denmark

(2021): "Other": Number of weighted cases

(2019): Backlogs is qualified by showing the average age of pending cases to the district courts.

Estonia

(2014): In 2014, the number of old cases has been considered among the main performance and quality indicators that have been defined. In 2012, this was not an official policy. In 2014, according to the decree adopted by the Minister of Justice, any case that has been pending for longer than two years is considered as an “old case”.

Finland

(2021): Performance yes, quality no - See answer 066

(2020): Statistics Finland (until 2013) or Ministry of Justice (until 2019) no longer collect statistical data regarding the functioning of the courts and the judiciary. From 2020 onward the National Courts Administration collects data and publishes the annual operational statistics.

(2018): Statistics Finland no longer collects statistical data regarding the functioning of the courts and the judiciary. The Ministry of Justice collects data and publishes the annual operational statistics, pleaase see for example Courts statistics 2018 (in Finnish): http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-259-745-8

France

(2021): Source DSJ and CE

(2020): No comment.

(2019): Replies from both the Directorate of Civil and Criminal Services (Direction des services judiciaires) and the Supreme Administrative Court (Conseil d’Etat) on civil, criminal and administrative justice.

(2018): The coverage rate of cases as well as the structure of civil or criminal litigation are used by the courts.
In addition, other indicators usefully complete the analysis: .
Share of decisions on the merits in completed cases (civil activity).
Share of referrals in completed cases (civil activity).
Theoretical time to sell off the stock.
Average age of the stock.
Percentage of cases over 12 months in stock (civil activity).

(2014): In 2014, the category "others" refers to the civil and criminal cassation rate for judicial justice and the annulment rate for administrative justice. Among the main performance indicators of these jurisdictions, are the rate and the time of enforcement of sentences, the criminal response rate, the use of ADR rate, the dismissal of national criminal record rate, the number of dematerialised exchanges for judicial jurisdictions. Regarding the administrative jurisdictions, there is an anticipated average time for the judgement of cases and the proportion of pending cases for more than 2 years.
Concerning the enforcement of criminal decisions, it has been decided to make a performance indicator out of it in 2014, but the available statistical tools make it impossible to produce it.

Germany

(2021): Scarcely half of the Länder answered that quality indicators have been defined for backlogs, a few reported that quality indicators for costs, number of appeals, appeal ratio, clearance rate, disposition time or productivity of judges and court staff have also been defined.

(2020): Scarcely half of the Länder answered that quality indicators have been defined for backlogs, a few reported that quality indicators for costs, number of appeals, appeal ratio, clearance rate or disposition time have also been defined.

Greece

(2021): The internal Regulation of each court determine a number of cases assigned to each judge and, in accordance with the law, the judge normally has to deliver his decision within eight months of the hearing, otherwise he is considered to be unduly delayed.(General Commission of ordinary and administrative courts).
- Depending on the procedure (e.g. n. 4412/2016 as in force, Article 372, procurement procedure).
- The rules of the Council of State provide for deadlines for holding a conference, for delivery of a draft decision and publication of a decision.
- The regulations of the administrative courts provide for a minimum number of charging cases for judges.(Counsil of State)
The number of incoming cases, number of pending cases and backlogs are refered by part of the Courts.

(2019): The Greek government has introduced a new system for organizing and evaluating the planning and implementation of public sector actions and projects, which envisages, among other things, the preparation of action plans that include various performance indicators. (L. 4622/2019 art. 49 foll.)

Hungary

(General Comment): Measuring the satisfaction of court users has been introduced in 2014.

(2021): Among others: individual judge’s statistics; statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials; number of trial days in cases;
number of cases heard per day; pending cases of an individual judge / court; the time frame of pending cases; number of appealed cases;the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases; the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases; cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month; cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2020): Among others: individual judge’s statistics; statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials; number of trial days in cases;
number of cases heard per day; pending cases of an individual judge / court; the time frame of pending cases; number of appealed cases;the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases; the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases; cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month; cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2019): Among others: individual judge's statistics; statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials; number of trial days in cases;
number of cases heard per day; pending cases of an individual judge / court; the time frame of pending cases; number of appealed cases; the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases; the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases; cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month; cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

(2018): Among others: individual judge's statistics; statistics on the reasons of the postpone of the trials; number of trial days in cases; number of cases heard per day; pending cases of an individual judge / court; the time frame of pending cases; number of appealed cases; the subject of incoming / finished / pending cases; the ratio of litigious and non-litigious cases; cases that are pending over 2 or 5 years have a separated statistical report every month; cases in which there were no actions taken in the last 30 days by the court have a separated statistical report every month

Latvia

(2021): We have overestimated the "costs of the judicial procedures" indicator. In our opinion, this indicator describes the accessibility of the court, not so much the activities and quality of the courts. Therefore, this indicator is not noted in this assessment.

(2020): The indicators "productivity of judges and court staff" and "number of appeals" are taken into account when assessing the professional activity of a judge, because the objective of the assessment of the professional activities of a judge is to promote the continuous professional growth of a judge throughout his or her career, thereby improving the quality of the work of the judge and the court. An Annual evaluation of court staff is also carried out, which is essential for high-quality work of courts.

(2019): All of these indicators can and are used to evaluate different aspects of court work from efficiency, quality and stability to decision of filling out a vacancy.
First four modalities are included in the report that courts have to prepare for the Judiciary Council before the end of January.

(2018): All of these indicators can and are used to evaluate different aspects of court work from efficiency, quality and stability to decision of filling out a vacancy.
First four modalities are included in the report that courts have to prepare for the Judiciary Council before the end of January.

(2014): According to the Law on Judicial Power as amended in 2014, the chief judge of a court, in cooperation with court judges, determines prior to the beginning of each calendar year targets in relation to the average length of court proceedings.

The standard in terms of length of proceedings is determined, taking into account the court resources and the necessity to ensure the right of a person to have his/her matter adjudicated within a reasonable time period and in compliance with other basic principles guaranteeing the right to a fair trial. A chief judge of a court must approve the standard of time periods and supervise the actual time periods of examining matters in a court.
The guidelines approved by the Judicial Council are used to establish standards of time periods for adjudication of matters.

Malta

(2020): Other: age of pending cases

(2019): Other: age of pending caseload

Netherlands

(2021): Satisfaction is recorded, but there are no immediate consequences for courts if satisfaction is low.

(2020): Satisfaction is monitored, but courts are not necessarily judged for that.

Poland

(2021): workload of judges and registrars

Romania

(2021): e.g. suspended cases

(2020): - e.g. suspended cases

(2019): e.g. Suspended cases

(2018): - e.g. suspended cases

Slovak Republic

(2019): The main performance and quality indicators that have been defined for courts and used in the selfevaluation reports of some pilot courts involved Number of appeals as well. The selfevaluation reports of the courts were not repeated with the data 2019. The other indicators are used and made public in dashboards and statistical reports. The number of the appeals is published but not as a indicator of quality, only as a statistical number.

Slovenia

(2021): In 2021, the Judicial Council started taking into account the results of the statisfaction surveys of court staff and court users (performed bi-anually by the Supreme court) when deciding on the nomination of court presidents. Consequently, the results of the aforementioned surveys have been included in the opinion of the President of the Supreme Court on the candidacy of court presidents, as well as on the data on work of courts for the purpose of assesment of judicial service for court presidents. We consider that the aforementioned decision of the Judicial Council is the legal ground to include the satisfaction suveys amongst defined indicators.

(2014): According to 2014 data, the Annual work programme established by court presidents consists of the assessment of the expected number of incoming cases, timeframes for typical procedural acts and solving the cases and the plan of operating results. The latter includes the expected number of resolved cases and criteria of efficiency (resolved cases to staff ratio), effectiveness (expected time to resolution) and economy (budgetary funds to solved cases ratio). The number of complaints is monitored as a performance indicator, however it is not directly considered as a measure of quality of work.

(2012): According to 2012 data, the Judicial Council has monitored performance of courts mainly through indicators such as incoming, closed and pending cases and backlogs, productivity of judges and court staff. With the development of justice administration the attention has shifted towards indicators prescribed by the Courts Act to draft a yearly plan of operating results: criterion of efficiency – number of closed cases, divided with the number of judges and non-judge staff; criterion of effectiveness – timeframes of proceedings; criterion of economy – budget, divided with the number of closed cases.

Spain

(2014): Judicial counsellors of each court fill a questionnaire every six months in which the personal performance is evaluated with data regarding the following: number of definitive rulings, number of cost proceedings appraisals, number of payments made to the parties, number of court fees managed and communicated to the Tax Authority, number of communications issued to the Land and Business Registries and number of seizures.

(2013): For 2014, the category “other” refers to the number of enforcement procedures, appealed decisions, rogatory letters issued, received and resolved.

Question 083-2

Denmark

(General Comment): There is a productivity target for the prosecution as a whole, but not for each public prosecutor.

France

(2021): source DSJ

Germany

(2021): The vast majority of the Länder selected "no", 2 of the Länder answered "yes".

Hungary

(2021): For the time being, no performance targets are in place, but the development of such targets is in progress.

Ireland

(General Comment): Prosecutors in our directing division are allocated a specific number of files per week. Decisions must be issued within a designated time frame and this is monitored by our case management system

(2021): Prosecutors in our directing division are allocated a specific number of files per week. Decisions must be issued within a designated time frame and this is monitored by our case management system

(2018): Work is demand led by number of files submitted by external investigating agencies

Latvia

(General Comment): The prosecutor provides a monthly report on the statistical indicators of his or her work. In addition, the statistical indicators of the individual work of the public prosecutor (statistical indicators for the monitoring of the investigation, prosecution, maintenance of the State prosecution and other functions of the public prosecutor) are also analysed during the process of assessing the professional activities of prosecutors (not less than once every five years).

Lithuania

(2018): The quantitative performance targets are defined for the Prosecutor General’s Office and 5 regional Prosecutor’s Offices, but not for individual public prosecutors.

Luxembourg

(2018): NAP

Netherlands

(General Comment): There is no national policy on targets for every prosecutor. An office could choose to set targets for their prosecutors (see next question), but these may vary across offices.

(2020): There is no national policy on targets for every prosecutor. An office (parket) could choose to set targets for their prosecutors (see next question), but this may vary across offices.

Portugal

(General Comment): Yes for some District Prosecution's Office and No at a national level. At national level, only reference values are fixed for the purpose of placing prosecutors. Also at a national level, the fact that a prosecutor has finished more proceedings than those that he/she started is a general criterion of evaluation and compliance with general objectives, in the qualitative individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work.

Slovenia

(General Comment): State Prosecutorial Council adopts Criteria for the assessment of state prosecutors' performance which define quality and quantity indicators. The quantitative criteria define expected time for the resolution of cases and for typical procedural acts. The performance of the evaluated prosecutor is compared to other prosecutors at his/her office concerning the number of assigned, resolved and unresolved cases, number of attendances at the court hearings, conviction rate, pronounced sanctions and number of logged appeals.

Question 083-3

Austria

(2018): There are no specific targets given to public prosecutors.

Belgium

(2021): To underline the consistency between Q 83-2 and Q 83-3: these are not quantitative targets.

Croatia

(General Comment): According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18) , the Minister in charge for Justice, upon the proposal of Prosecutor General, adopts the Framework criteria for the work of public prosecutors (Deputy State Attorneys).

(2020): According to the State Attorney Office Act (Official Gazette No. 67/18) , the Minister in charge for Justice, upon the proposal of Prosecutor General, adopts the Framework criteria for the work of public prosecutors (Deputy State Attorneys).

(2018): According to the State Attorney's Act, the Minister of Justice, upon the proposal of Prosecutor General, adopts the Framework criteria for the work of public prosecutors.

Germany

(2021): There are no quantitative performance targets for each public prosecutor. The 2 Länder that have quatitative performance targets answered, that the prosecutor General is responsible for setting these targets.

(2020): There are no quantitative performance targets for each public prosecutor

Lithuania

(2018): The quantitative performance targets are defined for the Prosecutor's Offices, but not for individual public prosecutors.

Luxembourg

(2018): NAP

Malta

(2018): NA

Poland

(2020): Individual goals are set by prosecutors themselves in a way that enables them to carry out their duties effectively

Portugal

(2020): The local hierarchically superior public prosecutor can set individual targets for each public prosecutor.
The High Council of the Public Prosecution Service only sets reference values for the purpose of placing prosecutors and establishing how many prosecutors are needed for a particular Public Prosecution Office.

Slovenia

(General Comment): State Prosecutorial Council adopts the Criteria for the assessment of state prosecutors' performance on the proposal of the state prosecutor general.

Spain

(General Comment): In accordance with Royal Decree 432/2004, of March 12, which regulates the variable complement by objectives of the members of the Prosecution service, the State Attorney General, at the proposal of the Prosecution Inspection, after hearing the Prosecutor Council and prior the report from the Ministry of Justice, will determine for each annual period the objectives whose fulfillment will lead to the perception of the variable remuneration.

Question 120

Belgium

(General Comment): This is the evaluation system of the "ordre judiciaire" (excluding administrative courts).

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The assessment is carried out in compliance with the Judicial System Act and Ordinance No. 3/23.02.2017 on the Indicators and Methods for Assessment and the Criteria for Reporting the Workload Degree of Prosecutors, Investigators, Administrative Heads and Their Deputies (adopted by a decision of the Plenum of the Supreme Judicial Council under Protocol No. 7/23.02.2017, promulgated in SG 21/10.03.2017). The Prosecutor’s Office of the Republic of Bulgaria has established an order for its implementation and for the retrieval and provision of data on prosecutors and investigators in accordance with validated performance indicators.

Denmark

(2020): Public prosecutors go through intensive education for the first three years of them being recruited and this evaluation is structured centrally with HR at the Attorney Generals office. During that period they are individually being assessed through exams and through working with mentors. Thus they are continuously being assessed both centrally through exams as well as locally through the daily work that the mentor sees. Later in the career the assessment is not structured in such a way but all through their career the prosecutors are evaluated through their daily work and how they perform in court.

France

(2021): source DSJ

Germany

(2021): The vast majority of the Länder answered "yes", 3 answered "no".

Greece

(General Comment): The court and prosecution offices Inspection and the Inspection of judges and prosecutors is being carried out by a Council and Inspection bodies, staffed by judicial officers. Inspectors draw up a separate, detailed and substantiated report for each judge of their court district. This report evaluates: the moral quality, vigor and character, scientific qualifications, judicial judgment and perception, diligence, hardworking and service (qualitative and quantitative) performance, Justice administration, wording of court decisions and procedure management capacity and concerning Prosecutors, the capacity to administer justice, both in the pre-litigation procedure and hearing, as well as their oral speech capacity, the judges' behavior in general and in the audience, as well as his social status. The inspector shall also indicate in the report whether s/he considers as eligible for promotion, the Judges of First Instance and the Deputy Prosecutors of First Instance who have completed five years of service in their grade, as well as the judges and prosecutors from the rank of the Judge President to the Court of First Instance and Prosecutor of First Instance and above, after the completion of one year in their grade. Inspectors' reports shall be submitted to the Chairman of the Council of Inspectors within two months from the end of their term of office. In the event of an extraordinary or additional inspection, the report shall be submitted immediately after it has been carried out. A copy of each report shall be submitted by the Chairman of the Inspection Council to the Minister of Justice and, as the case may be, to the President and the Prosecutor of the Supreme Court, the President of the Council of State, the President of the Court of Auditors and the Auditor General of the Court of Auditors and the General Commissioner of the General Commission of the State. A copy of the inspection report shall be placed on the individual file of the inspected person. Another copy is being handed over to the inspected person by the competent department of the Ministry of Justice.

Hungary

(General Comment): The evaluation system is defined by Articles 50-52 of the Act on the Legal Status of Prosecutors. The purpose is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's activities, his/her skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. Prosecutors, with the exception of the Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutor General, are assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first appointment, while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of 3 years following the appointment, and thereafter every 8 years. Prosecutors need not be assessed during the 6 years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age. A prosecutor shall also be assessed if: requested by the prosecutor; circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor's professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment; in the extraordinary proceeding to be completed without delay, s/he fails to meet the deadline extended by the superior prosecutor. The assessment is the duty of the person exercising the employer's rights. The official work of prosecutors assigned to the Ministry is evaluated by the Minister responsible for justice in accordance with the rules applicable to government officials. As a result, prosecutors may be awarded the following grades: excellent, suitable for promotion; excellent and fully eligible; eligible; eligible, subsequent assessment required; ineligible. In the event of an ineligible grade, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If the prosecutor is awarded a grade "eligible, subsequent assessment required", the person exercising the employer's rights identifies the deficiencies and irregularities and states the main criteria of the desired changes which shall be reviewed prior to the next assessment (within 2 years). A prosecutor shall be awarded an ineligible grade upon the next assessment if he/she fails to obtain an eligible grade. S/he may request a court of law to quash any erroneous or untrue finding.

Ireland

(General Comment): In addition to reporting directly to their line managers in relation to their work as prosecutors, they are required to participate in the Office-and-Public-Service-wide process of Performance Management and Development conducted during each year on an individual basis between Management and Staff.

Italy

(General Comment): The assessment procedure applies to both judges and public prosecutors. Every four years, the High Judicial Council (CSM) conducts a professional appraisal based on the professional skills of judges/prosecutors. The professional status of both judges and prosecutors is organized into 7 different levels. Several criteria are taken into consideration: independence, impartiality, balance, professional capacity, hardworkingness, diligence and commitment. The assessment is based on a number of acts and documents that describe all the professional aspects of the magistrate to be evaluated. The most significant are: • a "self report" where the magistrate illustrates all the elements that he/she believes are necessary or useful to be considered for the purpose of his/her appraisal; • a random sample of acts and documents produced by the magistrate during the evaluation period; • an "informative report" prepared by a superior of the magistrate; • the statistics concerning activity of the magistrate: the number of provisions drafted, the processing times of the proceedings, the time for filing the documents (even in comparison with the other magistrates of the office); • scientific publications, if any; • reports from the lawyers' council, if any.

Netherlands

(General Comment): The public prosecution has a team Judicial Quality at the General Office that studies the quality of the criminal proceedings of the public prosecution. As part of these studies and assessments, a pool of prosecutors has been compiled, and they study the work of other public prosecutors. This is an assessment of an office, not of individual prosecutors. The results of these studies are used for quality enhancement trajectories. The studies are repeated periodically.

(2020): The public prosecution has a team Judical Quality at the General Office (Parket Generaal) that studies the quality of the criminal proceedings of the public prosecution. As part of these studies and assessments, a pool of prosecutors has been compiled, and they study the work of other public prosecutors. The results of these studies are used for quality enhancement trajectories. The studies are repeated periodically.

Portugal

(General Comment): According to articles 141 and 143 of the Statute of the Public Prosecution Service, as a rule, a first assessment takes place three years after the beginning of the functions as a public prosecutor, then after four years and then every five years.
If a prosecutor has twice the maximum grade, he/she may be waived of the next assessment.
After the period of long-term leave, the public prosecutor is subject to a new inspection, one year after the resumption of functions

Slovenia

(General Comment): Qualitative indicators are professional knowledge, capability of logical and analytical deliberation, protection of the reputation of prosecutor's office and his/her function and the proficiency of verbal and written communication.

Spain

(2021): SOURCES: Royal Decree 432/2004, of March 12, which regulates the variable complement by objectives of the members of the Prosecution service.
Agreement of November 29, 2018, of the Plenary of the General Council of the Judiciary, by which Regulation 2/2018 is approved, regulating the remuneration regime Judicial caree

Question 120-1

Cyprus

(2021): the assessment is carried out by the AG the Deputy AG and the head of Department as part of their annual evaluation

Czech Republic

(2018): The individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work take place at least once every two years.

Denmark

(General Comment): Public prosecutors go through intensive education for the first three years of them being recruited and this evaluation is structured centrally with HR at the Attorney General's office. During that period, they are individually being assessed through exams and through working with mentors. Thus, they are continuously being assessed both centrally through exams as well as locally through the daily work that the mentor sees. Later in the career the assessment is not structured in such a way but all through their career the prosecutors are evaluated through their daily work and how they perform in court.

(2021): More frequent during the first three years of their career. Less frequent after that.

(2020): See response to 120: More frequent during the first three years of their career. Less frequent after that.

France

(2021): source DSJ

Hungary

(2021): Under Section 50 (1) of Act on Prosecutors, prosecutors shall be assessed on a regular basis, with the exception of the Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutors General.
In case of the first appointment, which is for a definite term, the prosecutor shall be assessed by the end of that term. In case of appointment to prosecutor for an indefinite term, the prosecutor shall be assessed within 3 years following the appointment; then the assessment shall be carried out every 8 years.
Prosecutors are do not need to be assessed within the period of six years before reaching retirement age.
Besides the above, prosecutors shall be assessed if they request so, provided that at least 2 years have elapsed since the last assessment, or in the occurrence of any circumstance which suggests professional inadequacy, or which necessitates the amendment of the results of the last assessment. The assessment procedure involves examination of case files, as set out in Sections 13A to 13F of the Prosecutor General's Order No. 4/2012.

(2018): The evaluation system is defined by Articles 50-52 of the Act on the Legal Status of Prosecutors. The purpose is to assess the quality of the prosecutor's activities, his/her skills, abilities and character traits with an impact thereon and to facilitate professional development. Prosecutors, with the exception of the Prosecutor General and the Deputy Prosecutor General, are assessed before the expiry of the fixed term of the first appointment, while in the case of a first appointment for an indefinite term, before the expiry of a period of 3 years following the appointment, and thereafter every 8 years. Prosecutors need not be assessed during the 6 years preceding the completion of the applicable old-age pension age. A prosecutor shall also be assessed if: requested by the prosecutor; circumstances have emerged that indicate the prosecutor's professional ineligibility or the necessity to alter the evaluation of the previous assessment; in the extraordinary proceeding to be completed without delay, s/he fails to meet the deadline extended by the superior prosecutor. The assessment is the duty of the person exercising the employer's rights. The official work of prosecutors assigned to the Ministry is evaluated by the Minister responsible for justice in accordance with the rules applicable to government officials. As a result, prosecutors may be awarded the following grades: excellent, suitable for promotion; excellent and fully eligible; eligible; eligible, subsequent assessment required; ineligible. In the event of an ineligible grade, the prosecutor shall be called upon to resign his/her office within thirty days. If the prosecutor is awarded a grade "eligible, subsequent assessment required", the person exercising the employer's rights identifies the deficiencies and irregularities and states the main criteria of the desired changes which shall be reviewed prior to the next assessment (within 2 years). A prosecutor shall be awarded an ineligible grade upon the next assessment if he/she fails to obtain an eligible grade. S/he may request a court of law to quash any erroneous or untrue finding.

Ireland

(2021): Performance Management System

(2018): Prosecutors working in-house are required to participate in Public service wide Performance Management and Development System (PMDS).

Latvia

(General Comment): The assessment of the professional activities of prosecutors have been commenced and is operational from 1 January 2014, within which, as for judges, the professional activities of prosecutors are assessed on a regular basis (not less than once every five years).

(2020): Not less than once every five years

Lithuania

(General Comment): According to Article 33 of the Law on Prosecution Service, evaluation of prosecutor's individual performance, qualification and suitability is carried out by the Attestation Commission. Performance of a prosecutor who has received a positive evaluation after his/her internship, is thereafter evaluated every five years during the regular evaluation of the service. The extraordinary evaluation can be carried out by decision of the Prosecutor General: at the request of the public prosecutor him/herself, if at least half a year has passed since his/her last evaluation; in the case the prosecutor is applying for a higher position, or to the same or an equivalent post after the expiry of the term of appointment; if three years have passed since the last evaluation of his/her service; if the prosecutor's performance has repeatedly been deficient, giving rise to reasonable doubts as to his/her suitability for the position in question.

Malta

(2021): The work of public prosecutors is constantly monitored by the Deputy AG and the AG herself. The monitoring is not scheduled at specific annual intervals but it is ingrained in the daily work processes in the Office.

(2020): The work of public prosecutors is constantly monitored by the Deputy AG and the AG herself. The monitoring is not scheduled at specific annual intervals but it is ingrained in the daily work processes in the Office.

(2018): Thework of public prosecutors is constantly monitored by the Deputy Attorney General (in charge of the criminal field) and the Attorney General. The monitoring is not scheduled at specific annual intervals, but is ongoing and ingrained in the daily work processes of the Office.

Netherlands

(General Comment): A regular cycle of individual assessments exists, based on certain competencies a public prosecutor should possess. The extent to which the public prosecutor possesses these competencies is assessed in performance and assessment reviews. Furthermore, each prosecutor has to obtain a certificaty implying they are 'fit for trial', that they have the necessary skills to represent the public prosecution at trial.

Romania

(General Comment): According to the provisions of art. 39 of the Law no. 303/2004, amended and republished in 2018, judges and prosecutors are being periodically evaluated under the observance of the professional and performance criteria. The evaluation shall envisage the quality of their activity, efficiency, integrity as well as the fulfilment of the obligation to take part in in-service professional training and on managerial activity for those judges and prosecutors in leadership positions. The periodical evaluation shall be first carried out by the end of the first 2 years of activity after the entering in profession and shall be continued every 3/4/5 years depending on the seniority in profession (5-10 years, 10-15 years, over 15 years of seniority).

(2020): According to the provisions of art. 39 of the Law no. 303/2004, amended and republished in 2018, judges and prosecutors are being periodically evaluated under the observance of the professional and performance criteria. The evaluation shall envisage the quality of their activity, efficiency, integrity as well as the fulfillment of the obligation to take part in in-service professional training and on managerial activity for those judges and prosecutors in leadership positions. The periodical evaluation shall be first carried out by the end of the first 2 years of activity after the entering in profession and shall be continued every 3/4/5 years depending on the seniority in profession (5-10 years, 10-15 years, over 15 years of seniority).

(2018): similar to judges, see Q114, 114.1 and the additional comments

Slovenia

(General Comment): Regular individual assessment of the public prosecutors' work is carried out every three years. The assessment can also be carried out on demand of the State Prosecutorial Council, head of prosecutor's office, Minister or the prosecutor himself. In first three years after the appointment for the state prosecutor the assessment is carried out every single year.

(2018): Every three years

Indicator 2: The judicial organisation

Table 2.1a Number of courts in 2021 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of all courts as geographic locations) (Q42, Q43 and Q44)

States	Legal entities								Geographic locations	
	Total (1+2)	General jurisdiction				Specialised courts				
		Total (1)	1st instance	2nd instance	3rd instance	Total (2)	1st instance	Higher instance	All courts	1st instance
Austria	152	133	128	4	1	19	18	1	164	158
Belgium	230	207	201	5	1	23	23	1	225	218
Bulgaria	182	147	113	33	1	35	32	3	182	145
Croatia	67	51	33	17	1	16	14	2	143	120
Cyprus	31	12	11	NAP	1	19	19	NAP	31	30
Czech Republic	98	97	86	10	1	1	NAP	1	107	89
Denmark	29	27	24	2	1	2	2	NAP	29	26
Estonia	9	7	4	2	1	2	2	NAP	20	17
Finland	36	26	20	5	1	10	9	1	52	45
France	1 063	206	168	37	1	857	848	9	715	661
Germany	1 092	778	753	24	1	314	245	69	1 092	998
Greece	279	279	259	19	1	NA	NA	NA	320	289
Hungary	139	139	113	25	1	0	NAP	NAP	139	113
Ireland	7	5	3	1	1	2	2	NAP	95	93
Italy	811	552	525	26	1	259	236	23	844	773
Latvia	18	15	9	5	1	3	2	1	53	46
Lithuania	22	19	12	6	1	3	2	1	62	59
Luxembourg	13	7	5	1	1	6	3	3	8	3
Malta	16	8	4	4	NAP	8	7	1	4	3
Netherlands	19	16	11	4	1	3	2	1	43	34
Poland	402	376	364	11	1	26	23	3	494	433
Portugal	591	151	145	5	1	440	437	3	328	319
Romania	242	233	175	57	1	9	8	1	242	182
Slovak Republic	65	63	54	8	1	2	1	1	65	55
Slovenia	66	60	55	4	1	6	5	1	76	70
Spain	4 164	2 556	2 313	240	3	1 608	1 549	59	700	621
Sweden	94	55	48	6	1	39	31	8	99	84
Average	368	231	209	22	1	143	147	9	235	211
Median	94	63	55	6	1	10	12	1	107	93
Minimum	7	5	3	1	1	0	1	1	4	3
Maximum	4 164	2 556	2 313	240	3	1 608	1 549	69	1 092	998
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	7%	19%	0%	0%

Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

Belgium: Starting from 2020, a new methodology of presentation of data is used as to the distinction between 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction and 1st instance specialised courts

Cyprus: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country.

Luxembourg: The methodology of presentation of data concerning 1st instance specialised courts was improved in 2020

Malta: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country.

Table 2.1b Number of courts per 100 000 inhabitants in 2021 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and number of all courts as geographic locations) (Q42, Q43 and Q44)

States	Legal entities								Geographic locations	
		General jurisdiction				Specialised courts				
	Total (1+2)	Total (1)	1st instance	2nd instance	3rd instance	Total (2)	1st instance	Higher instance	All courts	1st instance
Austria	1,69	1,48	1,43	0,04	0,01	0,21	0,20	0,01	1,83	1,76
Belgium	1,99	1,79	1,74	0,04	0,01	0,20	0,20	0,01	1,94	1,88
Bulgaria	2,66	2,15	1,65	0,48	0,01	0,51	0,47	0,04	2,66	2,12
Croatia	1,73	1,32	0,85	0,44	0,03	0,41	0,36	0,05	3,69	3,10
Cyprus	3,43	1,33	1,22	NAP	0,11	2,10	2,10	NAP	3,43	3,32
Czech Republic	0,93	0,92	0,82	0,10	0,01	0,01	NAP	0,01	1,02	0,85
Denmark	0,49	0,46	0,41	0,03	0,02	0,03	0,03	NAP	0,49	0,44
Estonia	0,68	0,53	0,30	0,15	0,08	0,15	0,15	NAP	1,50	1,28
Finland	0,65	0,47	0,36	0,09	0,02	0,18	0,16	0,02	0,94	0,81
France	1,57	0,30	0,25	0,05	0,00	1,27	1,25	0,01	1,06	0,98
Germany	1,31	0,93	0,90	0,03	0,00	0,38	0,29	0,08	1,31	1,20
Greece	2,61	2,61	2,43	0,18	0,01	NA	NA	NA	3,00	2,71
Hungary	1,43	1,43	1,17	0,26	0,01	0,00	NAP	NAP	1,43	1,17
Ireland	0,14	0,10	0,06	0,02	0,02	0,04	0,04	NAP	1,85	1,82
Italy	1,37	0,94	0,89	0,04	0,00	0,44	0,40	0,04	1,43	1,31
Latvia	0,96	0,80	0,48	0,27	0,05	0,16	0,11	0,05	2,83	2,45
Lithuania	0,78	0,68	0,43	0,21	0,04	0,11	0,07	0,04	2,21	2,10
Luxembourg	2,01	1,08	0,77	0,15	0,15	0,93	0,46	0,46	1,24	0,46
Malta	3,10	1,55	0,78	0,78	NAP	1,55	1,36	0,19	0,78	0,58
Netherlands	0,11	0,09	0,06	0,02	0,01	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,25	0,19
Poland	1,06	0,99	0,96	0,03	0,00	0,07	0,06	0,01	1,30	1,14
Portugal	5,71	1,46	1,40	0,05	0,01	4,25	4,22	0,03	3,17	3,08
Romania	1,27	1,22	0,92	0,30	0,01	0,05	0,04	0,01	1,27	0,96
Slovak Republic	1,20	1,16	0,99	0,15	0,02	0,04	0,02	0,02	1,20	1,01
Slovenia	3,13	2,85	2,61	0,19	0,05	0,28	0,24	0,05	3,61	3,32
Spain	8,78	5,39	4,88	0,51	0,01	3,39	3,27	0,12	1,48	1,31
Sweden	0,90	0,53	0,46	0,06	0,01	0,37	0,30	0,08	0,95	0,80
Average	1,91	1,28	1,08	0,18	0,03	0,66	0,66	0,06	1,77	1,56
Median	1,37	1,08	0,89	0,12	0,01	0,21	0,22	0,04	1,43	1,28
Minimum	0,11	0,09	0,06	0,02	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,25	0,19
Maximum	8,78	5,39	4,88	0,78	0,15	4,25	4,22	0,46	3,69	3,32
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	7%	19%	0%	0%

Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

Belgium: Starting from 2020, a new methodology of presentation of data is used as to the distinction between 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction and 1st instance specialised courts

Cyprus: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country

Luxembourg: The methodology of presentation of data concerning 1st instance specialised courts was improved in 2020

Malta: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country

Table 2.2a Number of first instance courts from 2012 to 2021 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and first instance courts as geographic locations) (Q42, Q43 and Q44)

States	Total number of first instance courts (legal entities) in 2021 (1) + (2)	First instance courts of general jurisdiction (legal entities)										Specialised first instance courts (legal entities)										First instance courts as geographic locations	
		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021 (1)	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021 (2)	2020	2021
Austria	**146**	154	132	129	129	129	129	128	128	128	**128**	7	7	19	19	19	19	18	18	18	**18**	158	158
Belgium	**224**	27	27	13	13	13	13	13	13	201	**201**	262	262	225	225	225	200	200	200	23	**23**	218	218
Bulgaria	**145**	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	**113**	34	34	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	**32**	145	145
Croatia	**47**	67	65	65	22	22	22	22	30	30	**33**	74	74	74	36	36	36	36	17	17	**14**	120	120
Cyprus	**30**	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	**11**	14	13	13	15	15	15	15	16	16	**19**	22	30
Czech Republic	**86**	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	**86**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	89	89
Denmark	**26**	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	**24**	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	**2**	26	26
Estonia	**6**	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	**4**	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	**2**	17	17
Finland	**29**	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	20	20	**20**	11	11	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	**9**	45	45
France	**1 016**	778	783	786	786	786	786	168	168	168	**168**	1 156	1 089	1 094	1 094	1 086	1 086	1 463	1 186	851	**848**	618	661
Germany	**998**	765	765	761	754	761	753	753	753	753	**753**	250	248	247	247	247	246	245	245	245	**245**	998	998
Greece	**259**	402	NA	298	298	289	289	289	289	259	**259**	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	289	289
Hungary	**113**	131	131	111	111	111	112	113	113	113	**113**	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	0	NAP	113	113
Ireland	**5**	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**3**	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	**2**	93	93
Italy	**761**	1 231	643	510	510	510	534	531	527	525	**525**	116	116	245	245	245	245	237	237	236	**236**	773	773
Latvia	**11**	34	34	34	28	28	25	9	9	9	**9**	1	1	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	**2**	47	46
Lithuania	**14**	59	54	54	54	54	54	17	17	17	**12**	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	2	**2**	59	59
Luxembourg	**8**	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	**5**	13	23	-	2	13	13	13	13	3	**3**	3	3
Malta	**11**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	**4**	7	7	7	7	7	8	9	9	7	**7**	2	3
Netherlands	**13**	19	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	**11**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**2**	33	34
Poland	**387**	287	-	287	-	363	363	363	363	364	**364**	26	-	26	-	26	25	25	25	23	**23**	433	433
Portugal	**582**	231	231	292	292	292	150	150	145	145	**145**	102	102	248	248	245	411	411	435	436	**437**	319	319
Romania	**183**	233	233	233	232	233	233	233	233	175	**175**	10	10	10	9	9	9	9	9	8	**8**	182	182
Slovak Republic	**55**	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	**54**	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	1	**1**	55	55
Slovenia	**60**	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	**55**	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	**5**	70	70
Spain	**3 862**	2 349	-	2 224	2 224	2 223	2 282	2 269	2 317	2 298	**2 313**	1 459	-	1 443	1 432	1 434	1 451	1 465	1 493	1 531	**1 549**	617	621
Sweden	**79**	60	60	60	60	60	60	48	48	48	**48**	12	12	12	12	10	10	31	31	31	**31**	84	84
Average	**339**	267	148	231	227	232	229	204	205	208	**209**	144	89	156	153	148	154	170	161	140	**147**	208	211
Median	**79**	60	55	60	55	55	55	54	54	55	**55**	12	11	13	11	13	13	15	16	9	**12**	93	93
Minimum	**5**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	**3**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	**1**	2	3
Maximum	**3 862**	2 349	783	2 224	2 224	2 223	2 282	2 269	2 317	2 298	**2 313**	1 459	1 089	1 443	1 432	1 434	1 451	1 465	1 493	1 531	**1 549**	998	998
Nb of values	**27**	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	27	25	26	26	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	27	27
% of NA	**0%**	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	**4%**	0%	0%
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	**7%**	0%	0%

Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

Belgium: Starting from 2020, a new methodology of presentation of data is used as to the distinction between 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction and 1st instance specialised courts

Italy: Before 2014 only courts financed by Ministry of justice were included

Latvia: Different presentation of number of specialised courts in 2015. In reality there is one administrative court with 5 court houses

Luxembourg: The methodology of presentation of data concerning 1st instance specialised courts was improved in 2020

Slovak Republic: Starting from 2020, the number of administrative courts is excluded from the count of specialised courts, since they are part of general courts of appeal

Table 2.2b Number of first instance courts per 100 000 inhabitants from 2012 to 2021 (general jurisdiction and specialised courts as legal entities and first instance courts as geographic locations) (Q1, Q42, Q43 and Q44)

States	Total number of first instance courts (legal entities) in 2021 (1) + (2)	First instance courts of general jurisdiction (legal entities)										Specialised first instance courts (legal entities)										First instance courts as geographic locations	
		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021 (1)	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021 (2)	2020	2021
Austria	**1,63**	1,82	1,56	1,50	1,48	1,48	1,47	1,45	1,44	1,43	**1,43**	0,08	0,08	0,22	0,22	0,22	0,22	0,20	0,20	0,20	**0,20**	1,77	**1,76**
Belgium	**1,94**	0,24	0,24	0,12	0,12	0,11	0,11	0,11	0,11	1,74	**1,74**	2,35	2,35	2,01	2,00	1,99	1,76	1,75	1,75	0,20	**0,20**	1,89	**1,88**
Bulgaria	**2,12**	1,55	1,56	1,57	1,58	1,59	1,60	1,61	1,63	1,63	**1,65**	0,47	0,47	0,44	0,45	0,45	0,45	0,46	0,46	0,46	**0,47**	2,10	**2,12**
Croatia	**1,21**	1,57	1,53	1,54	0,52	0,53	0,54	0,54	0,74	0,74	**0,85**	1,74	1,74	1,75	0,86	0,87	0,88	0,88	0,42	0,42	**0,36**	2,97	**3,10**
Cyprus	**3,32**	0,69	0,70	0,70	0,71	0,71	0,70	0,69	0,68	0,67	**1,22**	1,62	1,52	1,52	1,77	1,77	1,75	1,71	1,80	1,79	**2,10**	2,46	**3,32**
Czech Republic	**0,82**	0,82	0,82	0,82	0,81	0,81	0,81	0,81	0,81	0,80	**0,82**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	0,83	**0,85**
Denmark	**0,44**	0,43	0,43	0,42	0,42	0,42	0,42	0,41	0,41	0,41	**0,41**	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	0,03	**0,03**	0,45	**0,44**
Estonia	**0,45**	0,31	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	**0,30**	0,16	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,15	0,15	**0,15**	1,28	**1,28**
Finland	**0,52**	0,50	0,50	0,49	0,49	0,49	0,49	0,49	0,36	0,36	**0,36**	0,20	0,20	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	0,16	**0,16**	0,81	**0,81**
France	**1,50**	1,19	1,19	1,19	1,18	1,17	1,17	0,25	0,25	0,25	**0,25**	1,76	1,65	1,65	1,64	1,62	1,62	2,18	1,77	1,26	**1,25**	0,92	**0,98**
Germany	**1,20**	0,95	0,95	0,94	0,92	0,93	0,91	0,91	0,91	0,91	**0,90**	0,31	0,31	0,31	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,30	0,29	0,29	**0,29**	1,20	**1,20**
Greece	**2,43**	3,63	NA	2,75	2,74	2,68	2,68	2,69	2,69	2,42	**2,43**	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	2,70	**2,71**
Hungary	**1,17**	1,32	1,33	1,13	1,13	1,13	1,13	1,18	1,16	1,14	**1,17**	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,21	0,20	0,00	**NAP**	1,14	**1,17**
Ireland	**0,10**	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	**0,06**	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	0,04	**0,04**	1,87	**1,82**
Italy	**1,29**	2,06	1,08	0,84	0,84	0,84	0,88	0,88	0,87	0,89	**0,89**	0,19	0,19	0,40	0,40	0,40	0,41	0,39	0,39	0,40	**0,40**	1,30	**1,31**
Latvia	**0,59**	1,66	1,68	1,70	1,42	1,42	1,28	0,47	0,47	0,48	**0,48**	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,25	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	**0,11**	2,48	**2,45**
Lithuania	**0,50**	1,96	1,83	1,85	1,87	1,90	1,92	0,61	0,61	0,61	**0,43**	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,18	0,18	0,07	0,07	0,07	**0,07**	2,11	**2,10**
Luxembourg	**1,24**	0,95	0,91	0,89	0,89	0,85	0,83	0,81	0,80	0,79	**0,77**	2,48	4,18	-	0,36	2,20	2,16	2,12	2,08	0,47	**0,46**	0,47	**0,46**
Malta	**2,13**	0,24	0,23	0,23	0,22	0,22	0,21	0,21	0,20	0,78	**0,78**	1,66	1,63	1,59	1,55	1,52	1,68	1,89	1,82	1,36	**1,36**	0,39	**0,58**
Netherlands	**0,07**	0,11	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	**0,06**	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	**0,01**	0,19	**0,19**
Poland	**1,02**	0,74	-	0,75	-	0,94	0,94	0,95	0,95	0,95	**0,96**	0,07	-	0,07	-	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,06	**0,06**	1,13	**1,14**
Portugal	**5,62**	2,20	2,22	2,81	2,82	2,83	1,46	1,46	1,41	1,41	**1,40**	0,97	0,98	2,39	2,40	2,38	3,99	4,00	4,22	4,23	**4,22**	3,10	**3,08**
Romania	**0,96**	1,09	1,17	1,05	1,17	1,19	1,19	1,20	1,20	0,91	**0,92**	0,05	0,05	0,04	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,05	0,04	**0,04**	0,95	**0,96**
Slovak Republic	**1,01**	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	0,99	0,99	0,99	0,99	0,99	**0,99**	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,17	0,16	0,02	**0,02**	1,01	**1,01**
Slovenia	**2,85**	2,67	2,67	2,67	2,66	2,66	2,66	2,64	2,62	2,61	**2,61**	0,29	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,24	**0,24**	3,32	**3,32**
Spain	**8,14**	5,11	-	4,79	4,79	4,78	4,89	4,83	4,88	4,85	**4,88**	3,17	-	3,11	3,08	3,08	3,11	3,12	3,15	3,23	**3,27**	1,30	**1,31**
Sweden	**0,76**	0,63	0,62	0,62	0,61	0,60	0,59	0,47	0,46	0,46	**0,46**	0,13	0,12	0,12	0,12	0,10	0,10	0,30	0,30	0,30	**0,30**	0,81	**0,80**
Average	**1,67**	1,32	1,03	1,21	1,19	1,17	1,12	1,00	1,00	1,06	**1,08**	0,73	0,72	0,70	0,69	0,73	0,79	0,82	0,80	0,62	**0,66**	1,52	**1,56**
Median	**1,20**	1,00	0,97	0,94	0,91	0,93	0,91	0,81	0,80	0,80	**0,89**	0,20	0,20	0,21	0,25	0,22	0,22	0,24	0,24	0,20	**0,22**	1,28	**1,28**
Minimum	**0,07**	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	0,06	**0,06**	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01	0,00	**0,01**	0,19	**0,19**
Maximum	**8,14**	5,11	2,67	4,79	4,79	4,78	4,89	4,83	4,88	4,85	**4,88**	3,17	4,18	3,11	3,08	3,08	3,99	4,00	4,22	4,23	**4,22**	3,32	**3,32**
Nb of values	**27**	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	27	25	26	26	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	27	**27**
% of NA	**0%**	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	**4%**	0%	**0%**
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	**7%**	0%	**0%**

Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

Belgium: Starting from 2020, a new methodology of presentation of data is used as to the distinction between 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction and 1st instance specialised courts

Cyprus: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country

Italy: Before 2014 only courts financed by Ministry of justice were included

Latvia: Different presentation of number of specialised courts in 2015. In reality there is one administrative court with 5 court houses

Luxembourg: The methodology of presentation of data concerning 1st instance specialised courts was improved in 2020

Slovak Republic: Starting from 2020, the number of administrative courts is excluded from the count of specialised courts, since they are part of general courts of appeal

Table 2.3a Number of all courts as geographic locations from 2012 to 2021 (Q44)

States	All the courts (geographic locations)									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	149	135	103	103	103	103	102	102	164	**164**
Belgium	288	288	288	288	267	264	253	232	225	**225**
Bulgaria	170	170	168	175	182	182	182	182	182	**182**
Croatia	158	192	203	203	203	203	205	143	143	**143**
Cyprus	21	19	21	22	22	22	21	22	23	**31**
Czech Republic	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	107	**107**
Denmark	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	**29**
Estonia	22	22	22	22	21	22	21	21	20	**20**
Finland	82	78	81	79	73	73	71	52	52	**52**
France	640	641	643	643	641	641	641	641	672	**715**
Germany	1 108	1 107	1 101	1 095	1 102	1 093	1 076	1 076	1 092	**1 092**
Greece	402	NA	329	329	319	319	319	319	320	**320**
Hungary	157	157	157	157	157	158	159	159	139	**139**
Ireland	105	100	94	94	95	95	95	95	95	**95**
Italy	1 378	790	836	836	836	831	828	828	844	**844**
Latvia	48	48	48	49	42	47	52	56	55	**53**
Lithuania	67	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	**62**
Luxembourg	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	**8**
Malta	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	**4**
Netherlands	60	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42	**43**
Poland	827	-	NA	-	401	401	401	401	494	**494**
Portugal	318	319	253	253	253	312	312	316	328	**328**
Romania	244	244	244	243	243	243	243	243	242	**242**
Slovak Republic	64	64	64	64	64	64	63	64	64	**65**
Slovenia	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	76	**76**
Spain	763	-	763	763	763	698	701	702	695	**700**
Sweden	95	95	95	95	95	95	99	99	99	**99**
Average	273	199	224	224	230	229	228	225	232	**235**
Median	105	97	97	97	98	98	99	99	107	**107**
Minimum	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	**4**
Maximum	1 378	1 107	1 101	1 095	1 102	1 093	1 076	1 076	1 092	**1 092**
Nb of values	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	**27**
% of NA	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**

Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

Cyprus: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country

Italy: Before 2014 only courts financed by Ministry of justice were included.

Table 2.3b Number of all courts as geographic location per 100 000 inhabitants from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q44)

States	All the courts (geographic locations)									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	1,76	1,59	1,20	1,18	1,18	1,17	1,16	1,15	1,84	**1,83**
Belgium	2,58	2,58	2,57	2,56	2,36	2,32	2,21	2,03	1,95	**1,94**
Bulgaria	2,33	2,35	2,33	2,45	2,56	2,58	2,60	2,62	2,63	**2,66**
Croatia	3,71	4,52	4,80	4,84	4,89	4,94	5,03	3,52	3,54	**3,69**
Cyprus	2,43	2,21	2,45	2,59	2,59	2,57	2,40	2,48	2,57	**3,43**
Czech Republic	0,93	0,93	0,93	0,93	0,93	0,93	0,92	0,92	1,00	**1,02**
Denmark	0,52	0,52	0,51	0,51	0,50	0,50	0,50	0,50	0,50	**0,49**
Estonia	1,71	1,67	1,68	1,67	1,60	1,67	1,59	1,59	1,50	**1,50**
Finland	1,51	1,43	1,48	1,44	1,33	1,32	1,29	0,94	0,94	**0,94**
France	0,98	0,97	0,97	0,97	0,96	0,95	0,96	0,96	1,00	**1,06**
Germany	1,38	1,37	1,36	1,34	1,34	1,32	1,30	1,29	1,31	**1,31**
Greece	3,63	NA	3,03	3,03	2,96	2,96	2,97	2,97	2,99	**3,00**
Hungary	1,58	1,59	1,59	1,60	1,60	1,60	1,66	1,63	1,41	**1,43**
Ireland	2,29	2,17	2,03	2,02	2,03	1,98	1,96	1,93	1,91	**1,85**
Italy	2,31	1,32	1,38	1,38	1,38	1,37	1,37	1,37	1,42	**1,43**
Latvia	2,35	2,37	2,40	2,49	2,13	2,41	2,71	2,94	2,91	**2,83**
Lithuania	2,23	2,11	2,12	2,15	2,18	2,21	2,22	2,22	2,22	**2,21**
Luxembourg	1,52	1,45	1,42	1,42	1,35	1,33	1,30	1,28	1,26	**1,24**
Malta	0,47	0,47	0,45	0,44	0,43	0,42	0,63	0,61	0,58	**0,78**
Netherlands	0,36	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,23	0,23	0,23	0,23	0,24	**0,25**
Poland	2,15	-	NA	-	1,04	1,04	1,04	1,04	1,29	**1,30**
Portugal	3,03	3,06	2,44	2,45	2,45	3,03	3,04	3,07	3,19	**3,17**
Romania	1,15	1,22	1,10	1,23	1,24	1,24	1,25	1,25	1,26	**1,27**
Slovak Republic	1,18	1,18	1,18	1,18	1,18	1,18	1,16	1,17	1,17	**1,20**
Slovenia	3,74	3,74	3,74	3,73	3,73	3,73	3,70	3,67	3,60	**3,61**
Spain	1,66	-	1,64	1,64	1,64	1,49	1,49	1,48	1,47	**1,48**
Sweden	0,99	0,98	0,97	0,96	0,95	0,94	0,97	0,96	0,95	**0,95**
Average	1,87	1,75	1,77	1,79	1,73	1,76	1,76	1,70	1,73	**1,77**
Median	1,71	1,52	1,54	1,52	1,38	1,37	1,37	1,37	1,42	**1,43**
Minimum	0,36	0,24	0,24	0,24	0,23	0,23	0,23	0,23	0,24	**0,25**
Maximum	3,74	4,52	4,80	4,84	4,89	4,94	5,03	3,67	3,60	**3,69**
Nb of values	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	**27**
% of NA	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	**0%**

Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

Cyprus: The Supreme Court is the 2nd instance and highest instance court in the country

Italy: Before 2014 only courts financed by Ministry of justice were included.

Table 2.4a Number and distribution of first instance specialised courts as legal entities in 2021 (Q43)

States	Total	Commercial courts (excluding insolvency courts)	Insolvency courts	Labour courts	Family courts	Rent and tenancies courts	Enforcement of criminal sanctions courts	Fight against terrorism, organised crime and corruption	Internet related disputes	Administrative courts	Insurance and/or social welfare courts	Military courts	Juvenile courts	Other specialised first instance courts
Austria	**18**	2	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	11	1	NAP	NAP	2
Belgium	**23**	9	NAP	9	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	5	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**32**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	28	NAP	3	NAP	1
Croatia	**14**	9	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	4	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	**19**	NAP	NAP	4	4	3	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	1	5	1
Czech Republic	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**2**	1	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1
Estonia	**2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**9**	1	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	6	1	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**848**	152	NAP	216	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	42	NAP	NAP	156	282
Germany	**245**	NAP	NAP	108	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	51	68	NAP	NAP	18
Greece	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	30	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP
Hungary	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**236**	22	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	58	NAP	NAP	20	NAP	4	29	103
Latvia	**2**	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	**2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	**3**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	1	1	NAP	NAP
Malta	**7**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	1	4
Netherlands	**2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Poland	**23**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	16	NAP	7	NAP	NAP
Portugal	**437**	23	NAP	45	53	NAP	5	NAP	1	17	NAP	NAP	NAP	293
Romania	**8**	3	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	4	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**5**	NAP	NAP	4	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	1	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**1 549**	96	NAP	382	133	NAP	17	7	NAP	242	NAP	NAP	82	590
Sweden	**31**	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	12	NAP	NAP	NAP	18
Average	**147**	29	-	70	-	-	-	-	-	24	-	-	-	119
Median	**12**	9	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	18
Minimum	**1**	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Maximum	**1 549**	152	-	382	-	-	-	-	-	242	-	-	-	590
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**4%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%
% of NAP	**7%**	59%	96%	59%	85%	93%	81%	89%	96%	22%	81%	74%	81%	59%

Table 2.4b Number and distribution of higher instance specialised courts as legal entities in 2021 (Q43)

States	Total	Commercial courts (excluding insolvency courts)	Insolvency courts	Labour courts	Family courts	Rent and tenancies courts	Enforcement of criminal sanctions courts	Fight against terrorism, organised crime and corruption	Internet related disputes	Administrative courts	Insurance and/or social welfare courts	Military courts	Juvenile courts	Other specialised first instance courts
Austria	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**3**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	1	NAP	1
Croatia	**2**	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**9**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	9	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**69**	NAP	NAP	19	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	16	15	NAP	NAP	19
Greece	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	10	NAP	NA	NAP	1
Hungary	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**23**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	1	NAP	21
Latvia	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	**3**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	1	1	NAP	NAP
Malta	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1
Netherlands	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Poland	**3**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	2	NAP	NAP
Portugal	**3**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	3	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**1**	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**59**	4	NAP	23	6	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	23	NAP	1	NAP	NAP
Sweden	**8**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	5	NAP	NAP	NAP	3
Average	**9**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
Median	**1**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Minimum	**1**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Maximum	**69**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	-	-	-	-
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**4%**	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%
% of NAP	**19%**	93%	100%	89%	96%	100%	100%	96%	100%	30%	89%	74%	100%	78%

Table 2.5 Number of courts as geographic locations in 2021 (Q44)

States	First instance courts geographic locations		All courts geographic locations	
	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants
Austria	158	1,76	164	1,83
Belgium	218	1,88	225	1,94
Bulgaria	145	2,12	182	2,66
Croatia	120	3,10	143	3,69
Cyprus	30	3,32	31	3,43
Czech Republic	89	0,85	107	1,02
Denmark	26	0,44	29	0,49
Estonia	17	1,28	20	1,50
Finland	45	0,81	52	0,94
France	661	0,98	715	1,06
Germany	998	1,20	1 092	1,31
Greece	289	2,71	320	3,00
Hungary	113	1,17	139	1,43
Ireland	93	1,82	95	1,85
Italy	773	1,31	844	1,43
Latvia	46	2,45	53	2,83
Lithuania	59	2,10	62	2,21
Luxembourg	3	0,46	8	1,24
Malta	3	0,58	4	0,78
Netherlands	34	0,19	43	0,25
Poland	433	1,14	494	1,30
Portugal	319	3,08	328	3,17
Romania	182	0,96	242	1,27
Slovak Republic	55	1,01	65	1,20
Slovenia	70	3,32	76	3,61
Spain	621	1,31	700	1,48
Sweden	84	0,80	99	0,95
Average	211	1,56	235	1,77
Median	93	1,28	107	1,43
Minimum	3	0,19	4	0,25
Maximum	998	3,32	1 092	3,69
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%

Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

Table 2.6 (EC) Absolute number of all courts (geographic locations) from 2012 to 2021 and their variations between 2020 and 2021 and between 2012 and 2021 (Q44)

States	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Variation 2020-2021	Variation 2012-2021
Austria	20	149	135	103	103	103	103	102	102	164	164	0,0%	10,1%
Belgium	1	288	288	288	288	267	264	253	232	225	225	0,0%	-21,9%
Bulgaria	2	170	170	168	175	182	182	182	182	182	182	0,0%	7,1%
Croatia	11	158	192	203	203	203	203	205	143	143	143	0,0%	-9,5%
Cyprus	13	21	19	21	22	22	22	21	22	23	31	34,8%	47,6%
Czech Republic	3	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	107	107	0,0%	9,2%
Denmark	4	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	0,0%	0,0%
Estonia	6	22	22	22	22	21	22	21	21	20	20	0,0%	-9,1%
Finland	26	82	78	81	79	73	73	71	52	52	52	0,0%	-36,6%
France	10	640	641	643	643	641	641	641	641	672	715	6,4%	11,7%
Germany	5	1108	1107	1101	1095	1102	1093	1076	1076	1092	1092	0,0%	-1,4%
Greece	8	402	NA	329	329	319	319	319	319	320	320	0,0%	-20,4%
Hungary	17	157	157	157	157	157	158	159	159	139	139	0,0%	-11,5%
Ireland	7	105	100	94	94	95	95	95	95	95	95	0,0%	-9,5%
Italy	12	1378	790	836	836	836	831	828	828	844	844	0,0%	-38,8%
Latvia	14	48	48	48	49	42	47	52	56	55	53	-3,6%	10,4%
Lithuania	15	67	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	0,0%	-7,5%
Luxembourg	16	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	0,0%	0,0%
Malta	18	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	33,3%	100,0%
Netherlands	19	60	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	42	43	2,4%	-28,3%
Poland	21	827	-	NA	-	401	401	401	401	494	494	0,0%	-40,3%
Portugal	22	318	319	253	253	253	312	312	316	328	328	0,0%	3,1%
Romania	23	244	244	244	243	243	243	243	243	242	242	0,0%	-0,8%
Slovak Republic	25	64	64	64	64	64	64	63	64	64	65	1,6%	1,6%
Slovenia	24	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	76	76	0,0%	-1,3%
Spain	9	763	-	763	763	763	698	701	702	695	700	0,7%	-8,3%
Sweden	27	95	95	95	95	95	95	99	99	99	99	0,0%	4,2%

Due to clarifications in the methodology, in 2020 the number of courts of different instances that operate in the same site are separately counted.

Croatia: in 2019, misdemeanor courts were merged into municipal courts.

Indicator 2: The judicial organisation

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 042.

Question 043.

Question 044.

Austria

Q042 (2020): In 2020 in Austria, the number of courts considered as legal entities is 152. Namely, there are 133 courts of general jurisdiction and 19 specialised courts. Among the 133 legal entities of general jurisdiction, 128 act at first instance, 4 at second instance and one at third instance. More precisely, the 115 District courts and the 13 Regional courts of general jurisdiction intervene as first instance courts. It is noteworthy that the 7 other regional courts that have specialised jurisdiction are not taken into consideration here, but are counted as specialised first instance courts (infra). It is to be mentioned that the peculiarity of the 20 Austrian Regional courts is that even though these are first instance courts, some of them are also competent in respect of appeals against District courts' decisions. The 4 Higher Regional Courts have appeal competence in respect of all civil and criminal cases.
The Supreme court is the highest instance court in civil and criminal matters.

Q042 (2014): From January 1st 2013 to July 1st, 2014 a number of district courts merged. In 2014, there are 129 first instance district courts which is less than 132 (number communicated for 2013) but still not complying with the aim of 115.

Q043 (General Comment): The two "other specialized first instance courts" are the two civil law courts (in Vienna and Graz), while the two specialised criminal courts also located in Vienna and Graz are specialised on the enforcement of criminal sanctions. The sum of the numbers in the categories exceeds the total number of specialised courts because the labour and social court in Vienna is one court that is competent for labour and (some) social welfare cases. From January 1st, 2014 there are 11 newly found courts for administrative law in Austria, namely 9 regional administrative courts, 1 Federal administrative court and 1 Federal Tax Court.

Q043 (2021): As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Because of the Court for labour and social welfare cases in Vienna (Arbeits- und Sozialgericht Wien) the sum of the individual courts does not correspond to the total number of specialised courts. One commercial court in Vienna, both courts (in Vienna and Graz) specialised on civil cases and both courts (in Vienna and Graz) specialised on the enforcement of criminal sanctions also act as second instance courts.

Q043 (2020): As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases);
Because of the Court for labour and social welfare cases in Vienna (Arbeits- und Sozialgericht Wien) the sum of the individual courts does not correspond to the total number of specialised courts.
One commercial court in Vienna, both courts (in Vienna and Graz) specialised on civil cases and both courts (in Vienna and Graz) specialised on the enforcement of criminal sanctions also act as second instance courts.

Q043 (2019): On principal every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialized, i.e. eight in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2x], employment- and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (criminal cases, remaining cases). There is also a regional administrative court in every federal state (9 in total). Because of the Court for labour and social welfare cases in Vienna (Arbeits- und Sozialgericht Wien) the sum of the individual courts equals nineteen.

Q043 (2018): On principal every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], employment- and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (criminal cases, remaining cases)

Q043 (2017): On principal every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], employment- and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (criminal cases, remaining cases)
Q043 (2016): On principal every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], employment- and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (criminal cases, remaining cases)
Q044 (2020): For this cycle, data on geographic locations is presented in respect of different locations for different instances, in compliance with the methodology developed in the Explanatory Note. The variation observed with previous cycles is only of a methodological nature.
Q044 (2016): It is planned to reduce the number of courts by 3 in 2018 (-1) and 2019 (-2)

Belgium

Q042 (General Comment): The reform of the Justices of the peace, with a decrease in geographical locations, was consolidated by the law of December 25, 2017. The implementation of the reform has been carried out between 2016 and 2019.

Q042 (2021): 1.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 13 first instance courts, 162 Justices of the peace, 11 Assize courts (one per province and two in Brussels) and 15 Police courts.
1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction: 5 Courts of appeal (the 13 first instance courts that rule as appeal courts on the decisions of the Justices of the peace are taken into consideration only within line 1.1).
As for the previous evaluation round (2020 data), Justices of the peace and Police courts are counted as courts of general jurisdiction. Before 2020, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance. As of 2020, the 11 Assize courts are also included in the data. Insofar as the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) intervenes both in first instance and on appeal, it has been taken into account in both columns of Q43, but only once in the total of Q42.2.
It is worth mentioning that the Assize courts are not structural entities (they are not permanent); they are organised within the Courts of appeal. The Assize court is constituted whenever the Investigation Chamber of the respective Court of appeal (Chambre des mises en accusation) refers a case to that court - the Assize court.
All courts in Belgium (except the Court of cassation) are grouped into 49 legal entities (steering committees).

Q042 (2020): "1.1 First instance Courts of general jurisdiction: 13 first instance courts, 162 justices of the peace, 11 assize courts (one per province and two in Brussels) and 15 police courts. "Second instance Courts of general jurisdiction": 13 courts of first instance that rule as appeal courts on the decisions of the justices of the peace and 5 appeal courts.
Vertical consistency in the table is not ensured, as the 13 courts of first instance with dual jurisdiction (1 and 2 instances) have been counted only once in the totals.
For the current evaluation round (2020 data), justices of the peace and police courts are counted as general courts. In previous cycles, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance. As of 2020, the 11 assize courts are also included in the data. Insofar as the Conseil d'Etat intervenes both in first instance and on appeal, it has been taken into account in both columns of Q43, but only once in the total of Q42.2."

Q042 (2017): The law of 25 December 2017 amended the number of cantons of justices of the peace from 187 to 162. The implementation of this reform will take place until 2019.
Q042 (2016): A reform of the justices of the peace is under way, leading to a reduction in the number of hearing locations.

Q042 (2014): Following a reform of the judicial map, the number of legal entities decreased: from 27 to 13 first instance courts, from 27 to 9 labour courts, from 27 to 9 commercial courts, and from 34 to 15 police courts.
Q043 (General Comment): In Belgium, the following courts do not exist - insolvency courts, family courts, juvenile courts, insurance and / or social welfare courts, rent and tenancies courts, enforcement of criminal sanctions courts, courts specialised in fight against terrorism or in internet related disputes. These case categories are within the competence of company courts (insolvency, insurances), first instance courts (family, juveniles, enforcement of sentences), labour courts (safety in work).
As for the previous evaluation round (2020 data), Justices of the peace and Police courts are counted as courts of general jurisdiction. Before 2020, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance.
Administrative courts: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Six courts of first instance have chambers specialised in enforcement of criminal sanctions. The designation “enforcement court” is used, but in reality, it is a specialized chamber. All first instance courts (13) have a specialized family and youth section. The designation “family court” is used, but in reality, it is a specialized section.

Q043 (2021): In Belgium, the following courts do not exist - insolvency courts, family courts, juvenile courts, insurance and / or social welfare courts, rent and tenancies courts, enforcement of criminal sanctions courts, courts specialised in fight against terrorism or in internet related disputes. These case categories are within the competence of company courts (insolvency, insurances), first instance courts (family, juveniles, enforcement of sentences), labour courts (safety in work).
As for the previous evaluation round (2020 data), Justices of the peace and Police courts are counted as courts of general jurisdiction. Before 2020, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance.

Q043 (2020):
For the current evaluation round (2020 data), justices of the peace and police courts are counted as general courts. In previous cycles, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance.
Q043 (2019): Other: 162 justices of the peace and 15 police courts. Administrative courts: Council of State, Council for Aliens Litigation, de Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen (these courts are under the authority of the Minister for Home Affairs and the Flemish Regional Government, and not the Minister of Justice).
Six courts of first instance have specialized chambers for the application of sentences. The denomination 'court for the enforcement of sentences' is used, but in reality it is a specialized chamber.
All the courts of first instance (13) have a special family and youth section. The denomination 'family court' is used, but in reality it is a specialized section.
Q043 (2017): Others: justices of the peace and police courts. The law of 25 December 2017 amended the number of cantons of justices of the peace from 187 to 162 (162 justices of the peace and 15 police courts).
Administrative courts: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Five courts of first instance have specialized chambers for the enforcement of sentences. Despite the term used in their respect - "court for the enforcement of sentences", those are specialised chambers.
All courts of first instance (13) have a specialised family and youth section. The term "family court" is used, but these are also specialised sections.
Q043 (2016): Other: justices of the peace and police courts
Administrative courts: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Five courts of first instance have specialized chambers for the enforcement of sentences. The name "court for the enforcement of sentences" is used, but in reality it is a specialized chamber.
All courts of first instance (13) have a specialized family and youth section. The name "family court"' is used, but in reality it is a specialized section.
Q043 (2015): Other: justices of the peace and police courts
Administrative courts: the Council of State, the Council of the Litigation of Foreigners, Milieuhandhavingscollege, de Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Q043 (2014): The other specialised courts are 15 police courts and 187 justices of peace. Family courts are a section within the 13 first instance courts. The administrative courts (the Council of State, the Alien Litigation Council, "(Vlaamse)Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen", "het (Vlaamse) Milieuhandhavingscollege") are not part of the judicial system administered by the Ministry of Justice. Following a reform of the judicial map, the number of labour, commercial and police courts was reduced.

Q044 (2020): Deduction made on the basis of the number of buildings in which the courts are housed: 225 buildings in which all our premises are housed. In Eupen, the first instance courts combines the court of first instance, the labour court and the company court, which gives 8 for the labour and company courts (Law of 14 February 2014)

Q044 (2016): A reform of the justices of the peace is under way: 1. a reduction in the number of geographical settlements 2. expansion of their jurisdiction by increasing the amount of claims.
The reform of the cantons (justices of the peace) was launched in 2016 and resulted in the law of 25 December 2017 which formally amended or abolished the cantons. The amendments come into force over 1.5 years.
Q044 (2014):
According to 2014 data, a change in the number of seats of the justices of the peace is ongoing. Similarly, from 1 April 2014, the statutory number of courts has been decreased for commercial, labour and police first instance courts while keeping the existing geographical seats.

Bulgaria

Q042 (General Comment): There are the following courts in Bulgaria: District Courts- 113- The District Court is the main court of first instance. It has jurisdiction over all cases except those which are statutorily assigned to another court. It deals with civil, criminal and administrative-criminal cases. The decisions of the district courts are subject to appeal before the respective Regional court. Provincial/Regional Courts- 28- The Provincial Courts act as courts of first and second instance. As courts of first instance, they examine a precisely defined category of cases involving significant sums or substantial societal interest. When acting as a second (appellate) instance, they re-examine decisions taken by the district courts. Administrative Courts- 28 Specialized Criminal Court -1 Courts of Appeals - 5 Specialized Court of Appeal - 1 MilitaryCourts - 3 - The Military courts consider criminal cases of crimes committed by servicemen or officials of the Interior Ministry at first instance. Military Court of Appeal - 1 Supreme Court of Cassation - 1 Supreme Administrative Court - 1

Q042 (2020): Judiciary System Act
Article 65
All courts are legal entities funded by the budget and shall be represented by the administrative head or another designated person. In the discharge of the functions of administrative head, orders, instructions and rules shall be issued in accordance with the statutory competence. The general assembly, the plenum of the Supreme Cassation Court and the Plenum of the Supreme Administrative Court shall be bodies of the respective court, which rule only in the cases specified in the law, give opinions, adopt rules and decisions by open ballot and a majority of more than half of the judges present.

Q042 (2019): There are the following courts in Bulgaria: District Courts- 113- The District Court is the main court of first instance. It has jurisdiction over all cases except those which are statutorily assigned to another court. It deals with civil, criminal and administrative-criminal cases. The decisions of the district courts are subject to appeal before the respective Regional court.
Provincial/Regional Courts- 28- The Provincial Courts act as courts of first and second instance. As courts of first instance, they examine a precisely defined category of cases involving significant sums or substantial societal interest. When acting as a second (appellate) instance, they re-examine decisions taken by the district courts.
Administrative Courts- 28
Specialized Criminal Court -1
Courts of Appeals - 5
Specialized Court of Appeal - 1
MilitaryCourts - 3 - The Military courts consider criminal cases of crimes committed by servicemen or officials of the Interior Ministry at first instance.
Military Court of Appeal - 1
Supreme Court of Cassation - 1
Supreme Administrative Court - 1

Q042 (2018): 42.1. District Court - 113
The District Court is the main court of first instance. It has jurisdiction over all cases except those which are statutorily assigned to another court. It deals with civil, criminal and administrative-criminal cases. The decisions of the district courts are subject to appeal before the respective Regional court.
Provincial/ regional courts- 28
The provincial courts act as courts of first and second instance. As courts of first instance, they examine a precisely defined category of cases involving significant sums or substantial societal interest. When acting as a second (appellate) instance, they re-examine decisions taken by the district courts.
Military first instance courts- 3
Military courts consider criminal cases of crimes committed by servicemen or officials of the Interior Ministry at first instance.

Q043 (General Comment): Administrative Courts- 28
Supreme Administrative Court - 1
MilitaryCourts - 3
Military Court of Appeal - 1 Specialized Criminal Court -1 Specialized Court of Appeal - 1
Q043 (2021): The category “other specialised courts” encompasses the Specialized Criminal Court of Republic of Bulgaria, established in 2011, situated in Sofia and treated as a Provincial/Regional Court. Its jurisdiction covers criminal cases of a general nature for crimes carried out throughout the Republic of Bulgaria. Its competence is determined on the basis of the subject of the case and not the quality of the perpetrator. The Criminal Procedure Code exhaustively enumerates cases within the competence of this Court, namely crimes committed by organized criminal groups, or on behalf of them and following their decision.

Q043 (2020): The category “other specialised courts” encompasses the Specialized Criminal Court of Republic of Bulgaria, established in 2011, situated in Sofia and treated as a Provincial/Regional Court. Its jurisdiction covers criminal cases of a general nature for crimes carried out throughout the Republic of Bulgaria. Its competence is determined on the basis of the subject of the case and not the quality of the perpetrator. The Criminal Procedure Code exhaustively enumerates cases within the competence of this Court, namely crimes committed by organized criminal groups, or on behalf of them and following their decision.

Q043 (2019): The cases under the jurisdiction of Specialized Criminal Court are specified in Art. 411a of the Penal Procedure Code

Q043 (2018): The category “other” encompasses the Specialized Criminal Court of Republic of Bulgaria (see the general comment).

Q043 (2017): Specialized Criminal Court

Q043 (2016): 'Other specialised 1st instance courts' - 1 Specialized Criminal Court.

Q044 (2018): Proposals for amendments to the Code of Administrative Procedure and Code of Civil Procedure to change the jurisdiction of the district and administrative courts with a view to regulating their workload. A model for the optimization of the judicial map at the level of district courts will be developed in implementation of a project under the Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020.

Q044 (2016): Proposals for amendments to the Administrative Procedure Code and the Code of Civil Procedure are intended to reform the jurisdiction of regional and administrative courts in order to regulate their workload. Within the implementation of a project under “Good governance” Operational Programme 2014-2020 a model for optimization of the judicial map on regional courts level will be developed.

Croatia

Q042 (General Comment): The reform of judicial map implemented in 2015 decreased the number of Misdemeanour Courts from 63 to 22. Therefore, in accordance with the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette, No. 128/14) in force, there are currently 22 Misdemeanour Courts in function. On the 1st of January 2019. new Courts Areas and Seats Act came into force.From the organizational aspect, the most important organizational measure was the merging of misdemeanor courts into municipal courts, and few municipal courts were reopened after 2015. That is why we have now less first instance specialized courts than in 2018. and more courts of general jurisdiction (22 courts which were in 2018. plus 8 courts which were reopened after the new law came into force).

Q042 (2020): On the 1st of January 2019. new Courts Areas and Seats Act came into force.From the organizational aspect, the most important organizational measure was the merging of misdemeanor courts into municipal courts, and few municipal courts were reopened after 2015. That is why we have now less first instance specialized courts than in 2018. and more courts of general jurisdiction (22 courts which were in 2018. plus 8 courts which were reopened after the new law came into force).

Q042 (2019): On the 1st of January 2019. new Courts Areas and Seats Act came into force.From the organizational aspect, the most important organizational measure was the merging of misdemeanor courts into municipal courts, and few municipal courts were reopened after 2015. That is why we have now less first instance specialized courts than in 2018. and more courts of general jurisdiction (22 courts which were in 2018. plus 8 courts which were reopened after the new law came into force).

Q042 (2016): There was a reform of judicial map implemented in 2015 in which the number of Misdemeanour Courts has decreased from 63 to 22. Therefore, in accordance with the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette, No. 128/14) in force, there are currently 22 Misdemeanour Courts in function.

Q042 (2014): In 2014, according to the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts, there are 67 first instance courts but the Municipal Court in Novi Zagreb is not in function while the Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb is a specialized court counted in Q42.2. Accordingly, there are 65 actually functioning first instance courts of a general jurisdiction.

Q042 (2013): For 2013, the Ministry of Justice added to the number of geographic locations all offices of a specific court that are located outside of the seat of the court, in which judicial activities are undertaken. The number of courts did not increase in 2013. Also, 66 municipal courts (65 municipal courts and 1 Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb) were in function out of total 67 first instance courts prescribed by the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts. The Municipal Court in Novi Zagreb is still not in function.

Q043 (General Comment): The term “other specialized first instance courts” in the Republic of Croatia refers to misdemeanour courts and the Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb. There was a reform of judicial map implemented in 2015 in which the number of Misdemeanour Courts has decreased from 63 to 22. Therefore, in accordance with the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette, No. 128/14) in force, there are currently 22 Misdemeanour Courts in function.

Q043 (2020): In Croatian Judicial system there is a higher instances of 3 specialized courts: commercial, administrative and other (misdemeanour).

Q043 (2019): One criminal and two misdemeanour courts. After the reorganization of courts in 2019 we do not have 22 misdemeanor courts. Only two courts specialized only for misdemeanor cases were left in two largest cities (Zagreb and Split). Third specialized court is court in Zagreb specialized only for criminal cases.

Q043 (2018): Other specialised 1st instance courts are Misdemeanour courts and Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb.

Q043 (2017): 23 other specialised 1st instance courts are 22 Misdemeanour courts and 1 Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb

Q043 (2016): According to the Act on the Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette 128/14) as of 1 April 2015 the number of municipal courts has been reduced, as of 1 July 2015 reduced the number of misdemeanour courts has been reduced and as of 1 April 2015 a new commercial court has been established.
Other specialised 1st instance courts are 22 Misdemeanour courts and a Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb.

Q044 (2020): The reorganisation of judicial map that started in 2015 in which the number of municipal and misdemeanour courts as well as the number of municipal state attorneys' offices has been reduced continued in 2019 with the merger of municipal and misdemeanour courts into municipal courts.
The reasons for the merger were a significant decrease in the number of misdemeanour cases and overburdened municipal courts with civil cases. In the new judicial map, instead of 46 municipal and misdemeanour courts, there are now 34 municipal courts - all misdemeanour and municipal courts were merged in the same cities except in 2 largest cities, Zagreb and Split, in which specialised municipal courts for misdemeanour cases were retained, and due to geographical specificities and size of certain municipal courts they were separated and new municipal courts were established (10). Also, a new commercial court was established in Dubrovnik. The aim of this new judicial map with new courts in the network and increased jurisdiction of permanent services is to increase the efficiency of the courts, improve access to court services, ensure even distribution of the workload of judges, shorten the length of court proceedings, reduce the number of unresolved cases in municipal courts, and ensure optimisation and easier management of human resources in courts.

Q044 (2018): The reorganisation of judicial map that started in 2015 in which the number of municipal and misdemeanour courts as well as the number of municipal state attorneys' offices has been reduced continued in 2019 with the merger of municipal and misdemeanour courts into municipal courts.
The reasons for the merger were a significant decrease in the number of misdemeanour cases and overburdened municipal courts with civil cases. In the new judicial map, instead of 46 municipal and misdemeanour courts, there are now 34 municipal courts - all misdemeanour and municipal courts were merged in the same cities except in 2 largest cities, Zagreb and Split, in which specialised municipal courts for misdemeanour cases were retained, and due to geographical specificities and size of certain municipal courts they were separated and new municipal courts were established (10). Also, a new commercial court was established in Dubrovnik. The aim of this new judicial map with new courts in the network and increased jurisdiction of permanent services is to increase the efficiency of the courts, improve access to court services, ensure even distribution of the workload of judges, shorten the length of court proceedings, reduce the number of unresolved cases in municipal courts, and ensure optimisation and easier management of human resources in courts.

Q044 (2016): There is a new judicial reform in plan in which the misdemeanour courts will be merged with municipal courts (both 1st instance courts).

Q044 (2014): According to the new Act on Territories and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette 128/14), that entered into force on the 1st of April 2015, a further rationalization of the network of municipal (from 67 to 24) and misdemeanour courts (from 63 to 22) and the establishment of an additional commercial court (8 instead of 7) are to be carried out from 1st of April and 1st of July.
As well, the new Act introduces changes regarding the territorial jurisdiction with regard to dealing with appeals. In criminal cases, any county court can decide on appeals lodged against judgments, while only few county courts may decide on appeals in land, labor and family matters.

Cyprus

Q042 (2020): Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in the second instance cases - questions 97 and 98.

Q042 (2017): x

Q042 (2014): The number of courts changed in 2014. Instead one labour court in the district of Nicosia, there are 3 separate courts in different districts. This applies as well as for rent and tenancies court. One more family court was also established. The Assize court deals with serious criminal offences only.

Q043 (2021): other specialised courts are the Assize courts and the Administrative Court of International Protection.
In 2021 a law was enacted (law 55/21) providing for the establishment of a juvenile court in each district of the Republic. Family, Labour and rent control courts have been established in one more district.

Q043 (2020): 5 Assize courts
1 Administrative court for international Protection
Q043 (2019): Other specialised 1st instance courts: 1 International Protection Administrative Court and 5 Assize Court. In 2019 the new administrative court for international protection was established to hear cases concerning asylum applications and international protection matters.
Q043 (2018): 5 Assize courts

Q043 (2017): Assize Courts

Q043 (2016): Assize Courts

Q043 (2015): In 2015, two new Assize courts and one administrative court were established and one Rent Control Tribunal was removed.
Q044 (2018): In 2019 a New administrative court of international protection has been established that will deal with asylum cases.
Q044 (2016): Bills are being drafted for the creation of a commercial court and a first instance asylum administrative court.

Q044 (2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been pointed out that an Administrative court has been established in Cyprus and started functioning on the 7th of January 2016.

Czech Republic

Q042 (2021): 2. Supreme Administrative Court

Q042 (2020): 2. Supreme Administrative Court

Q042 (2017): There are no specialised first instance courts, but judges within individual courts are specialised (e.g. for family, labour and enforcement cases at district courts, and insolvency and administrative cases at regional courts as first instance courts).
Q042 (2016): There are no specialised first instance courts, but judges within individual courts are specialised (e.g. for family, labour and enforcement cases at district courts, and insolvency and administrative cases at regional courts as first instance courts).
Q043 (General Comment): There are no specialised first instance courts, but judges within individual courts are specialised (e.g. for family, labour and enforcement cases at district courts, and insolvency and administrative cases at regional courts as first instance courts).
Q044 (2021): 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

Q044 (2020): 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

Denmark

Q042 (General Comment): District courts are called 1st instance courts, the Land Registration court and the Maritime and Commercial Court are considered as first instance specialized courts. Second and third instance courts are the two High Courts and the Supreme Court.
Q042 (2021): Under "2" is Land Registration Court and Maritime and Commercial Court. In 4 is beside the 24 district courts 4 biting court houses.
Q042 (2019): Commercial and naval court
Land Registration court.
Q042 (2018): Data has not changed on this point.

Q042 (2017): District courts are called 1st instance courts, the Land Registration court and the Maritime and Commercial Court are considered as first instance specialized courts. Second and third instance courts are the two High Courts and the Supreme Court.
Q043 (General Comment): "Juvenile Courts" such courts do not exists. Juveniles are dealt with by district courts as any other case. There are taken special care though of juveniles in a Juvenile Board. The category “other” concerns the Land Registration Court that has been established in 2009. As for the Commercial Court, in Denmark, it is called Maritime and Commercial Court and it presents the peculiarity to also deal, to a great extent but not exclusively, with insolvency cases (bankruptcies etc.). Accordingly, there is an overlap with the category “Insolvency courts”. Family courts are administered as part of District courts. There is one military court but military courts are not part of the Danish Courts Administration.

Q043 (2021): "Other specialised courts" is The Land Registration Court.

Q043 (2020): Land Registration Court (see also general comments). The other specialized court is Maritime and Commercial Court. The latter do some degree deals with insolvency cases similar to district courts.

Q043 (2019): Other specialised 1st instance court is the Land Registration Court. The Maritime and Commercial Court is a commercial court which ALSO deals with insolvency cases. Although it looks like there are two courts there is only one! As the district courts outside Greater Copenhagen deal with insolvency cases, and the Maritime and Commercial Court deals with insolvency cases inside Greater Copenhagen, but at the same time is a specialized commercial court, the Maritime and Commercial Court is marked as a specialized Commercial Court and insolvency court.

Q043 (2018): Military courts exist but they are not part of the Danish Courts Administration. The 24 district courts have always dealt with family cases. From 1 April 2019 family issues are a section of the court.
Q043 (2017): The category “other” concerns the Land Registration Court that has been established in 2009. As for the Commercial Court, in Denmark, it is called Maritime and Commercial Court and it presents the peculiarity to also deal, to a great extent but not exclusively, with insolvency cases (bankruptcies etc.). Accordingly, there is an overlap with the category “Insolvency courts”. Of course Military courts exist but they are not part of the Danish Courts Administration.

Q043 (2016): Land Registration Court.

Q044 (2021): The 26 are all the 24 district courts plus the Maritime and Commercial Court and Land Registration Court. In the figure 29 is the two high courts and the Supreme Court included.
Q044 (2020): Included in first instance courts are district courts, Land Registration Court and the Maritime and Commercial Court.

Estonia

Q042 (General Comment): Estonia has 17 courthouses of county courts (first instance courts), 4 courthouses of administrative courts (first instance courts), 2 courthouses of appellate courts (second instance courts) and 1 courthouse of the Supreme Court (highest instance court), all together 24 courthouses. However, as some of the courts are situated in the same house (e.g Tallinn Administrative Court and Tallinn Circuit Court) and taking into account the fact that Pärnu County Court has a courthouse that is divided between two locations, there are 20 actual geographical locations of Estonian courts.

Q042 (2019): A small courthouse was adjoined with another small courthouse. The distance between them was less than 50 km.
Q042 (2016): A small courthouse was adjoined with another small courthouse. The distance between them was less than 50 km.
Q043 (General Comment): In Estonia, there are no specialized first instance courts, other than administrative courts. All the cases are dealt with by ordinary courts of first instance. The two administrative courts of first instance are situated in Tallinn and Tartu. Nevertheless, for guaranteeing wider access to justice, these two courts have several court buildings in other cities, namely in Pärnu and Jõhvi, where judges and their supporting legal staff work.

Q044 (General Comment): Estonia has 17 courthouses of county courts (first instance courts), 4 courthouses of administrative courts (first instance courts), 2 courthouses of appellate courts (second instance courts) and 1 courthouse of the Supreme Court (highest instance court), all together 24 courthouses. However, as some of the courts are situated in the same house (e.g Tallinn Administrative Court and Tallinn Circuit Court) and taking into account the fact that Pärnu County Court has a courthouse that is divided between two locations, there are 20 actual geographical locations of Estonian courts.

Q044 (2020): Tartu county court closed one courthouse, so now there's 20 geographic locations.

Q044 (2014): In the end of 2015 the Council for Administration of Courts devised the merger of two courthouses in Estonia that are situated very close to each other (20 km). Both houses will remain open but will have joint territorial jurisdiction and administration.

Finland

Q042 (General Comment): In Finland, there are 20 district courts with 36 offices, five courts of appeal, the Supreme Court, six administrative courts, the Supreme Administrative Court, the Market Court, the Labour Court and the Insurance Court. One of the administrative courts, the Labour Court and the Market Court are located in the same location. In total there are 36 courts in 52 geographic locations.

Q042 (2021): The number of district courts was reduced at the re-structuring on 1.1.2019

Q042 (2020): The number of district courts was reduced at the re-structuring on 1.1.2019.

Q042 (2019): The Court Network has been modified.

Q042 (2016): Some geographic locations of the District Courts have been shut down.

Q042 (2014): In 2014, in Finland there are 81 courts as geographic locations, namely 27 District Courts, 13 Branch offices of District Courts, 25 Auxiliary courtrooms of District Courts (23 till 2014), 3 specialized courts, 6 Administrative Courts (8 till 2014), 5 Courts of Appeal (6 till 2014), the Supreme Court and the Supreme Administrative Court.

Q043 (General Comment): In Finland, there are six regional administrative courts, the Market Court, the Labour Court and the Insurance Court.
Another specialised court is the High Court of Impeachment that hears charges against ministers (i.e. members of the Government), the Chancellor of Justice, the Parliamentary Ombudsman and members of the Supreme Court or the Supreme Administrative Court for unlawful conduct in office. In addition, the High Court of Impeachment deals with charges concerning the criminal liability of the President of the Republic. However, it is convened only when necessary.

Q043 (2016): In Finland there are 6 Administrative Courts, 1 Market Court, 1 Labour Court and 1 Insurance Court. Then there is the High Court of Impeachment that hears charges against Ministers (i.e.Members of the State Council), Chancellor of Justice, Parliamentary Ombudsman and Supreme Court Justices for unlawful conduct in office but it is convened only when necessary.
Q044 (2018): As of 1 January 2019, the district courts will be centralised by decreasing the number of the courts from 27 to 20. A court can have more than one office. The number of the district courts' offices will be reduced from 57 to 36 offices.
As of 1 September 2019, undisputed civil cases (for example debt collection, unpaid rents, other small debts and eviction cases) which are handled and decided in summary proceedings will be centralised from all 20 district courts to nine district courts.

Q044 (2016): In Finland is ongoing structural reform of the District Courts in which the number of the courts will be decreaced from 27 to 20. The main target is to merge smaller courts in to bigger units that would be more efficient and profitable and also maintain high quality. At the same time the geographichal locations of the District Courts will be decrased from 57 to 36. This means that in addition to the 7 administrational offices that will be shut down, 5 side offices and 13 separate locations for hearing will be closed. Instead the use of video conference, electronic services and other IT-solutions would be increased. Deadline for the new project is 31.12.2018 so that the reform would be in force in the beginning of the year 2019. The government's proposal has been given at January 2017. The handling of the proposal in the parliament is unfinished.

Q044 (2014): According to 2014 data, for the foreseeable future the next reform is the developing of the structure of the District Court network. The foreseen change is a reduction of the number of District Courts.

France

Q042 (2021): 1.1 : 164 TJ + 4 TPI
1.2 : 30 Courts of appeal in mainland France + 6 Courts of appeal in overseas France + 1 Superior Court of Appeal in Saint Pierre and Miquelon = 37
1.3: the Court of Cassation
Source DSJ
Q042 (2020):
There are 168 first instance courts of general jurisdiction, 37 second instance courts of general jurisdiction, and 1 highest instance court of general jurisdiction in the French judicial system.
Q042 (2019): See the comment on specialised first instance courts in the frame of Q43.
Q042 (2018): With regard to the ordinary courts, the number indicated in the 2016 questionnaire includes the local courts that have been abolished since 1 July 2017 (Act No. 2011-1862 of 13 December 2011), their powers having been taken over by the courts of first instance in civil matters and by the police courts attached to the courts of first instance in criminal matters.
The number of 786 corresponded to: 164 TGI + 4 TPI + 307 TI + 311 jprox Since then, TIs have been removed from the category of ordinary courts of first instance since they constitute specialised courts of first instance. The number of 479 ordinary courts of first instance therefore corresponded to 164 TGI + 4 TPI + 311 TPROX. The figure of 168 is thus explained by the abolition of the 311 local courts since 1 July 2017, as indicated in the comments in the questionnaire.
Thus: 479 - 311 = 168 ordinary courts of first instance (164 TGI + 4 TPI).

Q043 (General Comment): With regard to the Enforcement of criminal sanctions courts: in matters of enforcement of sentences, the enforcement judge (JAP) is a court of first instance for the enforcement of sentences, being at the same time a decision-making, control and monitoring body. There is at least one JAP per department (article 712-2 of the CPP). The JAP is competent for adult convicts, and his field of intervention is the following: for measures to individualize custodial sentences, he or she has general jurisdiction (except for a few measures that fall under the special jurisdiction of the Court for the enforcement of sentences); for custodial sentences, when a specific text so provides;
for the follow-up of security measures. Established by the law of March 9, 2004, the Court for the enforcement of sentences (TAP) is a court of first instance, composed of three JAPs of first instance courts, appointed by order of the First President of the Appelate Court. In each Appelate Court, a TAP is established whose territorial jurisdiction extends to the jurisdiction of this court (articles 712-3 and D 49-2 of the CPP, article indicating the list of TAPs by Appelate court and the territorial jurisdiction). The seat of the TAP is in principle "that of the first instance court of the seat of the Appelate Court" (article D. 49-3 CPP).
The objective is to entrust the most complex and sensitive cases to a collegiality. Thus, the TAP has jurisdiction over: 1) by the effect of the law for those sentenced to the heaviest penalties: applications for parole and suspension of "medical" sentences for persons sentenced to imprisonment or imprisonment of more than 10 years and whose remaining sentence to be served exceeds 3 years; applications for an increase in the security period; placement under judicial supervision of dangerous persons...); 2) by decision of the JAP, in particular because of the complexity of the case or the personality of the convicted person (article 712-6 al. 3 of the CPP).
In matters of terrorism, a derogatory jurisdiction is provided for under ordinary law (articles 706-22-1 and D 49-75 to D49-81-5 of the CPP). The Paris Enforcement courts specialized in terrorist matters (JAPAT, the TAPAT and the enforcement chamber) have 1)exclusive jurisdiction to monitor persons convicted by specialized terrorism trial courts pursuant to Article 706-17 of the CPP; 2) competing jurisdiction with ordinary law Enforcement courts to monitor persons convicted of acts of terrorism and other offenses falling within the scope of Article 706-16 of the CPP by ordinary law courts.
source DACG.

Q043 (2021): Labour courts: 211 CPH (conseils de prud’hommes) + 5 labour courts = 216 courts. The CPH have jurisdiction, according to Article L. 1411-1 of the Labour Code, to hear individual disputes between employees or apprentices and their employers arising from the execution of an employment or apprenticeship contract. Commercial courts: 134 TCs, 9 TMCs, 2 TPIs with commercial jurisdiction, 7 TJs with commercial jurisdiction = 152 courts. Commercial courts are specialised courts with jurisdiction to hear disputes relating to commitments between traders, between credit institutions or between them, disputes relating to commercial companies and commercial acts by their form (Art. L. 721-1 et seq. of the Commercial Code). There are 134 commercial courts whose judges are exclusively “juges consulaires”. With regard to the judicial organisation in overseas France, there are 2 First instance courts with jurisdiction in commercial matters and 9 mixed commercial courts. In addition, 7 judicial courts have a commercial chamber in Alsace-Moselle. Concerning juvenile courts: 156 according to the key figures of Justice 2021 and 155 according to the judicial atlas of 2021.
“Other specialised courts”: the parity courts for rural leases (TPBR): 272 (according to the key figures for Justice 2021); the court for navigation on the Rhine (L 215-4 al.1 COJ) ; the court of first instance for navigation on the Moselle (L 215-4 al.2 COJ); 6 maritime courts (Bordeaux, Brest, Cayenne, Le Havre, Marseille Saint-Denis); the National court of asylum. Source DSJ and Council of State

Q043 (2020): Despite the provisional NA answer for the category " Courts for the execution of criminal sanctions ", the total is available, as it is a small number that will not significantly affect the total. On labor courts: 210 CPHs + 6 labor courts = 216 courts Industrial tribunals have jurisdiction, according to Article L. 1411-1 of the Labor Code, to hear individual disputes that arise between employees or apprentices and their employers during the execution of an employment or apprenticeship contract. There are 210 industrial tribunals and 6 labor courts in the French overseas territories. Same figure as in 2020
On commercial courts: 134 TCs, 9 TMCs, 2 TPIs with commercial jurisdiction, 7 TJs with commercial jurisdiction = 152 courts Commercial courts are specialized courts with jurisdiction to hear disputes relating to commitments between traders, between credit institutions or between them, disputes relating to commercial companies and commercial acts by their form (Art. L. 721-1 et seq. of the Commercial Code) On social jurisdictions:
-Since November 1, 2019, litigation concerning military disability pensions has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the administrative courts, doing away with the military disability pension courts and the regional military disability pension courts that rule on appeal.
- Since January 1, 2019, as a result of Law No. 2016-1547 of November 18, 2016 on the modernization of justice in the 21st century, social litigation, formerly divided between the social security courts (TASS), the courts of disability litigation (TCI) and the departmental social assistance commissions (CDAS), was merged and transferred to the "tribunaux de grande instance", ordinary courts of first instance, which became, as of January 1, 2020, by effect of law n° 2019-222 of March 23, 2019 on programming 2018-2022 and reform for the justice system, Judicial Courts. Consequently, these specialized jurisdictions have been abolished. On appeal, the litigation was only under the jurisdiction of the CNITAAT (extended until December 31, 2022; but now it is under the jurisdiction of specially designated courts of appeal, which allows for better accessibility to justice. There are 134 commercial courts whose judges are exclusively consular. With regard to the judicial organization in overseas France, there are 2 courts of first instance with jurisdiction in commercial matters and 9 mixed commercial courts. In addition, 7 judicial courts have a commercial chamber in Alsace-Moselle. In 2020 it was written 143 commercial courts because I think that only the TC and TMC were counted and not the TJ with commercial jurisdiction nor the TPI with commercial jurisdiction. About the other specialized courts :
The tribunaux paritaires des baux ruraux (TPBR) are autonomous (L. 491-1 of the Code rural et de la pêche maritime). The 2018-2022 programming and reform law for justice sets the seats and jurisdictions of the TPBRs no longer with reference to the seats of the former magistrate's courts but according to the seats of the judicial courts and their proximity chamber. On social jurisdictions:
-Since November 1, 2019, the litigation of military disability pensions has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the administrative courts, making the military disability pension courts and the regional military disability pension courts, which rule on appeal, disappear.
- Since January 1, 2019, as a result of law no. 2016-1547 of November 18, 2016 on the modernization of justice in the 21st century, social litigation, which was previously divided between the social security courts (TASS), the disability litigation courts (TCI) and the departmental social assistance commissions (CDAS), was merged and transferred to the "tribunaux de grande instance", courts of first instance under ordinary law, which became, as of January 1, 2020, the "Tribunaux Judiciaires" (Judicial Courts) under Law No. 2019-222 of March 23, 2019, on programming for 2018-2022 and reform of the justice system.

Q043 (2019): Since 1 January 2019, social litigation, formerly divided between the social security courts (TASS), the incapacity courts (TCI) and the departmental social assistance commissions (CDAS), has been merged and transferred to the “tribunaux de grande instance” (first instance courts of general jurisdiction). As a result, these specialised courts have been abolished.
As of 1 November 2019, litigation concerning military invalidity pensions will be transferred to the administrative courts, eliminating the military invalidity pension courts and the regional military invalidity pension courts which rule on appeal.
These changes explain the variation in the number of courts compared to the previous year. The other specialised courts are: - joint courts for rural leases: 274; juvenile courts: 155; court for navigation on the Rhine: 1; maritime courts: 6; national asylum court: 1; court of first instance for navigation on the Moselle: 1.

Q043 (2018): The other specialized courts are: - joint courts for rural leases: 272 ;
- juvenile courts: 155; - military pension courts: 36;
- court for navigation on the Rhine: 1;
- Maritime courts: 6;
- national court of asylum: 1; - court of first instance for navigation on the Moselle: 1.
In the previous questionnaire, the Joint Rural Lease Courts (JRTs) were indicated, with the District Courts (TIs) within the "Rental Courts", the figure of 307 corresponding to the District Courts, since the seats and jurisdictions of the JRTs were linked to those of the TI. However, the TPBRs are, and have always been, autonomous courts. However, as decrees have been issued to remove some TPBRs, there is no longer a correlation between their number and that of IT. We have therefore indicated here in the "rental courts", only IT (289), and by including TPBRs in a separate item, which is legally more accurate. The total number of TPBRs is 274. On the insurance and social security courts: in the requested reference year, there are 26 disability courts, 115 social security courts (TASS) and 100 departmental social assistance commissions (CDAS). The differential of 100 corresponds to the addition of the 100 CDASs which are administrative courts.
The Paris Court, created on 14 May 2018, brought together all the services of the Regional Court, formerly dispersed over 5 sites, including Ile de la Cité, the Police Court and the 20 District Courts. The number of TIs had to be reduced by 19. In addition, the reform of the transfer of the police court under the 21st century Justice Act had the effect of removing 3 of them from the 307 TIs. The number of IT has therefore increased from 304 (307-3) to 285 district courts (304-19). We have added to these 285 TI the 4 TPIs because of their dual IT and TGI skills. Thus: 285 TI + 4 TPI = 289 TI in total.

Q043 (2017): The other specialized courts are:
- juvenile courts 155
- military pensions tribunals 36
- the court for navigation on the Rhine 1
- the court for navigation on the Moselle 1
- maritime trade courts 6
- national court of asylum 1

Q043 (2016): The other specialised courts are: 155 juvenile courts; 36 military pension courts; 1 court for navigation on the Rhine; 1 court for navigation on the Moselle; 6 maritime trade courts; 1 national asylum court.
As a matter of fact, the following reforms are on-going:
- The future Tribunal of Paris, whose establishment is scheduled for 14 May 2018, will unify all the services of the TGI (Tribunal de grande instance) currently dispersed over 5 sites, including “Ile de la Cité”, the police court and the first instance courts (tribunaux d’instance);
- Since 1 July 2017, the hearings of the Police Court, previously under the jurisdiction of the “tribunaux d’instance”, have been transferred to the TGI. The aim of this reform is to refocus the tribunaux d’instance on day-to-day civil justice and to centralise criminal litigation at the seat of the TGI.
- Since 1 July 2017, the 311 local courts have been abolished (Law No. 2011-1862 of 13 December 2011), their powers being taken over by the tribuanux d’instance in civil matters and by the police courts attached to the TGI in criminal matters.
- As of 1 January 2019, social litigation, currently divided between the Social Security Courts (TASS), the Disability Dispute Courts (TCI) and the Departmental Social Assistance Commissions (CDAS), will be unified and transferred to the TGI (first instance courts of general jurisdiction). These specialised courts will then be abolished.

Q043 (2015): Other specialised courts are:
Juvenile courts : 155
Military Pensions Courts: 36
Court for navigation on the Rhine: 1
Maritime Courts: 14
National Court of Asylum: 1
Court of First Instance for navigation on the Moselle: 1

Q043 (2014): The reduction of the number of specialised courts is primarily due to the suppression of 70 military pensions courts. The other specialised courts are: Children courts (155); Military pensions courts (36); the Rhine navigation court; commercial maritime courts (14); the National court for asylum right; the Court for the navigation on the Moselle. In contrast with 2010 and 2012 data, a part of the "other specialised courts" was distributed in the proposed categories, namely the agricultural land courts, the courts of rental cases, the Courts for enforcement of criminal sanctions and the courts of incapability litigation.The specialised interregional courts, competent to judge cases of organised crime were added.

Q043 (2013): The reduction of the number of specialised courts is primarily due to the suppression of 70 military pensions courts. The other specialised courts are: Children courts (155); Military pensions courts (36); the Rhine navigation court; commercial maritime courts (14); the National court for asylum right; the Court for the navigation on the Moselle. In contrast with 2010 and 2012 data, a part of the "other specialised courts" was distributed in the proposed categories, namely the agricultural land courts, the courts of rental cases, the Courts for enforcement of criminal sanctions and the courts of incapability litigation.The specialised interregional courts, competent to judge cases of organised crime were added.

Q043 (2012): There are 135 Commercial Courts and 8 mixed commercial courts (this of Mayotte is not included). The category "labour courts" subsumes 210 industrial courts and 6 labour courts. The category "insurance and/or social security courts" refers to the courts responsible for social security cases. The other specialised courts are: Police courts (3); local Police courts (3); Children courts (155); Incapacity Dispute courts (26); Agricultural land courts (281); Sentence enforcement courts (50); Military pensions courts (106); the Rhine navigation court; Commercial maritime courts (14); the Court for the navigation on Moselle. The military court of Paris was discontinued in January 2012. Its functions were transfered to a pole specialised in military matters in the High Court of Paris.

Q044 (2021): 661: this figure takes into account all courts of first instance, excluding Courts of appeal (CA). Sites hosting only a Court of appeal have therefore been excluded from this count. Sites hosting both a CA and a court of first instance have been counted only once (hence the difference of 44: 37 CAs occupying 44 sites), 43 of which are for the administrative order.
715: this figure takes into account all courts, whether on appeal or at first instance. When a court of first instance and a Court of appeal are located on the same site, they have been counted separately, including 53 for the administrative order.

Q044 (2020): "With regard to the judiciary, there are 576 courts of first instance - geographic locations. This figure takes into account, by number of sites, all the courts of first instance, excluding the second instance court. Sites hosting exclusively a second instance court have therefore been excluded from this count. Sites hosting both a CA and a trial court were counted only once. There were 619 Courts geographic locations counted. This figure takes into account, by number of sites, all the jurisdictions whether they are appeal or first instance. Moreover, when a first instance court and a second instance court are located on the same site, they have been counted twice (hence the difference of 43 with the previous question: 37 CA which occupy 43 sites).
As regards the administrative order, there are 42 first instance courts for the administrative order and 53 all courts for the administrative order. "

Q044 (2016): A reform could take place within the framework of the bill on Justice programming presented in 2018. If no court site should be closed, the organization could be modified, particularly at the level of the courts of appeal, whose map is very different from those of the current administrative regions. There could also be only one first instance court per department.

Q044 (2014): As of 1 September 2014, the high courts (TGI) were resettled in the towns of Saint-Gaudens, Saumur and Tulle. Moreover, seconded chambers (geographic locations) were created on the same date in Guingamp and Marmande and on 1 January 2015 in Millau. A draft law to modernise the justice provides that the litigation of social security affairs and disability will be brought together before the TGI. Small offences ruled before the District Court will be transferred to TGI; similarly, compensation for personal injury will be entirely the responsibility of the TGI.

Germany

Q042 (General Comment): Eventhough the German legal system generally knows three instances (first instance, appeal on questions of fact and law, appeal on questions of law only), the different kinds of courts do not correspond directly to the stages of appeal. Local Courts (Amtsgerichte) are first instance courts with the Regional Courts (Landgerichte) as next stage of appeal (exceptions apply in family matters). However, Regional Courts do not only serve as second instance courts but also deal with first instance cases. Whether a case is initially dealt with at a Local or Regional Court depends (among other things) on the value at dispute (civil cases) or on the kind of the suspected offence (criminal cases). Similarly the Higher Regional Courts (Oberlandesgerichte) may serve as second instance courts (for cases that were initially dealt with at Regional Courts or for cases in family matters) and as third/highest instance Courts for cases that were initiated at the Local Courts (criminal cases). Higher Regional Courts are also be responsible for some (rare) first instance cases in civil matters (e.g. model declaratory action) and criminal matters (e.g. high treason, treason and endangering external security).
The Constitutional Courts of the Länder and the Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) are not part of the the stages of appeal. Constitutional jurisdiction is also seen as seperate from general and specialised jurisdiction. Constitutional Courts review legislation with regard to constitutional provisions. The Federal Constitutional Court mainly assess alleged violations of base rights by public authorities. However, in order to have access to the Constitutional Courts, the regular path of legal proceedings must generally be exhausted.

Q042 (2021): 1.1 First instance courts include: 638 Local Courts, 115 Regional Courts
Regional Courts handle first as well as second instance cases. In 2021, Regional Courts registered 344 128 incoming first instance cases and 75 400 incoming second instance cases (civil and criminal matters). For further information see General Comment.
1.2 Second instance courts include: 24 Higher Regional Courts
Higher Regional Courts handle second and third instance cases as well as certain (few) first instance cases. Higher Regional Courts are the third and final instance with regard to criminal cases, that were originally initiated at the Local Courts. In 2021, Higher Regional Courts recorded 102 029 incoming second instance cases and 5 089 incoming third/last instance cases. For further information see General Comment.
1.3 Highest instance courts include: Federal Surpreme Court
The total number of specialised courts includes 16 Constitutional Courts of the Länder.

Q042 (2020): 1.1 First instance courts include: 638 Local Courts, 115 Regional Courts
1.2 Second instance courts include: 115 Regional Courts, 24 Higher Regional Courts
1.3 Highest instance courts include: 24 Higher Regional Courts, Federal Surpreme Court
The vertical consistency is not fulfilled, since the 115 Regional Courts appear as "First instance courts" (1.1) as well as "Second instance courts" (1.2) and 24 Higher Regional Courts appear as "Second Instance Courts"(1.2) as well as "Highest Instance Courts" (1.3).
For further information please consult the General Comment.
The total number of specialised courts includes 16 Constitutional Courts of the Länder.

Q043 (General Comment): It is noteworthy that depending on the value at dispute, commercial cases are dealt with at Local or Regional Courts, on application in a chamber established at the Regional Court for commercial cases. There are no separate commercial courts. Likewise, there are no independent rent and tenancies courts, enforcement courts or courts for insurance cases. Depending on the caseload, special panels of judges are established for this purpose at the Local and Regional Courts. Family cases are dealt with at first instance in special departments of the Local Courts (second instance: Higher Regional Courts). The Federal Armed Forces do not have any military courts of their own; its members are subject to civil jurisdiction. Juvenile courts do not exist as independet courts either. They are established at the Local Courts or Regional Courts, depending on the severity of the expected sentence and the type of offence. The Juvenile Courts may be composed of a single criminal judge sitting as youth judge or one or more jugdes together with lay youth assessors.

Q043 (2021): The category “other” covers:
18 Finance Courts (first instance)
16 Constitutional Courts of the Länder, the Federal Constitutional Court, Federal Patent Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)
With regard to the Constitutional Courts please see General Comment Q 42.

Q043 (2020): The category “other” covers:
18 Finance Courts (first instance)
16 Constitutional Courts of the Länder, the Federal Constitutional Court, Federal Patent Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Social Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)
With regard to the Constitutional Courts please see General Comment Q 42.

Q043 (2019): finance courts

Q043 (2018): Finance Courts

Q043 (2017): Finance courts

Q043 (2016): Other specialised 1st instance courts: Finance Courts

Q043 (2015): The data refer to the year 2014. At present, no more recent data are available.

Q043 (2014): In 2014, in comparison with 2012, the number of specialized first instance courts decreased of three labour courts in two Landers.

Q044 (General Comment): The figures in this section are taken from the chart "Number of Federal and State Courts" (https://www.bmjv.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF/Anzahl_der_Gerichte_des_Bundes_und_der_Laender.html) that does not distinguish between legal entities and geographic location of the courts. Generally, one legal entity equals one geographic location. A small number of courts may have a additional points of presence in other geographic locations. Since the exact number of geographic locations in comparison to legal entities is unknown, the figures from the chart "Number of Federal and State Courts" were used to answer this question as well.

Q044 (2018): The possibility of combining courts is being considered by individual Länder in order to reduce costs. The regional structures have proven effective.
On 5 November 2019, the Land Government of Schleswig-Holstein adopted a statutory instrument on the concentration of jurisdiction which combines existing concentrations of jurisdiction while adding further concentration provisions. The instrument will be promulgated at the end of the month.

Q044 (2016): The possibility of combining courts is being considered by individual Länder in order to reduce costs.

Greece

Q042 (2020): In highest instance courts include the Supreme Court(Areios Pagos). In First instance courts of general jurisdiction are included in the number 259, 196 local and District Criminal Courts and 63 courts of first degree.

Q043 (General Comment): In Greece, there are no special courts for the fields of law described in the question 43, besides those already mentioned. The Greek Constitution is reluctant to provide in the Greek legal system special courts. Instead, within the Courts of First Instance and Courts of Appeal of large cities, we have special Chambers, where the task of adjudicating in special categories of law (e.g. family law, commercial law, etc.) is assigned. Judges entrusted with such duties have usually the correspondent specific studies. As far as other special courts are concerned, special provisions regulate the operation of courts for juveniles, military, navy and air force courts.We clarify that the military,navy and air force courts are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of National Defense, therefore we have no further information.

Q043 (2021): There are no special courts for resolving Internet-related disputes.

Q043 (2020): Administrative courts include: in the first instance 30, in the second instance 9 and 1 Supreme Court(the Council of State).
Juvenile courts are subject to the Courts of First Instance, according to your instructions the choice changed from non-available to non applicable.
The military courts are under a different ministry, specifically the National Defense.
The higher instance other specialized courts is the Court of Auditors that is considered one of three supreme courts in Greece.

Q043 (2017): In Greece, there are no special courts for the fields of law described in the question 43, besides those already mentioned. The Greek Constitution is reluctant to provide in the Greek legal system special courts. Instead, within the Courts of First Instance and Courts of Appeal of large cities, we have special Chambers, where the task of adjudicating in special categories of law (e.g. family law, commercial law, etc.) is assigned. Judges entrusted with such duties have usually the correspondent specific studies. As far as other special courts are concerned, special provisions regulate the operation of courts for juveniles, military, navy and air force courts.

Q044 (2020): The total number of courts includes the Court of Auditors

Q044 (2014): According to 2014 data, the Law 1756/1988, article 2, as modified by the Law 4123/2013, provides for a reduction of the number of courts. Besides, the Law 1756/1988, article 4, as modified by the Law 4264/2014, provides for a change in the powers of courts.

Hungary

Q042 (General Comment): The Hungarian court system consits of the following courts: Kúria (1) – the Hungarian Supreme Court - its jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers adjudication of extraordinary remedies and appeals, adopting uniformity decisions. It also decides if municipal decrees are in compliance with higher level legislation. Regional courts of appeal (5) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from the regional courts (third instance in criminal cases). Regional courts (20) – their jurisdiction in criminal, civil, labour and administrative cases (only at 8 of the regional courts) covers the adjudication of appeals received from district courts and procedure at first instance in certain criminal and civil cases. District courts (113) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the procedures at first instance. The district courts in the seat of the regional courts have special competences in some cases (e.g. economic crimes). To be noted: administrative and labour courts (20) were dismissed on the 31st of March 2020. From this date Regional Courts deal with labour cases on first instance while administrative cases are dealt by eight Regional Court on a regional level.

Q042 (2020): The Hungarian court system is as follows: Kúria (1) – the Hungarian Supreme Court - its jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers adjudication of extraordinary remedies and appeals, adopting uniformity decisions. It also decides if municipal decrees are in compliance with higher level legislation. Regional courts of appeal (5) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from the regional courts (third instance in criminal cases). Regional courts (20) – their jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from district courts, administrative and labour courts, and procedure at first instance in certain criminal and civil cases. District courts (113) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the procedures at first instance. Out of the 113 district courts, the district courts in the seat of the regional courts have special competences in many cases. Administrative and labour courts (20) were dismissed on the 31st of March 2020. From this date Regional Courts deal with labour cases on first instance while administrative cases are dealth with by eight Regional Court on a regional level.

Q042 (2019): 113 District Courts (first instance courts of general jurisdiction)
20 Administrative and Labour Courts (specialized first instance courts)
20 Regional Courts (second instance courts of general jurisdiction + first instance courts in cases of higher importance)
5 Regional Courts of Appeal (second instance courts in cases of higher importance)
1 Supreme Court ("Kúria" - special judicial review)
It has to be noted that Administrative and Labour Courts are merged into the regional courts on the 31st of March 2020. Since 1st of April 2020 every regional court deals with labour cases on first instance (second instance are the regional courts of appeal) and 8 regional courts have special administrative law department dealing with first instance cases (seconf instance is the Supreme Court).

Q042 (2018): Two new district courts were established (one in 2017 in the city of Szigetszentmiklós, another one in 2019 in the city of Érd).
113 District Courts (first instance courts of general jurisdiction)
20 Administrative and Labour Courts (specialized first instance courts)
20 Regional Courts (second instance courts of general jurisdiction + first instance courts in cases of higher importance)
5 Regional Courts of Appeal (second instance courts in cases of higher importance)
1 Supreme Court (special judicial review)

Q042 (2017): All courts include :
112 District Courts
20 Regional Courts
20 Administrative and Labour Courts
5 Regional Courts of Appeal
1 Supreme Court (Kúria)
The Hungarian court system is as follows: Kúria (1) – the Hungarian Supreme Court - its jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers adjudication of extraordinary remedies and appeals, adopting uniformity decisions. It also decides if municipal decrees are in compliance with higher level legislation. Regional courts of appeal (5) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from the regional courts (third instance in criminal cases). Regional courts (20) – their jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from district courts, administrative and labour courts, and procedure at first instance in certain criminal and civil cases. District courts (112) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the procedures at first instance. The number of judges in the largest district court is 357, whereas the smallest court operates with one judge. Out of the 111 district courts, the district courts in the seat of the regional courts have special competences in many cases. Administrative and labour courts (20) – their jurisdiction covers procedures at first instance in individual and collective labour disputes and in administrative cases. First instance administrative and labour courts (20) started operating on 1 January 2013 as first instance specialized courts. Thus from this date the number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction is 112.

Q043 (General Comment): There are military departments at five Regional Courts and at one Regional Court of Appeal. Although they only deal with military related criminal cases, they are not considered as specialized courts as they are a part of the ordinary court system both in administrative and professional management.
Regional Courts deal with labour cases on first instance while administrative cases are dealt by eight Regional Court on a regional level.
Q043 (2020): “Administrative and labour courts (20) were dismissed on the 31st of March 2020. From this date Regional Courts deal with labour cases on first instance while administrative cases are dealt with by eight Regional Court on a regional level”.
Q044 (2018): According to proposed legislation an independent administrative court system may be established in the future.

Q044 (2016): Two new district courts will be established (one in 2017 in the city of Szigetszentmiklós, another one in 2019 in the city of Érd).
Q044 (2014): According to 2014 data, a new first instance (district) court will be established in the city of Érd on 01/01/2018.

Ireland

Q042 (General Comment): In Ireland, there are only three first instance courts (as legal entities) exercising general jurisdiction for the entire State (the High Court, the Circuit Court and the District Court). Each of those three courts has a single court president only, who exercises a nationwide remit for his/her court. The number of geographic locations reflects the physical location serving as seats or venues for the three jurisdictions.
Q042 (2016): The specialised courts referred to are the two Special Criminal Courts the jurisdiction of which generally relates to trial of terrorism- and organised crime-related offices.
The increase of one location over the figure provided for 2014 refers to the temporary relocation of the Dublin District Court's Drug Treatment Court in 2016.
Q043 (General Comment): The two specialised first instance courts listed above are Special Criminal Court No. 1 and Special Criminal Court No. 2. The latter was established in October 2015 and came into operation, sitting for the first time, in 2016. In previous cycles the category "other" (1) was referring to Special Criminal Court No. 1.
Other than distinctions between jurisdictional levels there is no specialisation - all judges within a court jurisdiction may be allocated to any category of case falling within the jurisdictional remit of the court concerned. Starting in 2013 a new cadre of specialist judges was created in the Circuit Court with specific jurisdiction in relation to certain types of personal insolvency remedy and certain pre-trial order making powers.
Ireland has a specialist regime for the trial of commercial proceedings in the form of the Commercial List of the High Court (known as the 'Commercial Court') but, as it is not a separate legal entity, being a list within and formally a part of the High Court, it is not included as a specialist court as such.

Q043 (2019): Legislation to provide for a Family Court has been proposed

Q044 (2018): The Assisted Decision-Making (Capacity) Act 2015 will, when commenced, replace the existing wardship regime for persons with capacity issues and introduce new decision support arrangements for such persons. New jurisdiction will, in particular , be conferred on the Circuit Court in respect of such arrangements. The current situation is that while some parts of the 2015 Act are commenced, others remain to be commenced.

Q044 (2016): The Assisted Decision-Making (Capacity) Act 2015 will, when commenced, replace the existing wardship regime for persons with capacity issues and introduce new decision support arrangements for such persons. New jurisdiction will, in particular , be conferred on the Circuit Court in respect of such arrangements.
Q044 (2014): According to 2014 data, legislation is in preparation for the creation of specialised family courts within the High, Circuit and District Courts.

Italy

Q042 (2018): In 2012-2013 we went through a major reform of the judicial map. In particular, a great number of justice of peace offices (initially 846) were shut down. However, each Italian municipality had (and still has) the opportunity to preserve the office at their own expenses. For this reason, each year a series of Justice of Peace offices administered by the municipality might be re-opened or closed. 3 justice of peace offices closed between 2017 and 2018.

Q042 (2017): In 2012-2013 we went through a major reform of the judicial map. In particular, a great number of justice of peace offices (initially 846) were shut down. However, each Italian municipality had (and still has) the opportunity to preserve the office at their own expenses. For this reason, each year a series of Justice of Peace offices administered by the municipality might be re-opened or closed.

Q043 (General Comment): Since 2014 in Italy there are 22 Brand Commercial courts (Tribunali delle imprese) that are legal entities of their own and not just internal court divisions for organizational purpose (such as labour, family etc.).
It is noteworthy that in Italy, some of the specialized first instance courts are not administered and financed by the Ministry of Justice. This is the case for the regional administrative courts, the regional audit commissions, the local tax commissions and military courts. These courts are not taken into consideration for the replies to questions 6, 46 and 52 for none of the exercises.
In respect of the 20 first instance administrative courts (legal entities) and their supreme court, it should be stressed that they have been encompassed within the total under question 43 for the last four exercises, but only since 2014 this approach is reflected in questions 91 and 99 (number of administrative law cases).
Moreover, in Italy specific matters (such as labour, family etc.) are dealt by specific divisions within the same Court. There are also 26 divisions called DDA (Direzioni Distrettuali Antimafia) which deal specifically with mafia and organized crime.

Q043 (2021): The appeal of some specialized courts (e.g. commercial courts, juvenile courts) are dealt by the general jurisdiction appeal courts.
Specific subject matters (e.g labour, insolvency, family, fight against terrorism and organised crime) are dealt by specific divisions within general jurisdiction courts. See general comment for details.

Q043 (2020): Tax courts fall into the “Other” category.
The appeal of some specialized courts (e.g. commercial courts, juvenile courts) are dealt by the general jurisdiction appeal courts.
Specific subject matters (e.g labour, insolvency, family, fight against terrorism and organised crime) are dealt by specific divisions within general jurisdiction courts. See general comment for details.

Q043 (2019): The category “other” subsumes 29 Minor (or Juvenile) Courts and 103 Tax Courts

Q043 (2018): The category “other” category subsumes 29 Minor (or Juvenile) Courts and 103 Tax Courts.

Q043 (2017): Other: 29 Minor (or Juvenile) Courts + 103 provincial tax commissions

Q043 (2016): OTHER: 29 Minor (or Juvenile) Courts + 103 Local Tax Commissions

Q043 (2013): In September 2013, the Italian judicial system implemented an extensive reorganization of the territorial distribution of offices with the closing (by merger) of 30 Tribunals, 30 Prosecution offices, 220 branches of Tribunals and 346 Peace Judges.

Q044 (2016): Enhancing the specialization of judges / courts. In particular, the judiciary authorities are evaluating the introduction of specific courts for family and personal matters (''Berruti'' reform). Increased competence of Business Courts. Establishment of specialized sections on matters such as immigration, international protection and free movement of citizens of the European Union.
Revision of the appeal system in order to reduce the appeal rate.

Latvia

Q042 (2021): In the total number of specialised courts - legal entities are included 1 Administrative court, 1 Administrative Regional (appeal) Court and 1 Economic Court, what was created and started operates from 31.03.2021. in Latvia. From 01.08.2022. is created and operates Riga City Court, merging 3 courts in Riga city territory. The number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction is indicated as it was in 2021, not including Riga City Court as 1 court in Riga. In Latvia is also Constitutional court - which within the jurisdiction specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and in this Law, shall adjudicate matters regarding the conformity of laws and other regulatory enactments with the Constitution, as well as other matters regarding which jurisdiction is conferred upon it by this Law. The Constitutional court is not included in the total number of the courts.

Q042 (2020): In the total number of specialised courts - legal entities are included 1 Administrative court and 1 Administrative Regional (appeal) court. Starting from 31.03.2021. in Latvia is created and operates the Economic Court. The Economic Court is not included in the total number of specialized courts. In Latvia is also Constitutional court - which within the jurisdiction specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and in this Law, shall adjudicate matters regarding the conformity of laws and other regulatory enactments with the Constitution, as well as other matters regarding which jurisdiction is conferred upon it by this Law. The Constitutional court is not included in the total number of the courts.

Q042 (2019): Since the reform of March, 2018, the number of first instance courts has been reduced to 10 legal entities at first instance (9 general + 1 administrative). There are also 6 appelate courts and Supreme court. In 2019 was completed reform of Land Register Units, which are included in the composition of district (city) courts. The number of legal entities doesn't changes, but number of courts per geographic locations therefore differs.
The data regarding the geographic locations are indicated on 31.12.2019.

Q042 (2018): Since the reform of March, 2018, the number of first instance courts has been reduced to 10 legal entities at first instance (9 general + 1 administrative). There are also 6 appelate courts and Supreme court.
Q042 (2017): The number of first instance courts (legal entities) is indicated on 31.12.2017., in Latvia starting from 2015 till March, 2018 was a reform where court map was revised. The number of first instance courts (legal entities) starting from March, 2018 is 9. As regards the specialised court - there is only one specialised court the Adminsitrative court with 5 court houses.
Q042 (2016): There is only one specialised court the administrative court with 5 court houses

Q043 (General Comment): In Latvia, only the Administrative court can be considered as a 1st instance specialized court (which is divided into 5 court houses). As to the category “military courts”, the reply NA is justified by the fact that according to the Law on Judicial Power, judicial power in the Republic of Latvia is vested in district (city) courts, regional courts, the Supreme Court and the Constitutional Court, but in state of emergencies or during war – also military courts. The rest of the courts in Latvia are not established, and therefore in this case should be NAP.

Q043 (2021): Military courts is established in state of emergency or during a war. On 1 July 2020, amendments to the Law on Judicial Power came into force, providing for the establishment of the Economic Court, which is competent for both certain types of civil and criminal cases. Accordingly, the Court is competent for specific commercial disputes and criminal cases, which cause significant damage to the business environment and economic development. The Economic Court is indicated as Commercial Court. As for Administrative court - first instance court is Administrative District Court and for higher instance is indicated Administrative Regional (appeal) instance Court.

Q043 (2020): Military courts is established in state of emergency or during a war. On 1 July 2020, amendments to the Law on Judicial Power came into force, providing for the establishment of the Economic Court, which is competent for both certain types of civil and criminal cases. Accordingly, the Court is competent for specific commercial disputes and criminal cases, which cause significant damage to the business environment and economic development. The Economic Court is not counted yet in the total number of specialized courts, because it will start its action on 31st March 2021. As for Administrative court - first instance court is Administrative District Court and for higher instance is indicated Administrative Regional (appeal) instance Court.

Q043 (2019): There is only Administrative court in Latvia. On July 1, 2020, amendments to the Law “On Judical Power” entered into force. The Amendments provides for the establishment of the Court of Economic Affairs. The Economic Court will take office on 1 January 2021.
Q043 (2018): There is only Administrative court in Latvia.

Q043 (2016): There is only one specialised court the administrative court with 5 court houses

Q044 (2021): All the courts (geographic locations) - Administrative District Court in Riga and Administrative Regional Court is located in one building, there is counted as 1 court per geographical location and indicated in the number of first instance courts. The same situation is in Vidzeme region - Vidzeme Regional Court Madona Court house and Vidzeme District Court is located in 1 building, there is counted as 1 court per geographical location and indicated in the number of first instance courts.

Q044 (2018): Reform was finished in March 2018. In its course first instance court count was reduced to 10 (9 first instance + 1 first instance Administrative court).
In year 2020/2021 there is a plan of creating a court for economical cases that would be a specialised 1st instance court.

Q044 (2016): Starting from 1 of February 2016, the reform has been introduced in Latgale (administrative region of Latvia). A number of district (city) courts in territory of Latgale regional court was decreased from six to two district (city) courts (Balvi District Court and Ludza District Court had been incorporated into Rezekne District Court; Kraslava district court and Preili District Court had been incorporated into Daugavpils District Court).
in 2016, Ministry of Justice make preparatory work to make court house reform in two district (city) court in the Rigas region. Accordingly, starting from 1 of February 2017, the City of Rīga Zemgale Urban District Court has been reorganized and conjoined with the City of Rīga Kurzeme District Court and changed the name of this court to City of Rīga Pārdaugavas Court.

Q044 (2014): In the frame of the 2014 evaluation, it has been stressed that the Judicial Council and the Cabinet of Ministers have initiated the gradual unification of the territory of operation of district (city) courts, through the implementation of the reform of the Riga court region. From March 2015, the Sigulda Court is attached to the Riga District Court, while the Riga City Central District Court was attached to the Riga City Vidzeme District Court.
The Judicial Council’s decision of 8 June 2015 confirmed the restructuring plan concerning the Jurmala City Court. According to the plan, the latter must be attached to the Riga District Court from August 2015. The review of the judicial map is intended to increase the efficiency of the court system and the quality of the judicial activity, to reduce the processing times and to even out the judicial capacity. The reform is still going on.

Lithuania

Q042 (General Comment): 1.1. 12 district courts;
1.2. 5 regional courts (regional courts are appeal instance for judgments, decisions, rulings and orders of district courts as well as first instance courts adjudicating certain categories of cases; in this table regional courts are counted only as second instance courts of general jurisdiction) and the Court of Appeal of Lithuania;
2. 2 regional administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.
Regional courts as the first instance courts examine criminal cases in which persons are accused of having committed serious and very serious crimes, as well as cases in which the accused were the President of the Republic of Lithuania, members of the Seimas (Parliament) or Government, judges, judges or prosecutors of the Constitutional Court at the time of the commission of the criminal act.
Regional courts as the first instance deal with civil cases in which the amount of the claim is greater than 28,510 EUR(except for family legal relations cases due to the division of property), copyright cases, civil public tender legal relations cases, bankruptcy and restructuring cases, according to the statement of the bank's temporary administrator on reduction of the bank's share capital, cases in which one of the parties is a foreign state, according to lawsuits regarding the forced sale of shares, due to the investigation of the activity of a legal entity, and other cases.
Only the Vilnius Regional Court, with exclusive rights, in accordance with the laws in force, as a court of first instance hears cases regarding disputes provided for in the Patent Law of the Republic of Lithuania, regarding disputes provided for in the Trademark Law of the Republic of Lithuania, regarding adoption based on requests of foreign citizens

Q042 (2021): Regional courts are counted only as second instance; general comment has been updated in view of the changed assignment of the regional courts to the second instance only.
Q042 (2020): 1.1. 12 district courts and 5 regional courts (the latter are adjudicating certain categories of cases as first instance courts);
1.2. 5 regional courts and the Court of Appeal of Lithuania;
2. 2 regional administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.
Q042 (2018): Number of courts (as legal entities) in Lithuania decreased from 1st January 2018 according to the Law on Reorganization of Courts of the Republic of Lithuania (Law of 23rd Juin, 2016 No. XII-2474). Instead of 49 district courts (as legal entities) there are now 12 district courts (some of them have court houses), instead of 5 regional administrative courts there are now 2 of them (one has houses). The number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction (legal entities) in point 42.1 implies 5 regional courts (of general jurisdiction) which are first instance for criminal and civil cases assigned to its jurisdiction by law. These courts also are appeal instance for judgements, decisions, rulings and orders of district courts, so their number is also included in the number of all courts at point 42.3.

Q042 (2017): From January 1, 2018, there are 22 left (17 first instance courts, 2 first instance courts of special jurisdiction, 2 courts of appeal (1 of them is specialized court) and 1 court of cassation).
Q042 (2014): As regional courts of Lithuania function not only as courts of appeal, but also as courts of first instance, for 2014, the number of these courts is also included in the number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction. This was not the case in earlier years.
Q044 (General Comment): There are 59 1st instance courts locations: 12 district courts (49 locations), 5 regional courts (5 locations) of general jurisdiction and 2 regional administrative courts (5 locations).
For all the courts 62 courts locations: The Supreme Court of Lithuania, the Court of Appeal of Lithuania, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania and 59 1st instance courts locations.
Q044 (2020): There are 59 1st instance courts locations: 12 district courts (49 locations), 5 regional courts (5 locations) of general jurisdiction and 2 regional administrative courts (5 locations).
For all the courts 62 courts locations: The Supreme Court of Lithuania, the Court of Appeal of Lithuania, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania and 59 1st instance courts locations.
Q044 (2018): Analysis and discussion on the need and possibility to decrease the number of court houses are initiated.

Q044 (2016): From January 1, 2018, there shall be 12 district courts (instead of 49) and 2 regional administrative courts (instead of 5).

Luxembourg

Q042 (General Comment): "42.1.1: three justices of the peace and two district courts
42.1.2: one Court of Appeal 42.1.3: one Court of Cassation
42.2: Total specialized courts (all instances) Q43"

Q042 (2020): "In addition to the courts proper, the law of 27 July 1997 on the organization of the Constitutional Court established this court, which is seized, on a preliminary basis, when a question relating to the conformity of a law to the Constitution arises before a court of the judicial or administrative order. It rules, by means of a judgment, on the conformity of laws with the Constitution, with the exception of those concerning the approval of treaties.
When a party raises a question concerning the conformity of a law with the Constitution before a court of the judicial or administrative order, that court is obliged to refer the matter to the Constitutional Court, except when it considers that a decision on the question raised is not necessary to render its judgment, that the question is unfounded or that the Constitutional Court has already ruled on a question with the same object.
If a court considers that a question of conformity of a law with the Constitution arises and that a decision on this point is necessary to render its judgment, it must raise it of its own motion after first inviting the parties to present their observations.
The parties are admitted to conclude and plead before the Constitutional Court through the ministry of a lawyer registered in list I of the tables drawn up annually by the Bar Associations.
The judgments of the Constitutional Court are published in the Official Journal of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg within thirty days of their delivery. (Portal of Justice: https://justice.public.lu/fr/organisation-justice/cour-constitutionnelle.html) "

Q042 (2017): 42.1: 3 justices of the peace and 2 district courts
42.2: Please note that the total of 043 is not identical to the total in 042, as most of the specialized courts are in fact specialized sections of a general court. E.g. the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court (tribunal d'arrondissement). Only the administrative, military and 1st instance social security courts are selfstanding.

Q042 (2016): 42.1: 3 justices of the peace and 2 district courts
42.2: Please note that the total of 043 is not identical to the total in 042, as most of the specialized courts are in fact specialized sections of a general court. E.g. the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court (tribunal d'arrondissement). Only the administrative, military and 1st instance social security courts are selfstanding.

Q043 (General Comment): Courts of general jurisdiction are organized into specialized sections. For example, the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court. Only the administrative, military and social security courts of first instance are autonomous.

Q043 (2020): Pour 2020, seules les entités juridiques ont été prises en considération dans le tableau.

Q043 (2017): Please note that the total of 043 is not identical to the total in 042, as most of the specialized courts are in fact specialized sections of a general court. E.g. the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court (tribunal d'arrondissement). Only the administrative, military and 1st instance social security courts are selfstanding.

Q043 (2016): Please note that the total of 043 is not identical to the total in 042, as most of the specialized courts are in fact specialized sections of a general court. E.g. the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court (tribunal d'arrondissement). Only the administrative, military and 1st instance social security courts are selfstanding.

Q043 (2014): Most of the areas mentioned in the question are within the competence of district courts (commercial cases, insolvency cases, family law cases and all criminal cases except for offenses that are under the jurisdiction of justices of peace) and justices of peace (labour law cases, rental cases). The indicated total is a purely statistical information which does not reflect the reality.

Q043 (2012): Matters concerning trade and family law are dealt with at the level of district courts, while matters pertaining to labour law and rental cases are within the competence of the justices of peace.

Malta

Q042 (2021): The total number of Specialised Courts has increased to 8 because of the addition of the Constitutional Court as a second instance specialised court.

Q042 (2020): The 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction are:
- the Court of Magistrates, Civil Jurisdiction (competency up to Euros 15,000)
- the Civil Court, First Hall (civil cases above Euros 15,000)

The 2nd instance courts of general jurisdiction are:
- the Civil Court of Appeal, Inferior Jurisdiction - the Civil Court of Appeal, Superior Jurisdiction

In the Maltese judicial system, there are only 2 instances of courts, hence Q1.3 is marked as NAP.
The increase in the number of courts as legal entities reflects the addition of the criminal courts to the above data, namely:
- 1st Instance Courts: Court of Magistrates Criminal Jurisdiction and Criminal Court
- 2nd Instance Courts: Criminal Court of Appeal in its Inferior and Superior Jurisdiction

Q042 (2018): In 2018, the Commercial Division was set up in order to hear cases filed under the Companies Act that include Insolvency cases. This new specialised first instance court is the reason behind the increase in the number of courts quoted at 42.2 above.

Q043 (General Comment): The number of specialised courts includes non-criminal, administrative and criminal courts established as legal entities in line with the CEPEJ methodology. The seven (7) 1st Instance specialised courts referred to in Q43 are the Rent Regulation Board, the Land Arbitration Board, the Rural Leases Control Board, the Small Claims Tribunal, the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction, the Administrative Review Tribunal and the Juvenile Court. In addition, we have included the Constitutional Court as a 2nd Instance specialised court. Other courts previously counted as specialised courts, such as the Family Court and the Commercial Court, are divisions of the Civil Court, First Hall, and as such are now being included with the 1st Instance Courts of General Jurisdiction.

Q043 (2021): The first instance specialised courts are:
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction
- the Juvenile Court

Under the second instance specialised courts, we are including the Constitutional Court which is a court that deals exclusively with constitutional cases.

Q043 (2020): A number of courts that used to be previously identified as specialised courts, are not being categorised this time, given that they all make part of the First Hall, General Jurisdiction Court. These are:
- The Commercial Court (including insolvency cases)
- The Family Court

The identified specialised courts listed under 'Other specialised courts' are:
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction

The Juvenile Court is a specialised criminal court.

Q043 (2019): The courts referred to under 'Other specialised 1st Instance courts' include:
- The Civil Court, First Hall
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction

Q043 (2018): The courts referred to under 'Other specialised 1st Instance courts' include:
- The Civil Court, First Hall
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction

Q043 (2017): The other specialised 1st Instance courts include:
- the Civil Court, First Hall
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction - the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal

Q043 (2016): The other specialised 1st Instance courts include:
- the Civil Court, First Hall
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal

Q044 (2021): The Juvenile Court is a first instance specialised court that is located outside of the main court building in Valletta. We are therefore reflecting this different geographic location in the updated figures in Q44.

Q044 (2016): Throughout 2017, work was carried out in order to introduce a commercial division within the Civil Court in order to facilitate cases filed under the Companies Act. The bill is currently undergoing the legislative process that would see it being enacted as law by the end of the year. The Commercial Division will become operative in 2018.

Netherlands

Q042 (General Comment): Since 2013 and following the implementation of the reform related to the reorganization of the judicial map, the number of district courts was reduced from 19 in 2010 to 11 in 2013 and 2014. Moreover, this reform resulted in the closure of sub-district court locations due to which the number of geographic locations decreased from 64 in 2010 to 40 in 2013 and 2014.

Q042 (2021): Second instance courts of general jurisdiction handle civil, criminal and tax cases.
There are two additional courts that do not seem to fit this categorization by instance, acting in the area of administrative law. Some administrative law cases (tax cases) are handled by first and second instance courts of general jurisdiction. Other administrative cases are handeled by the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, also known as the Administrative High Court for Trade and Industry (College van van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven). This is a specialized administrative court, which rules on disputes in the area of social-economic administrative law, and appeals for specific laws. The tribunal hears both first and second instance cases. Categorized as a specialized court.
The Central Appeals Tribunal (Centrale Raad van Beroep) is a court of appeal mainly active in legal areas pertaining to social security and civil service. In these areas, it is also the highest judicial authority. In some cases, it is the first and sole instance. This court does not exactly fit the distinction of the table above, but categorized as a specialized court.
The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State is the highest administrative court with general jurisdiction in the Netherlands. It hears various types of appeals (e.g. members of the public / associations / commercial companies against governmental bodies, or between public authorities). This court does not exactly fit the distinction of the table above, but categorized as a specialized court.
For more information, see https://www.rechtspraak.nl/English/Judicial-system-and-legislation/Pages/Special-Tribunals.aspx.
Note that the Supreme Court (highest instance court of general jurisdiction) does not retry the case itself, but judges whether the judges at the first and second instance applied the law correctly in the judgment, and whether the procedure was correctly followed (cassation, potential quashing of judgment).

Q042 (2020): There are 11 first instance courts (Rechtbanken).
There are 4 second instance courts of general jurisdiction: 4 courts of appeal (Second instance, Gerechtshoven) that handle civil cases, criminal cases and tax cases.
There is 1 highest instance court of general jurisdiction, the Supreme Court (Hoge Raad), the highest instance court in The Netherlands.
There are three specialized courts (see comment Q43).

Q042 (2017): same as last year

Q043 (General Comment): The Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, also known as the Administrative High Court for Trade and Industry (College van van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven) is a specialized administrative court, which rules on disputes in the area of social-economic administrative law, and appeals for specific laws. The tribunal hears both first and second instance cases, but is categorized as a first instance court.
The Central Appeals Tribunal is counted as first instance administrative court as well, as it hears both first and second instances, in some cases. The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State is counted as Administrative court at the highest instance, although it is a division of the Council of the Judiciary and not part of the organisational structure of the judiciary.
There is no separate military court, but there is a military chamber in one of the district courts.

Q043 (2021): See also comment at Q42 on the other special (not specialized) appeal tribunals.
Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, also known as the Administrative High Court for Trade and Industry (College van van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven). This is a specialized administrative court, which rules on disputes in the area of social-economic administrative law, and appeals for specific laws. The tribunal hears both first and second instance cases, but is categorized as a first instance court.
The Central Appeals Tribunal (Centrale Raad van Beroep) is a court of appeal mainly active in legal areas pertaining to social security and civil service. In these areas, it is also the highest judicial authority. In some cases, it is the first and sole instance.
The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State is the highest administrative court with general jurisdiction in the Netherlands. It hears various types of appeals (e.g. members of the public / associations / commercial companies against governmental bodies, or between public authorities).

Q043 (2020): The specialized courts are:
Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal: the administrative High Court for trade and industry. This tribunal is a specialized administrative court that rules on disputes in the area of social-economic administrative law. Categorized as administrative court.
The Central Appeals Tribunal is the highest judicial authority in areas of social security and civil service. Categorized as other.

Q043 (2017): same as last year

Q043 (2015): Currently the commercial court in the Netherlands is the specialized court CBb. Per January first 2017 starts the Netherlands Commercial Court (NCC).

Q044 (2021): First instance: the first instance courts, and the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal are included.
All courts: first instance, second and highest instance courts of general jurisdiction are included, as well as the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, Central Appeals Tribunal and Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State.
First instance geo.locations:
-33 first instance geo.location of general jurisdiction, with 4 locations only housing a Justice of the Peace.
-1 Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal. Counted separately, although located at the same location as a first instance court of general jurisdiction, as it is not the same court, but a separate, specialized court (different than previous evaluation). See Q43 for why this is counted as a first instance court.
All courts geo.locations:
-34 first instance geo.locations (see above).
-6 second instance geo.locations of general jurisdiction, of which 4 are located at the same geo.location as a first instance court.
-1 Supreme Court, located at a separate location.
-1 Central Appeals Tribunal, located at the same geo.location as a first instance court. Counted separately as it is not the same court.
-1 Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State, located at a separate location.

Q044 (2020): In one case (of 43), a first instance court of general jurisdiction, a specialized first instance court, and a court of appeal are housed at the same site (adding 2 sites according to the explanatory note).
In 3 cases, a first instance court of gen.jur. and a court of appeal are housed at the same site (adding 3 sites according to the explanatory note).
In 1 case, a f.i. court of gen.jur. and a specialized second instance court are housed at the same site (adding 1 site according to the explanatory note).
Finally, the Supreme Court, 1 specialized second instance court, and 2 appeal courts are housed at unique locations (adding 4 sites according to the explanatory note).

Q044 (2016): Possibility of closing subdistrict court facility?

Q044 (2014): According to 2014 data, the reforms regarding the merging of courts mentioned on the occasion of the 2012 evaluation have been implemented.

Poland

Q042 (General Comment): The Polish court structure is characterized by four levels of courts but only three instances. Basically, there are district courts which are first instance courts, regional courts which are first and second instance courts, and appellate courts which are second instance courts. The highest instance courts are the Supreme Court, the Supreme Administrative Court and the Constitutional Tribunal.

Q042 (2021): The table indicating the content of:
1.1 first instance courts (district + regional courts), 1.2 second (appellate courts) , 1.3 third instance courts (cassation of the judgment) (Supreme Court) of general jurisdiction.

Q042 (2020): The table indicating the content of:
1.1 first instance courts (district + regional courts), 1.2 second (appellate courts) , 1.3 third instance courts (cassation of the judgment) (Supreme Court) of general jurisdiction.

Q042 (2018): .

Q042 (2017): 42.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - common courts (318 regional courts, 45 district courts).
42.2 First instance specialised courts - 16 administrative courts, 9 military courts.
42.3 All the courts - the Supreme Court, common courts (318 regional courts, 45 district courts, 11 appeal courts), administrative courts (voivodship administrative courts (16), the Supreme Administrative Court), military courts (regional military courts (7), district military courts (2)).

Q042 (2016): 42.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - common courts (318 regional courts, 45 district courts).
42.2 First instance specialised courts - 16 administrative courts, 9 military courts.
42.3 All the courts - the Supreme Court, common courts (318 regional courts, 45 district courts, 11 appeal courts), administrative courts (16 voivodship administrative courts. the Supreme Administrative Court), militry courts (9 regional military courts, 2 district military courts). The differences between presented data and the data from 2014 edition is likely to be due to the restoration of District Courts, abolished and converted to divisions of larger units in 2013.
The difference in courts number between this (363) and previous evaluation cycle (287) is probably caused by a significant organizational reform of polish court system, which took place in 2013. Almost eighty small district courts were merged with larger entities. Since 2015 the reform has been reversing, which has resulted in an increase in the number of the courts.

Q042 (2012): In 2012, there was a structural change concerning District courts. Some of them were transformed into divisions of other courts.

Q043 (2020): There are 7 military courts of first instance and 2 military courts of higher instance in Poland.

Q043 (2019): It is noteworthy that the Land and Mortgage Courts which are within the structure of the common court system deal with specific topics, but they are departments.
Besides, the National Court Register and Pledge Registry Departments are business divisions.
The EU Trademark and Community Design Court (which existed in the XXII Division of the District Court in Warsaw)- functioned from 2004 until the creation of intellectual property courts, which took place on 1 July 2020. Cases in the field of intellectual property belong to the jurisdiction of selected District Courts (Article 47990 of the Code of Civil Procedure), while the District Court in Warsaw (XXII Division) has exclusive jurisdiction in matters of intellectual property concerning computer programs, inventions, utility models, topography of integrated circuits, plant varieties and company secrets of a technical nature.
The Court of Competition and Consumer Protection is a special department functioning within the District Court in Warsaw. In the current state of law, the scope of activity of the 17th Department of the Court of Competition and Consumer Protection includes the handling of the following cases in court proceedings of appeals and complaints against decisions and orders issued by the government: the President of the Office of Competition and Consumer Protection, the President of the Energy Regulatory Office, the President of the Railway Transport Office, the President of the Office of Electronic Communications.
When it comes to matters from lease or tenancy agreements - as long as these matters are of an economic nature, they are recognized by business departments, as are matters related to new technologies and the Internet space.

Q044 (2020): Regarding point 44, it should be noted that in the previous evaluation cycles (2016, 2017, 2018, 2019) the answer in terms of the number of all courts as geographical locations was 401, while in 2020 it is 494.
The figure of 494 indicated in 2020 is the sum of the common, administrative and military courts of first and second instance and the Supreme Court by geographic location (i.e. including the subdivisions). To the number of courts of first instance by geographical location (item 44 in line 1 - all common, administrative, military courts of first instance with localised divisions: number of courts 433) was added the number of 61 courts: - regional courts: 46; - courts of appeal: 11; - military courts: 2; - Supreme Administrative Court: 1; - Supreme Court: 1;
Total: 494 (433 + 61).
The discrepancy is due to the adoption of a different method of data presentation in 2020 (by geographical location). In compliance with the Explanatory note, the 2020 data show first-instance courts (line 1), and further all courts (line 2) together with all seats in different locations, which in the realities of the Polish legal system should be understood as a necessity to show the number of courts together with local divisions.

Q044 (2016): It is considered to reduce the number of district courts which are responsible for land and mortgage registers or abolishing external branches in district courts.

Portugal

Q042 (2020): 1.1 Courts of general jurisdiction and proximity divisions;
1.2. 2nd Instance Courts (Tribunal Relação de Lisboa, Coimbra, Porto, Évora e Guimarães).
1.3. Supreme Justice Court

Q042 (2019): Regarding Q 42.1 the decrease of the total number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction is accompanied by an increase of certain types of first instance courts (please consult answers provided to Q 43).
Regarding Q 42.2, the total corresponds to first instance specialised courts of judicial courts and administrative and tax courts.
Under our Constitution, we have two set of courts: judicial courts, which have general jurisdiction in civil/commercial and criminal matters and encompass specialized courts, and administrative and tax courts, whose role is to settle disputes arising out of administrative and tax relations. These latter are specialised in this domain only.
In order to be rigourous and coherent with Q 43, we have included first instance administrative and tax courts. The total corresponds to 418 judicial courts + 17 administrative/tax courts.

Q042 (2018): These data correspond to the values given for the last scoreboard.
The differences registered result from the changes to the judicial organization (Law n. 40-A/2016, 22 December) in force since January 1, 2017.
42.1 the number of 1st instance courts with general jurisdiction decreased due to the increase of specialized courts.
Accordingly, 20 courts that were closed in 2014 were re-enacted as proximity judgments, new family sections were created as well as new sections with generic jurisdiction.

Q042 (2017): The differences registered result from the changes to the judicial organization (Law n. 40-A/2016, 22 December) in force since January 1, 2017.
42.1 the number of 1st instance courts with general jurisdiction decreased due to the increase of specialized courts. Accordingly, 20 courts that were closed in 2014 were re-enacted as proximity judgments, new family sections were created as well as new sections with generic jurisdiction.

Q042 (2014): As a result of the new Judicial Organization Reform, the number of specialized first instance courts increased in 2014, while the enlargement of the court districts has been promoted. The reform melted the former judicial districts into 23 judicial districts, each containing two or more units, according to the demographic and economic reality of the respective geographic area. The difference between Q42.2 and Q43 is due to the inclusion of the 20 administrative courts in Q43. In Portugal, the administrative jurisdiction is autonomous, independent from the civil jurisdiction.

Q043 (General Comment): Q.43 -total:The number given under Q43.1.1 includes 17 first instance courts and 3 higher instance courts of administrative jurisdiction that are not included under Q.42.2. Administrative courts are part of another jurisdiction and under our law cannot be considered specialized courts.

Q043 (2020): «Commercial courts» deal with, inter alia, winding up of the company, insolvency and suspension and revocation of company resolutions.
«Internet related disputes»: only for Internet domain system (DNS) issues, which are under the jurisdiction of the Intelectual Property Court; for all other Internet related issues, general jurisdiction courts are competent. Internet related disputes were not included in the number of specialised courts for previous cycles.
«Other specialised courts": includes all other courts that are not listed in the categories above.
This category includes Civil Central Judicial Divisions, Criminal Central Judicial Divisions, Civil Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Criminal Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Petty Criminality Local; Proximity Judicial Divisions, Criminal Examination Judicial Divisions, Enforcement Judicial Divisions, Central Criminal Examination Court, Competition Court and Maritime Court.

Q043 (2019): This category includes Civil Central Judicial Divisions, Criminal Central Judicial Divisions, Civil Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Criminal Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Petty Criminality Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Criminal Examination Judicial Divisions, Enforcement Judicial Divisions, Central Criminal Examination Court, Intelectual Property Court, Competition Court and Maritime Court.

Q043 (2018): Changes to the judicial organization (Law n. 40-A/2016, 22 December) are in force since January 1, 2017.

Q043 (2017): Changes to the judicial organization (Law n. 40-A/2016, 22 December) are in force since January 1, 2017.
Other specialised 1st instance courts include, among others: Criminal Instruction Courts, Maritime Courts; Intelectual Property and Competition Court; Enforcement Courts.
Law 31/2012, 14 August, put in force the Rent and tenancy section (Balcão Nacional do Arrendamento) that is functioning since 8
January 2013.

Q043 (2015): In 2013-2014, the Reform of the Portuguese Judicial system was implemented. One of the major goals of this reform was to set up specialised courts on a national level, which led to a significant increase of commercial courts compared to previous years.

The difference between Q42.2 and Q43 is due to the inclusion of the 20 administrative courts in Q43. In Portugal, the administrative jurisdiction is autonomous, independent from the civil jurisdiction and cannot be considered as specialised courts.

Other courts:
Other specialised 1st instance courts include: Criminal Instruction Courts, Maritime Courts; Intelectual Property and Competition Court; Enforcement Courts.
Law 31/2012, 14 August, put in force the Rent and tenancy section (Balcão Nacional do Arrendamento) that is functioning since 8 January 2013

Q043 (2014): In 2013-2014, the Reform of the Portuguese Judicial system was implemented. One of the major goals of this reform was to set up specialised courts on a national level, which led to a significant increase of commercial courts compared to previous years.

For 2014, the category "other" subsumes as in 2012 Criminal Instruction Courts, Maritime Courts, Intellectual Property and Competition Court and Enforcement Courts. Additionally, the Rent and tenancy section (Balcão Nacional do Arrendamento) has been established by law in August 2012 and is functioning since 8 January 2013.

Q043 (2012): For 2012, the category “other” encompasses Criminal Instruction Courts, Maritime Courts, Intellectual Property and Competition Court and Enforcement Courts.

Q044 (2020): The difference between 2019 and 2020 is justified by the increase in new buildings.

Q044 (2018): Law n.º 19/2019, 19th February.
The recent amendments to the Law of the Organization of the Judiciary System are intended to ensure the reciprocal proximity of justice and citizens in two key segments: criminal jurisdiction and family and minors jurisdiction.
These new amendements aim to facilitate people's access to courts and combat the desertification of the interior regions of the country.

Q044 (2016): Law n.40-A/2016, 22 December and Decree-Law n. 86/2016, 27 December.
On the 1st of january 2017, 20 extinct districts were reopened, as well as 23 of the so-called proximity sections, in which judicial acts may now be concluded.

Romania

Q042 (General Comment): In Romania there are 175 judecatorii, first instance courts of general jurisdiction.

Q042 (2021): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.
The number of „judecatorii” has decreased by one between 2019-2020 because the activity of Judecătoria Insuratei was suspended so it no longer appears in the statistics. 175 represent the first instance courts with general jurisdiction in this matter, even if tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court may also judge first instance cases. Starting from 2020 the methodology of presentation of data changed and only “judecatorii” are counted as first instance courts of general jurisdiction, even if tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court may also judge first instance cases.

Q042 (2020): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.
The number of „judecatorii” has decreased by one between 2019-2020 because the activity of Judecătoria Insuratei was suspended so it no longer appears in the statistics. 175 represent the first instance courts with general jurisdiction in this matter, even if tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court may also judge first instance cases. Starting from 2020 the methodology of presentation of data changed and only “judecatorii” are counted as first instance courts of general jurisdiction, even if tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court may also judge first instance cases.

Q042 (2017): There are 176 first instance courts, 42 tribunals and 15 courts of appeals. All of the first instance courts deal with cases in first instance, but also the tribunals and the courts of appeal may have material or personal jurisdiction in first instance.

Q042 (2016): There are 176 first instance courts, 42 tribunals and 15 courts of appeals. All of the first instance courts deal with cases in first instance, but also the tribunals and the courts of appeal may have material or personal jurisdiction in first instance.

Q043 (General Comment): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.

Q043 (2020): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.

Q044 (General Comment): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.
It should be mentioned that some of the first instance specialised courts share the location with „judecatorii”.

Q044 (2020): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.
It should be mentioned that some of the first instance specialised courts share the location with „judecatorii”.

Q044 (2014): According to 2014 data, a bill on closing 30 courts and 30 attached prosecution offices with low volume of work was initiated by the Ministry of Justice with the support of the Superior Council of Magistracy of Romania. The bill was rejected by the Parliament. The Superior Council of Magistracy seeks for alternative solutions for the reallocation of the resources.

Slovak Republic

Q042 (2021): The changed answer in line 2 is due to the Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic, it was established from January 1, 2021 by Constitutional Act No. 422/2020.

Q042 (2020): The Constitutional Court is not included, since it was not included in previous cycles. Acoording to the explanatory note - "In some countries, other bodies can be referred to as courts. When they are not part of the regular judiciary system, they should not be considered here (e.g. courts of audits, constitutional courts when not dealing with individual cases but rather with questions of compliance with constitution and international law etc.)." In Slovak republic the Constitutional Court can deal with some rare individual cases.

Q042 (2019): The entire court system of the Slovak republic consists of 54 District Courts, 8 Regional Courts, The Specialized Criminal
Court and the Supreme Court of the Slovak republic.

Q042 (2018): The entire court system of the Slovak republic consists of 54 District Courts, 8 Regional Courts, The Specialised Criminal Court and
The Supreme Court of the Slovak republic

Q042 (2017): The court system of the Slovak republic consists of 54 District Courts, 8 Regional Courts, Specialised Criminal Court and Supreme Court of the Slovak republic

Q042 (2016): The court system of the Slovak republic consists of 54 District Courts, 8 Regional Courts, The Specialised Criminal Court and The Supreme Court of the Slovak republic

Q043 (General Comment): In the Slovak court system there are 8 Regional courts which are the courts with dual competence. The Regional courts are the courts of appeal with the general jurisdiction in the civil, commercial and the criminal cases. In the appellate procedure they decide the appeals lodged against the decisions of all 54 District courts within their local jurisdiction. At the same time the Regional courts have the jurisdiction as the courts of first instance in administrative matters. They act as the administrative courts.
The Specialized Criminal court is competent to judge the grave criminal matters enumerated in the § 14 of the Criminal procedure Code (e. g. premeditated murder, corruption, terrorism, organised crime, severe economic crimes, damaging the financial interests of the EU etc.). Highest instance courts are the Supreme Court and the new Supreme Adminstrative Court.

Q043 (2021): The first instance administrative cases agenda is concentrated in eight regional courts, which also act as general courts of appeal. The question (43.) defines specialized courts as legal entities, so it cannot be understood that the administrative cases agenda is centralized on specialized courts as legal entities, but it is concentrated on 8 regional general courts. These 8 general regional courts are already legal entities included in Q42, line 1.2. Highest instance courts are the Supreme Court and the new Supreme Adminstrative Court.

Q043 (2020): The first instance administrative cases agenda is concentrated in eight regional courts, which also act as general courts of appeal. The question (43.) defines specialized courts as legal entities, so it cannot be understood that the administrative cases agenda is centralized on specialized courts as legal entities, but it is concentrated on 8 regional general courts. These 8 general regional courts are already legal entities included in Q42, line 1.2.

Q044 (2021): The Constitutional court is not included in Q44.

Q044 (2020): The Constitutional Court is not included in the 44 answer.

Q044 (2014): According to 2014 data, on 1st July 2016, the new Civil Litigious Procedure Code will enter into force. It introduces the so called “causal jurisdiction” of first instance courts. It means that certain types of civil claims will belong to the jurisdiction of only some of the first instance courts. This will apply e.g. for individual labour disputes, arbitration disputes, disputes arisen from bill of exchange etc.

Slovenia

Q042 (General Comment): First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
Second instance courts of general jurisdiction: 4 higher courts
Specialised courts: 3 labour courts (1st instance) + 1 labour and social court (1st instance) + 1 Administrative court (1st instance) + 1 Higher labour and social Court (2nd instance) = 6
Highest instance courts of general jurisdiction: The Supreme Court (also highest instance court for specialised courts)

Q042 (2018): First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
First instance specialised courts: 3 labour courts + 1 labour and social court + 1 Administrative court = 5
All courts: first instance courts of general jurisdiction (55, see Q42.1) + first instance specialised courts (4 labour courts + 1 social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of administrative court) + second instance courts and courts of appeal (4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court) + the Supreme court = 77.

Q042 (2017): First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
First instance specialised courts: 3 labour courts + 1 labour and social court + 1 Administrative court = 5
All courts: first instance courts of general jurisdiction (55, see Q42.1) + first instance specialised courts (4 labour courts + 1 social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of administrative court) + second instance courts and courts of appeal (4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court) + the Supreme court = 77.

Q042 (2016): First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
First instance specialised courts: 3 labour courts + 1 labour and social court + 1 Administrative court = 5
All courts: first instance courts of general jurisdiction (55, see Q42.1) + first instance specialised courts (4 labour courts + 1 social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of administrative court) + second instance courts and courts of appeal (4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court) + the Supreme court = 77.

Q042 (2015): legal entities:
First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
First instance specialised courts: 3 labour courts + 1 labour and social court + 1 administrative court = 5
geographic locations:
All the courts = 77
- first instance courts of general jurisdiction = 55 (Q42.1); additionally
- first instance specialised courts = 4 labour courts + 1 social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of administrative court = 16; additionally
- second instance courts and courts of appeal = 4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court = 5; and finally
- supreme court: the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia = 1.

Q043 (General Comment): Although the given answer for 'labour courts' is 4 and 'insurance and/ or social welfare courts' at first instance is 1, the total number of these courts is 4, as one of the labour courts and the social court form a single legal entity – the Labour and social court in Ljubljana.
Concerning specialised courts – higher instances, although the given answer for 'labour courts' is 1 and 'insurance and/ or social welfare courts' is 1, the total number of these courts is 1, as they form a single legal entity – the Higher labour and social Court.

Q043 (2019): Please see general comment.

Q044 (General Comment): First instance courts: first instance courts of general jurisdiction (55, see Q42.1) + first instance specialised courts (4 labour courts and social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of the Administrative court) =70
All courts: In addition to above also 4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court + the Supreme court = 76.
Q044 (2018): A change in the organisation of first instance courts (judicial map), as well as first instance judges' position is being prepared by the Ministry of Justice - see Q208.
Q044 (2016): Ministry of Justice is preparing court network reform. Existent first instance court network is considered as inefficient and insufficient. The main goal of this reform is to set up a system, which could assure better quality and efficiency of adjudication, specialization of judges and even allocation of cases. Furthermore, reform still should assure proper access to the courts and financial efficiency. Ministry of Justice is also taking in consideration different system of the nomination of judges, nomination of Supreme Court judges and president of the Supreme Court. Existent nomination procedure of judges is too rigid and does not enable taking prompt actions when the post is vacant.

Q044 (2014): According to 2014 data, discussions about the reorganization of the structure of courts have been initiated. Following the CEPEJ Guidelines on the creation of judicial maps to support access to justice within a quality judicial system (CEPEJ(2013)7) the change should be gradual. The reduction in the number of courts regarding geographical locations is not foreseen, but reorganization in the powers of local courts that are organizational units of district courts might be needed. There are local courts that have only a few (3-5) judges, which is not rational in the sense of court management. Such local courts might start dealing only with certain kinds of cases, with other local courts in the same district dealing with other kinds of cases, having de facto specialized local courts.
Nevertheless, these changes are still in the initial debate phase, so no formal proposal can be presented yet.

Spain

Q042 (General Comment): Courts counted as First Instance: Courts of first instance (civil), Courts of First Instance and Instruction (civil and criminal), Family Courts (Civil) and Courts of Mortgage Enforcement.
Courts counted as Second Instance General Jurisdiction: Sections of the Provincial Courts (except special sections) and Civil and Criminal Chambers of the Superior Courts of Justice of the Autonomous Regions.

Q043 (General Comment): The Arbitration Court was created by decision of the General Council of the Judiciary of 25 November 2010. The latter assigns exclusive jurisdiction over arbitration matters to the Court of First Instance No. 101 of Madrid. This measure seeks to foster the development of uniform criteria in court proceedings for the assistance and control of arbitration in Madrid.
Other specialised courts include: Penal courts; Penal courts specialized in violence against women (courts for criminal trial, that have been assigned only to cases of gender violence); violence against women courts (courts of criminal investigation and civil proceedings related to gender violence cases); Prison courts; foreclosure proceedings courts;Civil Capacity courts and Civil registry.
Q043 (2021): "Juzgados de lo Mercantil" are in Spain in charge of insovencies and commercial cases (both). So it cannot be separated commercial and insolvency.
Q043 (2020): Commercial courts - new units have been established.

Q043 (2019): Courts of violence against women 106
Foreclosure proceedings Courts: 3
Court of arbitration: 1
Civil capacity courts: 13
Criminal courts: 348
Criminal courts specialized in Violence against women, 31
Juvenile Courts: 82
Prison courts: 51
Civil Registries: 28

Q043 (2018): Between 2016 and 2018, more first instance courts have become specialized in family matters. Courts of violence against women: 106
Foreclosure proceedings Courts: 3
Court of arbitration: 1
Civil capacity courts: 12
Criminal courts: 341
Criminal courts specialized in Violence against women, 32
Juvenile Courts: 82
Prison courts: 51
Civil Registries: 28
Additionally (and they are not accounted) there are 26 military courts that are not part of the Judiciary but they are inspected by it)

Q043 (2017): -338 Criminal courts
-32 Criminal courts specialized in violence against women
-106 violence against women courts
-82 juvenile courts
-51 Prison courts
-3 foreclosure proceedings courts
-1 Arbitration court
-18 Civil Capacity courts
- 28 Civil register offices

Q043 (2016): - 335 Criminal courts
-30 Criminal courts specialized in violence against women
-106 violence against women courts
-83 juvenile courts
-51 Prison courts
-3 foreclosure proceedings courts
-1 Arbitration court
-18 Civil Capacity courts
- 28 Civil register courts

Q043 (2015): Other specialised courts include: 343 Penal courts; 23 Penal courts specialized in violence against women; 106 violence against women courts; 83 juvenile courts; 50 Prison courts; 3 foreclosure proceedings courts; 1 Arbitration court; 12 Civil Capacity courts and 28 Civil registry.

The Commercial Courts deal with insolvency issues.

Military Courts have not been accounted because they do not belong to the Judiciary (except the Supreme Court 5th room). There are other 26 Military Courts.

Q043 (2014): In 2014, the category “other” encompasses: 357 Penal courts; 23 Penal courts specialized in violence against women; 106 violence against women courts; 83 Juvenile courts; 50 Prison courts; 16 Courts for disabled people (capacity courts), 26 Civil Register Courts, 3 Foreclosure proceedings courts (mortgage courts); 1 Arbitration court. The Decanatos exclusive are not included in this exercise because these organs are not courts and have rather administrative nature.

Q043 (2012): In 2012, the category “other” encompasses: 380 Penal courts; 17 Penal courts specialised in violence against women; 106 Violence against women courts; 82 Juvenile courts; 1 Juvenile Enforcement court; 50 Prison courts; 9 Capacity courts; 26 Civil Register courts; 8 Decanatos exclusive; 4 Labour enforcement courts; 4 Mortgage courts and one Arbitration Court.

Q044 (General Comment): One building usually houses different courts.

Q044 (2018): The traditional structure of a Court includes a Judge (or Magistrate), a Judicial Counsellor, and several civil servants (the exact number depends on many circumstances). The New Judicial Office (Nueva Oficina Judicial)has been implemented in many territories and its development continues. The New Judicial Office (NOJ) has, as base, the called ‘Procedural Unit of Direct Support' (UPAD), a small office with personnel necessary for the strict aid of the work of the Judge. On the other hand, and for the uniform processing of repetitive tasks, the called Common Procedural Services have been created. The Judicial Counsellor is the Director of these services, and is responsible of processing the phase of the judicial file of a strictly procedural nature.

Q044 (2016): The traditional structure of a Court includes a Judge (or Magistrate), a Lawyer of the Administration of Justice, and several civil servants (the exact number depends on many circumstances). The New Judicial Office (Nueva Oficina Judicial) has been implemented in many territories and its development continues. The New Judicial Office (NOJ) has, as base, the called ‘Procedural Unit of Direct Support' (UPAD), a small office with personnel necessary for the strict aid of the work of the Judge. On the other hand, and for the uniform processing of repetitive tasks, the called Common Procedural Services have been created. The Lawyer of the Administration of Justice is the Director of these services, and is responsible of processing the phase of the judicial file of a strictly procedural nature.

Q044 (2014): On the occasion of the 2014 evaluation, the attention was drawn on the deployment in the entire country of the Judicial Office, the new model for organising courts of law and the creation of the Instance Courts (Tribunales de Instancia), a new model of collegial courts aimed at replacing local courts belonging to the same judicial district.

Indicator 2: The judicial organisation

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

Question 042.

Question 043.

Question 044.

Question 042

Austria

(2020): In 2020 in Austria, the number of courts considered as legal entities is 152. Namely, there are 133 courts of general jurisdiction and 19 specialised courts. Among the 133 legal entities of general jurisdiction, 128 act at first instance, 4 at second instance and one at third instance. More precisely, the 115 District courts and the 13 Regional courts of general jurisdiction intervene as first instance courts. It is noteworthy that the 7 other regional courts that have specialised jurisdiction are not taken into consideration here, but are counted as specialised first instance courts (infra). It is to be mentioned that the peculiarity of the 20 Austrian Regional courts is that even though these are first instance courts, some of them are also competent in respect of appeals against District courts' decisions. The 4 Higher Regional Courts have appeal competence in respect of all civil and criminal cases.
The Supreme court is the highest instance court in civil and criminal matters.

(2014): From January 1st 2013 to July 1st, 2014 a number of district courts merged. In 2014, there are 129 first instance district courts which is less than 132 (number communicated for 2013) but still not complying with the aim of 115.

Belgium

(General Comment): The reform of the Justices of the peace, with a decrease in geographical locations, was consolidated by the law of December 25, 2017. The implementation of the reform has been carried out between 2016 and 2019.

(2021): 1.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 13 first instance courts, 162 Justices of the peace, 11 Assize courts (one per province and two in Brussels) and 15 Police courts.
1.2 Second instance courts of general jurisdiction: 5 Courts of appeal (the 13 first instance courts that rule as appeal courts on the decisions of the Justices of the peace are taken into consideration only within line 1.1).
As for the previous evaluation round (2020 data), Justices of the peace and Police courts are counted as courts of general jurisdiction. Before 2020, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance. As of 2020, the 11 Assize courts are also included in the data. Insofar as the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat) intervenes both in first instance and on appeal, it has been taken into account in both columns of Q43, but only once in the total of Q42.2.
It is worth mentioning that the Assize courts are not structural entities (they are not permanent); they are organised within the Courts of appeal. The Assize court is constituted whenever the Investigation Chamber of the respective Court of appeal (Chambre des mises en accusation) refers a case to that court - the Assize court.
All courts in Belgium (except the Court of cassation) are grouped into 49 legal entities (steering committees).

(2020): "1.1 First instance Courts of general jurisdiction: 13 first instance courts, 162 justices of the peace, 11 assize courts (one per province and two in Brussels) and 15 police courts. "Second instance Courts of general jurisdiction": 13 courts of first instance that rule as appeal courts on the decisions of the justices of the peace and 5 appeal courts.
Vertical consistency in the table is not ensured, as the 13 courts of first instance with dual jurisdiction (1 and 2 instances) have been counted only once in the totals.
For the current evaluation round (2020 data), justices of the peace and police courts are counted as general courts. In previous cycles, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance. As of 2020, the 11 assize courts are also included in the data. Insofar as the Conseil d'Etat intervenes both in first instance and on appeal, it has been taken into account in both columns of Q43, but only once in the total of Q42.2."

(2017): The law of 25 December 2017 amended the number of cantons of justices of the peace from 187 to 162. The implementation of this reform will take place until 2019.

(2016): A reform of the justices of the peace is under way, leading to a reduction in the number of hearing locations.

(2014): Following a reform of the judicial map, the number of legal entities decreased: from 27 to 13 first instance courts, from 27 to 9 labour courts, from 27 to 9 commercial courts, and from 34 to 15 police courts.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): There are the following courts in Bulgaria: District Courts- 113- The District Court is the main court of first instance. It has jurisdiction over all cases except those which are statutorily assigned to another court. It deals with civil, criminal and administrative-criminal cases. The decisions of the district courts are subject to appeal before the respective Regional court. Provincial/Regional Courts- 28- The Provincial Courts act as courts of first and second instance. As courts of first instance, they examine a precisely defined category of cases involving significant sums or substantial societal interest. When acting as a second (appellate) instance, they re-examine decisions taken by the district courts. Administrative Courts- 28 Specialized Criminal Court -1 Courts of Appeals - 5 Specialized Court of Appeal - 1 MilitaryCourts - 3 - The Military courts consider criminal cases of crimes committed by servicemen or officials of the Interior Ministry at first instance. Military Court of Appeal - 1 Supreme Court of Cassation - 1 Supreme Administrative Court - 1

(2020): Judiciary System Act
Article 65
All courts are legal entities funded by the budget and shall be represented by the administrative head or another designated person. In the discharge of the functions of administrative head, orders, instructions and rules shall be issued in accordance with the statutory competence. The general assembly, the plenum of the Supreme Cassation Court and the Plenum of the Supreme Administrative Court shall be bodies of the respective court, which rule only in the cases specified in the law, give opinions, adopt rules and decisions by open ballot and a majority of more than half of the judges present.

(2019): There are the following courts in Bulgaria: District Courts- 113- The District Court is the main court of first instance. It has jurisdiction over all cases except those which are statutorily assigned to another court. It deals with civil, criminal and administrative-criminal cases. The decisions of the district courts are subject to appeal before the respective Regional court. Provincial/Regional Courts- 28- The Provincial Courts act as courts of first and second instance. As courts of first instance, they examine a precisely defined category of cases involving significant sums or substantial societal interest. When acting as a second (appellate) instance, they re-examine decisions taken by the district courts.
Administrative Courts- 28
Specialized Criminal Court -1
Courts of Appeals - 5
Specialized Court of Appeal - 1
MilitaryCourts - 3 - The Military courts consider criminal cases of crimes committed by servicemen or officials of the Interior Ministry at first instance.
Military Court of Appeal - 1
Supreme Court of Cassation - 1
Supreme Administrative Court - 1

(2018): 42.1. District Court - 113
The District Court is the main court of first instance. It has jurisdiction over all cases except those which are statutorily assigned to another court. It deals with civil, criminal and administrative-criminal cases. The decisions of the district courts are subject to appeal before the respective Regional court.
Provincial/ regional courts- 28
The provincial courts act as courts of first and second instance. As courts of first instance, they examine a precisely defined category of cases involving significant sums or substantial societal interest. When acting as a second (appellate) instance, they re-examine decisions taken by the district courts.
Military first instance courts- 3
Military courts consider criminal cases of crimes committed by servicemen or officials of the Interior Ministry at first instance.

Croatia

(General Comment): The reform of judicial map implemented in 2015 decreased the number of Misdemeanour Courts from 63 to 22. Therefore, in accordance with the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette, No. 128/14) in force, there are currently 22 Misdemeanour Courts in function. On the 1st of January 2019. new Courts Areas and Seats Act came into force.From the organizational aspect, the most important organizational measure was the merging of misdemeanor courts into municipal courts, and few municipal courts were reopened after 2015. That is why we have now less first instance specialized courts than in 2018. and more courts of general jurisdiction (22 courts which were in 2018. plus 8 courts which were reopened after the new law came into force).

(2020): On the 1st of January 2019. new Courts Areas and Seats Act came into force.From the organizational aspect, the most important organizational measure was the merging of misdemeanor courts into municipal courts, and few municipal courts were reopened after 2015. That is why we have now less first instance specialized courts than in 2018. and more courts of general jurisdiction (22 courts which were in 2018. plus 8 courts which were reopened after the new law came into force).

(2019): On the 1st of January 2019. new Courts Areas and Seats Act came into force.From the organizational aspect, the most important organizational measure was the merging of misdemeanor courts into municipal courts, and few municipal courts were reopened after 2015. That is why we have now less first instance specialized courts than in 2018. and more courts of general jurisdiction (22 courts which were in 2018. plus 8 courts which were reopened after the new law came into force).

(2016): There was a reform of judicial map implemented in 2015 in which the number of Misdemeanour Courts has decreased from 63 to 22. Therefore, in accordance with the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette, No. 128/14) in force, there are currently 22 Misdemeanour Courts in function.

(2014): In 2014, according to the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts, there are 67 first instance courts but the Municipal Court in Novi Zagreb is not in function while the Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb is a specialized court counted in Q42.2. Accordingly, there are 65 actually functioning first instance courts of a general jurisdiction.

(2013): For 2013, the Ministry of Justice added to the number of geographic locations all offices of a specific court that are located outside of the seat of the court, in which judicial activities are undertaken. The number of courts did not increase in 2013. Also, 66 municipal courts (65 municipal courts and 1 Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb) were in function out of total 67 first instance courts prescribed by the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts. The Municipal Court in Novi Zagreb is still not in function.

Cyprus

(2020): Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in the second instance cases - questions 97 and 98.

(2017): x

(2014): The number of courts changed in 2014. Instead one labour court in the district of Nicosia, there are 3 separate courts in different districts. This applies as well as for rent and tenancies court. One more family court was also established. The Assize court deals with serious criminal offences only.

Czech Republic

(2021): 2. Supreme Administrative Court

(2020): 2. Supreme Administrative Court

(2017): There are no specialised first instance courts, but judges within individual courts are specialised (e.g. for family, labour and enforcement cases at district courts, and insolvency and administrative cases at regional courts as first instance courts).

(2016): There are no specialised first instance courts, but judges within individual courts are specialised (e.g. for family, labour and enforcement cases at district courts, and insolvency and administrative cases at regional courts as first instance courts).

Denmark

(General Comment): District courts are called 1st instance courts, the Land Registration court and the Maritime and Commercial Court are considered as first instance specialized courts. Second and third instance courts are the two High Courts and the Supreme Court.

(2021): Under "2" is Land Registration Court and Maritime and Commercial Court. In 4 is beside the 24 district courts 4 biting court houses.

(2019): Commercial and naval court
Land Registration court.

(2018): Data has not changed on this point.

(2017): District courts are called 1st instance courts, the Land Registration court and the Maritime and Commercial Court are considered as first instance specialized courts. Second and third instance courts are the two High Courts and the Supreme Court.

Estonia

(General Comment): Estonia has 17 courthouses of county courts (first instance courts), 4 courthouses of administrative courts (first instance courts), 2 courthouses of appellate courts (second instance courts) and 1 courthouse of the Supreme Court (highest instance court), all together 24 courthouses. However, as some of the courts are situated in the same house (e.g Tallinn Administrative Court and Tallinn Circuit Court) and taking into account the fact that Pärnu County Court has a courthouse that is divided between two locations, there are 20 actual geographical locations of Estonian courts.

(2019): A small courthouse was adjoined with another small courthouse. The distance between them was less than 50 km.

(2016): A small courthouse was adjoined with another small courthouse. The distance between them was less than 50 km.

Finland

(General Comment): In Finland, there are 20 district courts with 36 offices, five courts of appeal, the Supreme Court, six administrative courts, the Supreme Administrative Court, the Market Court, the Labour Court and the Insurance Court. One of the administrative courts, the Labour Court and the Market Court are located in the same location. In total there are 36 courts in 52 geographic locations.

(2021): The number of district courts was reduced at the re-structuring on 1.1.2019

(2020): The number of district courts was reduced at the re-structuring on 1.1.2019.

(2019): The Court Network has been modified.

(2016): Some geographic locations of the District Courts have been shut down.

(2014): In 2014, in Finland there are 81 courts as geographic locations, namely 27 District Courts, 13 Branch offices of District Courts, 25 Auxiliary courtrooms of District Courts (23 till 2014), 3 specialized courts, 6 Administrative Courts (8 till 2014), 5 Courts of Appeal (6 till 2014), the Supreme Court and the Supreme Administrative Court.

France

(2021): 1.1 : 164 TJ + 4 TPI
1.2 : 30 Courts of appeal in mainland France + 6 Courts of appeal in overseas France + 1 Superior Court of Appeal in Saint Pierre and Miquelon = 37
1.3: the Court of Cassation
Source DSJ

(2020):
There are 168 first instance courts of general jurisdiction, 37 second instance courts of general jurisdiction, and 1 highest instance court of general jurisdiction in the French judicial system.

(2019): See the comment on specialised first instance courts in the frame of Q43.

(2018): With regard to the ordinary courts, the number indicated in the 2016 questionnaire includes the local courts that have been abolished since 1 July 2017 (Act No. 2011-1862 of 13 December 2011), their powers having been taken over by the courts of first instance in civil matters and by the police courts attached to the courts of first instance in criminal matters.
The number of 786 corresponded to: 164 TGI + 4 TPI + 307 TI + 311 jprox Since then, TIs have been removed from the category of ordinary courts of first instance since they constitute specialised courts of first instance. The number of 479 ordinary courts of first instance therefore corresponded to 164 TGI + 4 TPI + 311 TPROX. The figure of 168 is thus explained by the abolition of the 311 local courts since 1 July 2017, as indicated in the comments in the questionnaire.
Thus: 479 - 311 = 168 ordinary courts of first instance (164 TGI + 4 TPI).

Germany

(General Comment): Eventhough the German legal system generally knows three instances (first instance, appeal on questions of fact and law, appeal on questions of law only), the different kinds of courts do not correspond directly to the stages of appeal. Local Courts (Amtsgerichte) are first instance courts with the Regional Courts (Landgerichte) as next stage of appeal (exceptions apply in family matters). However, Regional Courts do not only serve as second instance courts but also deal with first instance cases. Whether a case is initially dealt with at a Local or Regional Court depends (among other things) on the value at dispute (civil cases) or on the kind of the suspected offence (criminal cases). Similarly the Higher Regional Courts (Oberlandesgerichte) may serve as second instance courts (for cases that were initially dealt with at Regional Courts or for cases in family matters) and as third/highest instance Courts for cases that were initiated at the Local Courts (criminal cases). Higher Regional Courts are also be responsible for some (rare) first instance cases in civil matters (e.g. model declaratory action) and criminal matters (e.g. high treason, treason and endangering external security).
The Constitutional Courts of the Länder and the Federal Constitutional Court (Bundesverfassungsgericht) are not part of the the stages of appeal. Constitutional jurisdiction is also seen as seperate from general and specialised jurisdiction. Constitutional Courts review legislation with regard to constitutional provisions. The Federal Constitutional Court mainly assess alleged violations of base rights by public authorities. However, in order to have access to the Constitutional Courts, the regular path of legal proceedings must generally be exhausted.

(2021): 1.1 First instance courts include: 638 Local Courts, 115 Regional Courts
Regional Courts handle first as well as second instance cases. In 2021, Regional Courts registered 344 128 incoming first instance cases and 75 400 incoming second instance cases (civil and criminal matters). For further information see General Comment.
1.2 Second instance courts include: 24 Higher Regional Courts
Higher Regional Courts handle second and third instance cases as well as certain (few) first instance cases. Higher Regional Courts are the third and final instance with regard to criminal cases, that were originally initiated at the Local Courts. In 2021, Higher Regional Courts recorded 102 029 incoming second instance cases and 5 089 incoming third/last instance cases. For further information see General Comment.
1.3 Highest instance courts include: Federal Surpreme Court
The total number of specialised courts includes 16 Constitutional Courts of the Länder.

(2020): 1.1 First instance courts include: 638 Local Courts, 115 Regional Courts
1.2 Second instance courts include: 115 Regional Courts, 24 Higher Regional Courts
1.3 Highest instance courts include: 24 Higher Regional Courts, Federal Surpreme Court
The vertical consistency is not fulfilled, since the 115 Regional Courts appear as "First instance courts" (1.1) as well as "Second instance courts" (1.2) and 24 Higher Regional Courts appear as "Second Instance Courts"(1.2) as well as "Highest Instance Courts" (1.3).
For further information please consult the General Comment.
The total number of specialised courts includes 16 Constitutional Courts of the Länder.

Greece

(2020): In highest instance courts include the Supreme Court(Areios Pagos). In First instance courts of general jurisdiction are included in the number 259, 196 local and District Criminal Courts and 63 courts of first degree.

Hungary

(General Comment): The Hungarian court system consits of the following courts: Kúria (1) – the Hungarian Supreme Court - its jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers adjudication of extraordinary remedies and appeals, adopting uniformity decisions. It also decides if municipal decrees are in compliance with higher level legislation. Regional courts of appeal (5) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from the regional courts (third instance in criminal cases). Regional courts (20) – their jurisdiction in criminal, civil, labour and administrative cases (only at 8 of the regional courts) covers the adjudication of appeals received from district courts and procedure at first instance in certain criminal and civil cases. District courts (113) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the procedures at first instance. The district courts in the seat of the regional courts have special competences in some cases (e.g. economic crimes). To be noted: administrative and labour courts (20) were dismissed on the 31st of March 2020. From this date Regional Courts deal with labour cases on first instance while administrative cases are dealt by eight Regional Court on a regional level.

(2020): The Hungarian court system is as follows: Kúria (1) – the Hungarian Supreme Court - its jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers adjudication of extraordinary remedies and appeals, adopting uniformity decisions. It also decides if municipal decrees are in compliance with higher level legislation. Regional courts of appeal (5) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from the regional courts (third instance in criminal cases). Regional courts (20) – their jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from district courts, administrative and labour courts, and procedure at first instance in certain criminal and civil cases. District courts (113) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the procedures at first instance. Out of the 113 district courts, the district courts in the seat of the regional courts have special competences in many cases. Administrative and labour courts (20) were dismissed on the 31st of March 2020. From this date Regional Courts deal with labour cases on first instance while administrative cases are dealth with by eight Regional Court on a regional level.

(2019): 113 District Courts (first instance courts of general jurisdiction)
20 Administrative and Labour Courts (specialized first instance courts)
20 Regional Courts (second instance courts of general jurisdiction + first instance courts in cases of higher importance)
5 Regional Courts of Appeal (second instance courts in cases of higher importance)
1 Supreme Court ("Kúria" - special judicial review)
It has to be noted that Administrative and Labour Courts are merged into the regional courts on the 31st of March 2020. Since 1st of April 2020 every regional court deals with labour cases on first instance (second instance are the regional courts of appeal) and 8 regional courts have special administrative law department dealing with first instance cases (seconf instance is the Supreme Court).

(2018): Two new district courts were established (one in 2017 in the city of Szigetszentmiklós, another one in 2019 in the city of Érd).
113 District Courts (first instance courts of general jurisdiction)
20 Administrative and Labour Courts (specialized first instance courts)
20 Regional Courts (second instance courts of general jurisdiction + first instance courts in cases of higher importance)
5 Regional Courts of Appeal (second instance courts in cases of higher importance)
1 Supreme Court (special judicial review)

(2017): All courts include :
112 District Courts
20 Regional Courts
20 Administrative and Labour Courts
5 Regional Courts of Appeal
1 Supreme Court (Kúria)
The Hungarian court system is as follows: Kúria (1) – the Hungarian Supreme Court - its jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers adjudication of extraordinary remedies and appeals, adopting uniformity decisions. It also decides if municipal decrees are in compliance with higher level legislation. Regional courts of appeal (5) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from the regional courts (third instance in criminal cases). Regional courts (20) – their jurisdiction in criminal, civil and administrative cases covers the adjudication of appeals received from district courts, administrative and labour courts, and procedure at first instance in certain criminal and civil cases. District courts (112) – their jurisdiction in criminal and civil cases covers the procedures at first instance. The number of judges in the largest district court is 357, whereas the smallest court operates with one judge. Out of the 111 district courts, the district courts in the seat of the regional courts have special competences in many cases. Administrative and labour courts (20) – their jurisdiction covers procedures at first instance in individual and collective labour disputes and in administrative cases. First instance administrative and labour courts (20) started operating on 1 January 2013 as first instance specialized courts. Thus from this date the number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction is 112.

Ireland

(General Comment): In Ireland, there are only three first instance courts (as legal entities) exercising general jurisdiction for the entire State (the High Court, the Circuit Court and the District Court). Each of those three courts has a single court president only, who exercises a nationwide remit for his/her court. The number of geographic locations reflects the physical location serving as seats or venues for the three jurisdictions.

(2016): The specialised courts referred to are the two Special Criminal Courts the jurisdiction of which generally relates to trial of terrorism- and organised crime-related offices.
The increase of one location over the figure provided for 2014 refers to the temporary relocation of the Dublin District Court's Drug Treatment Court in 2016.

Italy

(2018): In 2012-2013 we went through a major reform of the judicial map. In particular, a great number of justice of peace offices (initially 846) were shut down. However, each Italian municipality had (and still has) the opportunity to preserve the office at their own expenses. For this reason, each year a series of Justice of Peace offices administered by the municipality might be re-opened or closed. 3 justice of peace offices closed between 2017 and 2018.

(2017): In 2012-2013 we went through a major reform of the judicial map. In particular, a great number of justice of peace offices (initially 846) were shut down. However, each Italian municipality had (and still has) the opportunity to preserve the office at their own expenses. For this reason, each year a series of Justice of Peace offices administered by the municipality might be re-opened or closed.

Latvia

(2021): In the total number of specialised courts - legal entities are included 1 Administrative court, 1 Administrative Regional (appeal) Court and 1 Economic Court, what was created and started operates from 31.03.2021. in Latvia. From 01.08.2022. is created and operates Riga City Court, merging 3 courts in Riga city territory. The number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction is indicated as it was in 2021, not including Riga City Court as 1 court in Riga. In Latvia is also Constitutional court - which within the jurisdiction specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and in this Law, shall adjudicate matters regarding the conformity of laws and other regulatory enactments with the Constitution, as well as other matters regarding which jurisdiction is conferred upon it by this Law. The Constitutional court is not included in the total number of the courts.

(2020): In the total number of specialised courts - legal entities are included 1 Administrative court and 1 Administrative Regional (appeal) court. Starting from 31.03.2021. in Latvia is created and operates the Economic Court. The Economic Court is not included in the total number of specialized courts. In Latvia is also Constitutional court - which within the jurisdiction specified in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia and in this Law, shall adjudicate matters regarding the conformity of laws and other regulatory enactments with the Constitution, as well as other matters regarding which jurisdiction is conferred upon it by this Law. The Constitutional court is not included in the total number of the courts.

(2019): Since the reform of March, 2018, the number of first instance courts has been reduced to 10 legal entities at first instance (9 general + 1 administrative). There are also 6 appelate courts and Supreme court. In 2019 was completed reform of Land Register Units, which are included in the composition of district (city) courts. The number of legal entities doesn't changes, but number of courts per geographic locations therefore differs.
The data regarding the geographic locations are indicated on 31.12.2019.

(2018): Since the reform of March, 2018, the number of first instance courts has been reduced to 10 legal entities at first instance (9 general + 1 administrative). There are also 6 appelate courts and Supreme court.

(2017): The number of first instance courts (legal entities) is indicated on 31.12.2017., in Latvia starting from 2015 till March, 2018 was a reform where court map was revised. The number of first instance courts (legal entities) starting from March, 2018 is 9. As regards the specialised court - there is only one specialised court the Adminsitrative court with 5 court houses.

(2016): There is only one specialised court the administrative court with 5 court houses

Lithuania

(General Comment): 1.1. 12 district courts;
1.2. 5 regional courts (regional courts are appeal instance for judgments, decisions, rulings and orders of district courts as well as first instance courts adjudicating certain categories of cases; in this table regional courts are counted only as second instance courts of general jurisdiction) and the Court of Appeal of Lithuania;
2. 2 regional administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.
Regional courts as the first instance courts examine criminal cases in which persons are accused of having committed serious and very serious crimes, as well as cases in which the accused were the President of the Republic of Lithuania, members of the Seimas (Parliament) or Government, judges, judges or prosecutors of the Constitutional Court at the time of the commission of the criminal act.
Regional courts as the first instance deal with civil cases in which the amount of the claim is greater than 28,510 EUR(except for family legal relations cases due to the division of property), copyright cases, civil public tender legal relations cases, bankruptcy and restructuring cases, according to the statement of the bank's temporary administrator on reduction of the bank's share capital, cases in which one of the parties is a foreign state, according to lawsuits regarding the forced sale of shares, due to the investigation of the activity of a legal entity, and other cases.
Only the Vilnius Regional Court, with exclusive rights, in accordance with the laws in force, as a court of first instance hears cases regarding disputes provided for in the Patent Law of the Republic of Lithuania, regarding disputes provided for in the Trademark Law of the Republic of Lithuania, regarding adoption based on requests of foreign citizens

(2021): Regional courts are counted only as second instance; general comment has been updated in view of the changed assignment of the regional courts to the second instance only.

(2020): 1.1. 12 district courts and 5 regional courts (the latter are adjudicating certain categories of cases as first instance courts);
1.2. 5 regional courts and the Court of Appeal of Lithuania;
2. 2 regional administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.

(2018): Number of courts (as legal entities) in Lithuania decreased from 1st January 2018 according to the Law on Reorganization of Courts of the Republic of Lithuania (Law of 23rd Juin, 2016 No. XII-2474). Instead of 49 district courts (as legal entities) there are now 12 district courts (some of them have court houses), instead of 5 regional administrative courts there are now 2 of them (one has houses). The number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction (legal entities) in point 42.1 implies 5 regional courts (of general jurisdiction) which are first instance for criminal and civil cases assigned to its jurisdiction by law. These courts also are appeal instance for judgements, decisions, rulings and orders of district courts, so their number is also included in the number of all courts at point 42.3.

(2017): From January 1, 2018, there are 22 left (17 first instance courts, 2 first instance courts of special jurisdiction, 2 courts of appeal (1 of them is specialized court) and 1 court of cassation).

(2014): As regional courts of Lithuania function not only as courts of appeal, but also as courts of first instance, for 2014, the number of these courts is also included in the number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction. This was not the case in earlier years.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): "42.1.1: three justices of the peace and two district courts
42.1.2: one Court of Appeal 42.1.3: one Court of Cassation
42.2: Total specialized courts (all instances) Q43"

(2020): "In addition to the courts proper, the law of 27 July 1997 on the organization of the Constitutional Court established this court, which is seized, on a preliminary basis, when a question relating to the conformity of a law to the Constitution arises before a court of the judicial or administrative order. It rules, by means of a judgment, on the conformity of laws with the Constitution, with the exception of those concerning the approval of treaties.
When a party raises a question concerning the conformity of a law with the Constitution before a court of the judicial or administrative order, that court is obliged to refer the matter to the Constitutional Court, except when it considers that a decision on the question raised is not necessary to render its judgment, that the question is unfounded or that the Constitutional Court has already ruled on a question with the same object.
If a court considers that a question of conformity of a law with the Constitution arises and that a decision on this point is necessary to render its judgment, it must raise it of its own motion after first inviting the parties to present their observations.
The parties are admitted to conclude and plead before the Constitutional Court through the ministry of a lawyer registered in list I of the tables drawn up annually by the Bar Associations.
The judgments of the Constitutional Court are published in the Official Journal of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg within thirty days of their delivery. (Portal of Justice: https://justice.public.lu/fr/organisation-justice/cour-constitutionnelle.html) "

(2017): 42.1: 3 justices of the peace and 2 district courts
42.2: Please note that the total of 043 is not identical to the total in 042, as most of the specialized courts are in fact specialized sections of a general court. E.g. the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court (tribunal d'arrondissement). Only the administrative, military and 1st instance social security courts are selfstanding.

(2016): 42.1: 3 justices of the peace and 2 district courts
42.2: Please note that the total of 043 is not identical to the total in 042, as most of the specialized courts are in fact specialized sections of a general court. E.g. the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court (tribunal d'arrondissement). Only the administrative, military and 1st instance social security courts are selfstanding.

Malta

(2021): The total number of Specialised Courts has increased to 8 because of the addition of the Constitutional Court as a second instance specialised court.

(2020): The 1st instance courts of general jurisdiction are:
- the Court of Magistrates, Civil Jurisdiction (competency up to Euros 15,000)
- the Civil Court, First Hall (civil cases above Euros 15,000)
The 2nd instance courts of general jurisdiction are:
- the Civil Court of Appeal, Inferior Jurisdiction - the Civil Court of Appeal, Superior Jurisdiction
In the Maltese judicial system, there are only 2 instances of courts, hence Q1.3 is marked as NAP.
The increase in the number of courts as legal entities reflects the addition of the criminal courts to the above data, namely:
- 1st Instance Courts: Court of Magistrates Criminal Jurisdiction and Criminal Court
- 2nd Instance Courts: Criminal Court of Appeal in its Inferior and Superior Jurisdiction

(2018): In 2018, the Commercial Division was set up in order to hear cases filed under the Companies Act that include Insolvency cases. This new specialised first instance court is the reason behind the increase in the number of courts quoted at 42.2 above.

Netherlands

(General Comment): Since 2013 and following the implementation of the reform related to the reorganization of the judicial map, the number of district courts was reduced from 19 in 2010 to 11 in 2013 and 2014. Moreover, this reform resulted in the closure of sub-district court locations due to which the number of geographic locations decreased from 64 in 2010 to 40 in 2013 and 2014.

(2021): Second instance courts of general jurisdiction handle civil, criminal and tax cases.
There are two additional courts that do not seem to fit this categorization by instance, acting in the area of administrative law. Some administrative law cases (tax cases) are handled by first and second instance courts of general jurisdiction. Other administrative cases are handeled by the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, also known as the Administrative High Court for Trade and Industry (College van van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven). This is a specialized administrative court, which rules on disputes in the area of social-economic administrative law, and appeals for specific laws. The tribunal hears both first and second instance cases. Categorized as a specialized court.
The Central Appeals Tribunal (Centrale Raad van Beroep) is a court of appeal mainly active in legal areas pertaining to social security and civil service. In these areas, it is also the highest judicial authority. In some cases, it is the first and sole instance. This court does not exactly fit the distinction of the table above, but categorized as a specialized court.
The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State is the highest administrative court with general jurisdiction in the Netherlands. It hears various types of appeals (e.g. members of the public / associations / commercial companies against governmental bodies, or between public authorities). This court does not exactly fit the distinction of the table above, but categorized as a specialized court.
For more information, see https://www.rechtspraak.nl/English/Judicial-system-and-legislation/Pages/Special-Tribunals.aspx.
Note that the Supreme Court (highest instance court of general jurisdiction) does not retry the case itself, but judges whether the judges at the first and second instance applied the law correctly in the judgment, and whether the procedure was correctly followed (cassation, potential quashing of judgment).

(2020): There are 11 first instance courts (Rechtbanken).
There are 4 second instance courts of general jurisdiction: 4 courts of appeal (Second instance, Gerechtshoven) that handle civil cases, criminal cases and tax cases.
There is 1 highest instance court of general jurisdiction, the Supreme Court (Hoge Raad), the highest instance court in The Netherlands.
There are three specialized courts (see comment Q43).

(2017): same as last year

Poland

(General Comment): The Polish court structure is characterized by four levels of courts but only three instances. Basically, there are district courts which are first instance courts, regional courts which are first and second instance courts, and appellate courts which are second instance courts. The highest instance courts are the Supreme Court, the Supreme Administrative Court and the Constitutional Tribunal.

(2021): The table indicating the content of:
1.1 first instance courts (district + regional courts), 1.2 second (appellate courts) , 1.3 third instance courts (cassation of the judgment) (Supreme Court) of general jurisdiction.

(2020): The table indicating the content of:
1.1 first instance courts (district + regional courts), 1.2 second (appellate courts) , 1.3 third instance courts (cassation of the judgment) (Supreme Court) of general jurisdiction.

(2018): .

(2017): 42.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - common courts (318 regional courts, 45 district courts).
42.2 First instance specialised courts - 16 administrative courts, 9 military courts.
42.3 All the courts - the Supreme Court, common courts (318 regional courts, 45 district courts, 11 appeal courts), administrative courts (voivodship administrative courts (16), the Supreme Administrative Court), military courts (regional military courts (7), district military courts (2)).

(2016): 42.1 First instance courts of general jurisdiction - common courts (318 regional courts, 45 district courts).
42.2 First instance specialised courts - 16 administrative courts, 9 military courts.
42.3 All the courts - the Supreme Court, common courts (318 regional courts, 45 district courts, 11 appeal courts), administrative courts (16 voivodship administrative courts. the Supreme Administrative Court), militry courts (9 regional military courts, 2 district military courts). The differences between presented data and the data from 2014 edition is likely to be due to the restoration of District Courts, abolished and converted to divisions of larger units in 2013.
The difference in courts number between this (363) and previous evaluation cycle (287) is probably caused by a significant organizational reform of polish court system, which took place in 2013. Almost eighty small district courts were merged with larger entities. Since 2015 the reform has been reversing, which has resulted in an increase in the number of the courts.

(2012): In 2012, there was a structural change concerning District courts. Some of them were transformed into divisions of other courts.

Portugal

(2020): 1.1 Courts of general jurisdiction and proximity divisions;
1.2. 2nd Instance Courts (Tribunal Relação de Lisboa, Coimbra, Porto, Évora e Guimarães).
1.3. Supreme Justice Court

(2019): Regarding Q 42.1 the decrease of the total number of first instance courts of general jurisdiction is accompanied by an increase of certain types of first instance courts (please consult answers provided to Q 43).
Regarding Q 42.2, the total corresponds to first instance specialised courts of judicial courts and administrative and tax courts. Under our Constitution, we have two set of courts: judicial courts, which have general jurisdiction in civil/commercial and criminal matters and encompass specialized courts, and administrative and tax courts, whose role is to settle disputes arising out of administrative and tax relations. These latter are specialised in this domain only.
In order to be rigourous and coherent with Q 43, we have included first instance administrative and tax courts. The total corresponds to 418 judicial courts + 17 administrative/tax courts.

(2018): These data correspond to the values given for the last scoreboard.
The differences registered result from the changes to the judicial organization (Law n. 40-A/2016, 22 December) in force since January 1, 2017.
42.1 the number of 1st instance courts with general jurisdiction decreased due to the increase of specialized courts. Accordingly, 20 courts that were closed in 2014 were re-enacted as proximity judgments, new family sections were created as well as new sections with generic jurisdiction.

(2017): The differences registered result from the changes to the judicial organization (Law n. 40-A/2016, 22 December) in force since January 1, 2017.
42.1 the number of 1st instance courts with general jurisdiction decreased due to the increase of specialized courts. Accordingly, 20 courts that were closed in 2014 were re-enacted as proximity judgments, new family sections were created as well as new sections with generic jurisdiction.

(2014): As a result of the new Judicial Organization Reform, the number of specialized first instance courts increased in 2014, while the enlargement of the court districts has been promoted. The reform melted the former judicial districts into 23 judicial districts, each containing two or more units, according to the demographic and economic reality of the respective geographic area. The difference between Q42.2 and Q43 is due to the inclusion of the 20 administrative courts in Q43. In Portugal, the administrative jurisdiction is autonomous, independent from the civil jurisdiction.

Romania

(General Comment): In Romania there are 175 judecatorii, first instance courts of general jurisdiction.

(2021): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.
The number of „judecatorii" has decreased by one between 2019-2020 because the activity of Judecătoria Insuratei was suspended so it no longer appears in the statistics. 175 represent the first instance courts with general jurisdiction in this matter, even if tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court may also judge first instance cases. Starting from 2020 the methodology of presentation of data changed and only "judecatorii" are counted as first instance courts of general jurisdiction, even if tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court may also judge first instance cases.

(2020): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.
The number of „judecatorii" has decreased by one between 2019-2020 because the activity of Judecătoria Insuratei was suspended so it no longer appears in the statistics. 175 represent the first instance courts with general jurisdiction in this matter, even if tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court may also judge first instance cases. Starting from 2020 the methodology of presentation of data changed and only "judecatorii" are counted as first instance courts of general jurisdiction, even if tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court may also judge first instance cases.

(2017): There are 176 first instance courts, 42 tribunals and 15 courts of appeals. All of the first instance courts deal with cases in first instance, but also the tribunals and the courts of appeal may have material or personal jurisdiction in first instance.

(2016): There are 176 first instance courts, 42 tribunals and 15 courts of appeals. All of the first instance courts deal with cases in first instance, but also the tribunals and the courts of appeal may have material or personal jurisdiction in first instance.

Slovak Republic

(2021): The changed answer in line 2 is due to the Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic, it was established from January 1, 2021 by Constitutional Act No. 422/2020.

(2020): The Constitutional Court is not included, since it was not included in previous cycles. Acoording to the explanatory note - "In some countries, other bodies can be referred to as courts. When they are not part of the regular judiciary system, they should not be considered here (e.g. courts of audits, constitutional courts when not dealing with individual cases but rather with questions of compliance with constitution and international law etc.)." In Slovak republic the Constitutional Court can deal with some rare individual cases.

(2019): The entire court system of the Slovak republic consists of 54 District Courts, 8 Regional Courts, The Specialized Criminal
Court and the Supreme Court of the Slovak republic.

(2018): The entire court system of the Slovak republic consists of 54 District Courts, 8 Regional Courts, The Specialised Criminal Court and
The Supreme Court of the Slovak republic

(2017): The court system of the Slovak republic consists of 54 District Courts, 8 Regional Courts, Specialised Criminal Court and Supreme Court of the Slovak republic

(2016): The court system of the Slovak republic consists of 54 District Courts, 8 Regional Courts, The Specialised Criminal Court and The Supreme Court of the Slovak republic

Slovenia

(General Comment): First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
Second instance courts of general jurisdiction: 4 higher courts
Specialised courts: 3 labour courts (1st instance) + 1 labour and social court (1st instance) + 1 Administrative court (1st instance) + 1 Higher labour and social Court (2nd instance) = 6
Highest instance courts of general jurisdiction: The Supreme Court (also highest instance court for specialised courts)

(2018): First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
First instance specialised courts: 3 labour courts + 1 labour and social court + 1 Administrative court = 5
All courts: first instance courts of general jurisdiction (55, see Q42.1) + first instance specialised courts (4 labour courts + 1 social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of administrative court) + second instance courts and courts of appeal (4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court) + the Supreme court = 77.

(2017): First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
First instance specialised courts: 3 labour courts + 1 labour and social court + 1 Administrative court = 5
All courts: first instance courts of general jurisdiction (55, see Q42.1) + first instance specialised courts (4 labour courts + 1 social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of administrative court) + second instance courts and courts of appeal (4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court) + the Supreme court = 77.

(2016): First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
First instance specialised courts: 3 labour courts + 1 labour and social court + 1 Administrative court = 5
All courts: first instance courts of general jurisdiction (55, see Q42.1) + first instance specialised courts (4 labour courts + 1 social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of administrative court) + second instance courts and courts of appeal (4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court) + the Supreme court = 77.

(2015): legal entities:
First instance courts of general jurisdiction: 44 local courts + 11 district courts = 55
First instance specialised courts: 3 labour courts + 1 labour and social court + 1 administrative court = 5
geographic locations:
All the courts = 77
- first instance courts of general jurisdiction = 55 (Q42.1); additionally
- first instance specialised courts = 4 labour courts + 1 social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of administrative court = 16; additionally
- second instance courts and courts of appeal = 4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court = 5; and finally
- supreme court: the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia = 1.

Spain

(General Comment): Courts counted as First Instance: Courts of first instance (civil), Courts of First Instance and Instruction (civil and criminal), Family Courts (Civil) and Courts of Mortgage Enforcement.
Courts counted as Second Instance General Jurisdiction: Sections of the Provincial Courts (except special sections) and Civil and Criminal Chambers of the Superior Courts of Justice of the Autonomous Regions.

Question 043

Austria

(General Comment): The two "other specialized first instance courts" are the two civil law courts (in Vienna and Graz), while the two specialised criminal courts also located in Vienna and Graz are specialised on the enforcement of criminal sanctions. The sum of the numbers in the categories exceeds the total number of specialised courts because the labour and social court in Vienna is one court that is competent for labour and (some) social welfare cases. From January 1st, 2014 there are 11 newly found courts for administrative law in Austria, namely 9 regional administrative courts, 1 Federal administrative court and 1 Federal Tax Court.

(2021): As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases); Because of the Court for labour and social welfare cases in Vienna (Arbeits- und Sozialgericht Wien) the sum of the individual courts does not correspond to the total number of specialised courts. One commercial court in Vienna, both courts (in Vienna and Graz) specialised on civil cases and both courts (in Vienna and Graz) specialised on the enforcement of criminal sanctions also act as second instance courts.

(2020): As a rule every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], labour and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (civil cases, criminal cases);
Because of the Court for labour and social welfare cases in Vienna (Arbeits- und Sozialgericht Wien) the sum of the individual courts does not correspond to the total number of specialised courts.
One commercial court in Vienna, both courts (in Vienna and Graz) specialised on civil cases and both courts (in Vienna and Graz) specialised on the enforcement of criminal sanctions also act as second instance courts.

(2019): On principal every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialized, i.e. eight in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2x], employment- and social welfare cases, administrative cases) and two in Graz (criminal cases, remaining cases). There is also a regional administrative court in every federal state (9 in total). Because of the Court for labour and social welfare cases in Vienna (Arbeits- und Sozialgericht Wien) the sum of the individual courts equals nineteen.

(2018): On principal every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], employment- and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (criminal cases, remaining cases)

(2017): On principal every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], employment- and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (criminal cases, remaining cases)

(2016): On principal every court has to deal with all judicial issues; in the biggest Austrian cities certain courts are specialised, i.e. five in Vienna (civil cases, criminal cases, commercial cases [2 x], employment- and social welfare cases) and two in Graz (criminal cases, remaining cases)

Belgium

(General Comment): In Belgium, the following courts do not exist - insolvency courts, family courts, juvenile courts, insurance and / or social welfare courts, rent and tenancies courts, enforcement of criminal sanctions courts, courts specialised in fight against terrorism or in internet related disputes. These case categories are within the competence of company courts (insolvency, insurances), first instance courts (family, juveniles, enforcement of sentences), labour courts (safety in work).
As for the previous evaluation round (2020 data), Justices of the peace and Police courts are counted as courts of general jurisdiction. Before 2020, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance.
Administrative courts: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Six courts of first instance have chambers specialised in enforcement of criminal sanctions. The designation “enforcement court” is used, but in reality, it is a specialized chamber. All first instance courts (13) have a specialized family and youth section. The designation “family court” is used, but in reality, it is a specialized section.

(2021): In Belgium, the following courts do not exist - insolvency courts, family courts, juvenile courts, insurance and / or social welfare courts, rent and tenancies courts, enforcement of criminal sanctions courts, courts specialised in fight against terrorism or in internet related disputes. These case categories are within the competence of company courts (insolvency, insurances), first instance courts (family, juveniles, enforcement of sentences), labour courts (safety in work).
As for the previous evaluation round (2020 data), Justices of the peace and Police courts are counted as courts of general jurisdiction. Before 2020, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance.

(2020):
For the current evaluation round (2020 data), justices of the peace and police courts are counted as general courts. In previous cycles, they were categorized as specialized courts of first instance.

(2019): Other: 162 justices of the peace and 15 police courts. Administrative courts: Council of State, Council for Aliens Litigation, de Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen (these courts are under the authority of the Minister for Home Affairs and the Flemish Regional Government, and not the Minister of Justice).
Six courts of first instance have specialized chambers for the application of sentences. The denomination 'court for the enforcement of sentences' is used, but in reality it is a specialized chamber.
All the courts of first instance (13) have a special family and youth section. The denomination 'family court' is used, but in reality it is a specialized section.

(2017): Others: justices of the peace and police courts. The law of 25 December 2017 amended the number of cantons of justices of the peace from 187 to 162 (162 justices of the peace and 15 police courts).
Administrative courts: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Five courts of first instance have specialized chambers for the enforcement of sentences. Despite the term used in their respect - "court for the enforcement of sentences", those are specialised chambers.
All courts of first instance (13) have a specialised family and youth section. The term "family court" is used, but these are also specialised sections.

(2016): Other: justices of the peace and police courts
Administrative courts: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
Five courts of first instance have specialized chambers for the enforcement of sentences. The name "court for the enforcement of sentences" is used, but in reality it is a specialized chamber.
All courts of first instance (13) have a specialized family and youth section. The name "family court"' is used, but in reality it is a specialized section.

(2015): Other: justices of the peace and police courts
Administrative courts: the Council of State, the Council of the Litigation of Foreigners, Milieuhandhavingscollege, de Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.

(2014): The other specialised courts are 15 police courts and 187 justices of peace. Family courts are a section within the 13 first instance courts. The administrative courts (the Council of State, the Alien Litigation Council, "(Vlaamse)Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen", "het (Vlaamse) Milieuhandhavingscollege") are not part of the judicial system administered by the Ministry of Justice. Following a reform of the judicial map, the number of labour, commercial and police courts was reduced.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): Administrative Courts- 28
Supreme Administrative Court - 1
MilitaryCourts - 3
Military Court of Appeal - 1 Specialized Criminal Court -1 Specialized Court of Appeal - 1

(2021): The category “other specialised courts” encompasses the Specialized Criminal Court of Republic of Bulgaria, established in 2011, situated in Sofia and treated as a Provincial/Regional Court. Its jurisdiction covers criminal cases of a general nature for crimes carried out throughout the Republic of Bulgaria. Its competence is determined on the basis of the subject of the case and not the quality of the perpetrator. The Criminal Procedure Code exhaustively enumerates cases within the competence of this Court, namely crimes committed by organized criminal groups, or on behalf of them and following their decision.

(2020): The category “other specialised courts” encompasses the Specialized Criminal Court of Republic of Bulgaria, established in 2011, situated in Sofia and treated as a Provincial/Regional Court. Its jurisdiction covers criminal cases of a general nature for crimes carried out throughout the Republic of Bulgaria. Its competence is determined on the basis of the subject of the case and not the quality of the perpetrator. The Criminal Procedure Code exhaustively enumerates cases within the competence of this Court, namely crimes committed by organized criminal groups, or on behalf of them and following their decision.

(2019): The cases under the jurisdiction of Specialized Criminal Court are specified in Art. 411a of the Penal Procedure Code

(2018): The category “other” encompasses the Specialized Criminal Court of Republic of Bulgaria (see the general comment).

(2017): Specialized Criminal Court

(2016): 'Other specialised 1st instance courts' - 1 Specialized Criminal Court.

Croatia

(General Comment): The term “other specialized first instance courts” in the Republic of Croatia refers to misdemeanour courts and the Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb. There was a reform of judicial map implemented in 2015 in which the number of Misdemeanour Courts has decreased from 63 to 22. Therefore, in accordance with the Act on Territorial Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette, No. 128/14) in force, there are currently 22 Misdemeanour Courts in function.

(2020): In Croatian Judicial system there is a higher instances of 3 specialized courts: commercial, administrative and other (misdemeanour).

(2019): One criminal and two misdemeanour courts. After the reorganization of courts in 2019 we do not have 22 misdemeanor courts. Only two courts specialized only for misdemeanor cases were left in two largest cities (Zagreb and Split). Third specialized court is court in Zagreb specialized only for criminal cases.

(2018): Other specialised 1st instance courts are Misdemeanour courts and Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb.

(2017): 23 other specialised 1st instance courts are 22 Misdemeanour courts and 1 Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb

(2016): According to the Act on the Jurisdiction and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette 128/14) as of 1 April 2015 the number of municipal courts has been reduced, as of 1 July 2015 reduced the number of misdemeanour courts has been reduced and as of 1 April 2015 a new commercial court has been established.
Other specialised 1st instance courts are 22 Misdemeanour courts and a Municipal Criminal Court in Zagreb.

Cyprus

(2021): other specialised courts are the Assize courts and the Administrative Court of International Protection.
In 2021 a law was enacted (law 55/21) providing for the establishment of a juvenile court in each district of the Republic. Family, Labour and rent control courts have been established in one more district.

(2020): 5 Assize courts
1 Administrative court for international Protection

(2019): Other specialised 1st instance courts: 1 International Protection Administrative Court and 5 Assize Court. In 2019 the new administrative court for international protection was established to hear cases concerning asylum applications and international protection matters.

(2018): 5 Assize courts

(2017): Assize Courts

(2016): Assize Courts

(2015): In 2015, two new Assize courts and one administrative court were established and one Rent Control Tribunal was removed.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): There are no specialised first instance courts, but judges within individual courts are specialised (e.g. for family, labour and enforcement cases at district courts, and insolvency and administrative cases at regional courts as first instance courts).

Denmark

(General Comment): "Juvenile Courts" such courts do not exists. Juveniles are dealt with by district courts as any other case. There are taken special care though of juveniles in a Juvenile Board. The category “other” concerns the Land Registration Court that has been established in 2009. As for the Commercial Court, in Denmark, it is called Maritime and Commercial Court and it presents the peculiarity to also deal, to a great extent but not exclusively, with insolvency cases (bankruptcies etc.). Accordingly, there is an overlap with the category “Insolvency courts”. Family courts are administered as part of District courts. There is one military court but military courts are not part of the Danish Courts Administration.

(2021): "Other specialised courts" is The Land Registration Court.

(2020): Land Registration Court (see also general comments). The other specialized court is Maritime and Commercial Court. The latter do some degree deals with insolvency cases similar to district courts.

(2019): Other specialised 1st instance court is the Land Registration Court. The Maritime and Commercial Court is a commercial court which ALSO deals with insolvency cases. Although it looks like there are two courts there is only one! As the district courts outside Greater Copenhagen deal with insolvency cases, and the Maritime and Commercial Court deals with insolvency cases inside Greater Copenhagen, but at the same time is a specialized commercial court, the Maritime and Commercial Court is marked as a specialized Commercial Court and insolvency court.

(2018): Military courts exist but they are not part of the Danish Courts Administration. The 24 district courts have always dealt with family cases. From 1 April 2019 family issues are a section of the court.

(2017): The category “other” concerns the Land Registration Court that has been established in 2009. As for the Commercial Court, in Denmark, it is called Maritime and Commercial Court and it presents the peculiarity to also deal, to a great extent but not exclusively, with insolvency cases (bankruptcies etc.). Accordingly, there is an overlap with the category “Insolvency courts”. Of course Military courts exist but they are not part of the Danish Courts Administration.

(2016): Land Registration Court.

Estonia

(General Comment): In Estonia, there are no specialized first instance courts, other than administrative courts. All the cases are dealt with by ordinary courts of first instance. The two administrative courts of first instance are situated in Tallinn and Tartu. Nevertheless, for guaranteeing wider access to justice, these two courts have several court buildings in other cities, namely in Pärnu and Jõhvi, where judges and their supporting legal staff work.

Finland

(General Comment): In Finland, there are six regional administrative courts, the Market Court, the Labour Court and the Insurance Court.
Another specialised court is the High Court of Impeachment that hears charges against ministers (i.e. members of the Government), the Chancellor of Justice, the Parliamentary Ombudsman and members of the Supreme Court or the Supreme Administrative Court for unlawful conduct in office. In addition, the High Court of Impeachment deals with charges concerning the criminal liability of the President of the Republic. However, it is convened only when necessary.

(2016): In Finland there are 6 Administrative Courts, 1 Market Court, 1 Labour Court and 1 Insurance Court. Then there is the High Court of Impeachment that hears charges against Ministers (i.e.Members of the State Council), Chancellor of Justice, Parliamentary Ombudsman and Supreme Court Justices for unlawful conduct in office but it is convened only when necessary.

France

(General Comment): With regard to the Enforcement of criminal sanctions courts: in matters of enforcement of sentences, the enforcement judge (JAP) is a court of first instance for the enforcement of sentences, being at the same time a decision-making, control and monitoring body. There is at least one JAP per department (article 712-2 of the CPP). The JAP is competent for adult convicts, and his field of intervention is the following: for measures to individualize custodial sentences, he or she has general jurisdiction (except for a few measures that fall under the special jurisdiction of the Court for the enforcement of sentences); for custodial sentences, when a specific text so provides;
for the follow-up of security measures. Established by the law of March 9, 2004, the Court for the enforcement of sentences (TAP) is a court of first instance, composed of three JAPs of first instance courts, appointed by order of the First President of the Appelate Court. In each Appelate Court, a TAP is established whose territorial jurisdiction extends to the jurisdiction of this court (articles 712-3 and D 49-2 of the CPP, article indicating the list of TAPs by Appelate court and the territorial jurisdiction). The seat of the TAP is in principle "that of the first instance court of the seat of the Appelate Court" (article D. 49-3 CPP).
The objective is to entrust the most complex and sensitive cases to a collegiality. Thus, the TAP has jurisdiction over: 1) by the effect of the law for those sentenced to the heaviest penalties: applications for parole and suspension of "medical" sentences for persons sentenced to imprisonment or imprisonment of more than 10 years and whose remaining sentence to be served exceeds 3 years; applications for an increase in the security period; placement under judicial supervision of dangerous persons...); 2) by decision of the JAP, in particular because of the complexity of the case or the personality of the convicted person (article 712-6 al. 3 of the CPP).
In matters of terrorism, a derogatory jurisdiction is provided for under ordinary law (articles 706-22-1 and D 49-75 to D49-81-5 of the CPP). The Paris Enforcement courts specialized in terrorist matters (JAPAT, the TAPAT and the enforcement chamber) have 1)exclusive jurisdiction to monitor persons convicted by specialized terrorism trial courts pursuant to Article 706-17 of the CPP; 2) competing jurisdiction with ordinary law Enforcement courts to monitor persons convicted of acts of terrorism and other offenses falling within the scope of Article 706-16 of the CPP by ordinary law courts.
source DACG.

(2021): Labour courts: 211 CPH (conseils de prud'hommes) + 5 labour courts = 216 courts. The CPH have jurisdiction, according to Article L. 1411-1 of the Labour Code, to hear individual disputes between employees or apprentices and their employers arising from the execution of an employment or apprenticeship contract. Commercial courts: 134 TCs, 9 TMCs, 2 TPIs with commercial jurisdiction, 7 TJs with commercial jurisdiction = 152 courts. Commercial courts are specialised courts with jurisdiction to hear disputes relating to commitments between traders, between credit institutions or between them, disputes relating to commercial companies and commercial acts by their form (Art. L. 721-1 et seq. of the Commercial Code). There are 134 commercial courts whose judges are exclusively "juges consulaires". With regard to the judicial organisation in overseas France, there are 2 First instance courts with jurisdiction in commercial matters and 9 mixed commercial courts. In addition, 7 judicial courts have a commercial chamber in Alsace-Moselle. Concerning juvenile courts: 156 according to the key figures of Justice 2021 and 155 according to the judicial atlas of 2021.
"Other specialised courts": the parity courts for rural leases (TPBR): 272 (according to the key figures for Justice 2021); the court for navigation on the Rhine (L 215-4 al.1 COJ) ; the court of first instance for navigation on the Moselle (L 215-4 al.2 COJ); 6 maritime courts (Bordeaux, Brest, Cayenne, Le Havre, Marseille Saint-Denis); the National court of asylum. Source DSJ and Council of State

(2020): Despite the provisional NA answer for the category " Courts for the execution of criminal sanctions ", the total is available, as it is a small number that will not significantly affect the total. On labor courts: 210 CPHs + 6 labor courts = 216 courts Industrial tribunals have jurisdiction, according to Article L. 1411-1 of the Labor Code, to hear individual disputes that arise between employees or apprentices and their employers during the execution of an employment or apprenticeship contract. There are 210 industrial tribunals and 6 labor courts in the French overseas territories. Same figure as in 2020
On commercial courts: 134 TCs, 9 TMCs, 2 TPIs with commercial jurisdiction, 7 TJs with commercial jurisdiction = 152 courts Commercial courts are specialized courts with jurisdiction to hear disputes relating to commitments between traders, between credit institutions or between them, disputes relating to commercial companies and commercial acts by their form (Art. L. 721-1 et seq. of the Commercial Code) On social jurisdictions:
-Since November 1, 2019, litigation concerning military disability pensions has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the administrative courts, doing away with the military disability pension courts and the regional military disability pension courts that rule on appeal.
- Since January 1, 2019, as a result of Law No. 2016-1547 of November 18, 2016 on the modernization of justice in the 21st century, social litigation, formerly divided between the social security courts (TASS), the courts of disability litigation (TCI) and the departmental social assistance commissions (CDAS), was merged and transferred to the "tribunaux de grande instance", ordinary courts of first instance, which became, as of January 1, 2020, by effect of law n° 2019-222 of March 23, 2019 on programming 2018-2022 and reform for the justice system, Judicial Courts. Consequently, these specialized jurisdictions have been abolished. On appeal, the litigation was only under the jurisdiction of the CNITAAT (extended until December 31, 2022; but now it is under the jurisdiction of specially designated courts of appeal, which allows for better accessibility to justice. There are 134 commercial courts whose judges are exclusively consular. With regard to the judicial organization in overseas France, there are 2 courts of first instance with jurisdiction in commercial matters and 9 mixed commercial courts. In addition, 7 judicial courts have a commercial chamber in Alsace-Moselle. In 2020 it was written 143 commercial courts because I think that only the TC and TMC were counted and not the TJ with commercial jurisdiction nor the TPI with commercial jurisdiction. About the other specialized courts :
The tribunaux paritaires des baux ruraux (TPBR) are autonomous (L. 491-1 of the Code rural et de la pêche maritime). The 2018-2022 programming and reform law for justice sets the seats and jurisdictions of the TPBRs no longer with reference to the seats of the former magistrate's courts but according to the seats of the judicial courts and their proximity chamber. On social jurisdictions:
-Since November 1, 2019, the litigation of military disability pensions has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the administrative courts, making the military disability pension courts and the regional military disability pension courts, which rule on appeal, disappear.
- Since January 1, 2019, as a result of law no. 2016-1547 of November 18, 2016 on the modernization of justice in the 21st century, social litigation, which was previously divided between the social security courts (TASS), the disability litigation courts (TCI) and the departmental social assistance commissions (CDAS), was merged and transferred to the "tribunaux de grande instance", courts of first instance under ordinary law, which became, as of January 1, 2020, the "Tribunaux Judiciaires" (Judicial Courts) under Law No. 2019-222 of March 23, 2019, on programming for 2018-2022 and reform of the justice system.

(2019): Since 1 January 2019, social litigation, formerly divided between the social security courts (TASS), the incapacity courts (TCI) and the departmental social assistance commissions (CDAS), has been merged and transferred to the “tribunaux de grande instance” (first instance courts of general jurisdiction). As a result, these specialised courts have been abolished. As of 1 November 2019, litigation concerning military invalidity pensions will be transferred to the administrative courts, eliminating the military invalidity pension courts and the regional military invalidity pension courts which rule on appeal. These changes explain the variation in the number of courts compared to the previous year. The other specialised courts are: - joint courts for rural leases: 274; juvenile courts: 155; court for navigation on the Rhine: 1; maritime courts: 6; national asylum court: 1; court of first instance for navigation on the Moselle: 1.

(2018): The other specialized courts are: - joint courts for rural leases: 272 ;
- juvenile courts: 155; - military pension courts: 36;
- court for navigation on the Rhine: 1;
- Maritime courts: 6;
- national court of asylum: 1; - court of first instance for navigation on the Moselle: 1.
In the previous questionnaire, the Joint Rural Lease Courts (JRTs) were indicated, with the District Courts (TIs) within the "Rental Courts", the figure of 307 corresponding to the District Courts, since the seats and jurisdictions of the JRTs were linked to those of the TI. However, the TPBRs are, and have always been, autonomous courts. However, as decrees have been issued to remove some TPBRs, there is no longer a correlation between their number and that of IT. We have therefore indicated here in the "rental courts", only IT (289), and by including TPBRs in a separate item, which is legally more accurate. The total number of TPBRs is 274. On the insurance and social security courts: in the requested reference year, there are 26 disability courts, 115 social security courts (TASS) and 100 departmental social assistance commissions (CDAS). The differential of 100 corresponds to the addition of the 100 CDASs which are administrative courts.
The Paris Court, created on 14 May 2018, brought together all the services of the Regional Court, formerly dispersed over 5 sites, including Ile de la Cité, the Police Court and the 20 District Courts. The number of TIs had to be reduced by 19. In addition, the reform of the transfer of the police court under the 21st century Justice Act had the effect of removing 3 of them from the 307 TIs. The number of IT has therefore increased from 304 (307-3) to 285 district courts (304-19). We have added to these 285 TI the 4 TPIs because of their dual IT and TGI skills. Thus: 285 TI + 4 TPI = 289 TI in total.

(2017): The other specialized courts are:
- juvenile courts 155
- military pensions tribunals 36
- the court for navigation on the Rhine 1
- the court for navigation on the Moselle 1
- maritime trade courts 6
- national court of asylum 1

(2016): The other specialised courts are: 155 juvenile courts; 36 military pension courts; 1 court for navigation on the Rhine; 1 court for navigation on the Moselle; 6 maritime trade courts; 1 national asylum court.
As a matter of fact, the following reforms are on-going:
- The future Tribunal of Paris, whose establishment is scheduled for 14 May 2018, will unify all the services of the TGI (Tribunal de grande instance) currently dispersed over 5 sites, including “Ile de la Cité”, the police court and the first instance courts (tribunaux d’instance);
- Since 1 July 2017, the hearings of the Police Court, previously under the jurisdiction of the “tribunaux d’instance”, have been transferred to the TGI. The aim of this reform is to refocus the tribunaux d’instance on day-to-day civil justice and to centralise criminal litigation at the seat of the TGI.
- Since 1 July 2017, the 311 local courts have been abolished (Law No. 2011-1862 of 13 December 2011), their powers being taken over by the tribuanux d’instance in civil matters and by the police courts attached to the TGI in criminal matters.
- As of 1 January 2019, social litigation, currently divided between the Social Security Courts (TASS), the Disability Dispute Courts (TCI) and the Departmental Social Assistance Commissions (CDAS), will be unified and transferred to the TGI (first instance courts of general jurisdiction). These specialised courts will then be abolished.

(2015): Other specialised courts are:
Juvenile courts : 155
Military Pensions Courts: 36
Court for navigation on the Rhine: 1
Maritime Courts: 14
National Court of Asylum: 1
Court of First Instance for navigation on the Moselle: 1

(2014): The reduction of the number of specialised courts is primarily due to the suppression of 70 military pensions courts. The other specialised courts are: Children courts (155); Military pensions courts (36); the Rhine navigation court; commercial maritime courts (14); the National court for asylum right; the Court for the navigation on the Moselle. In contrast with 2010 and 2012 data, a part of the "other specialised courts" was distributed in the proposed categories, namely the agricultural land courts, the courts of rental cases, the Courts for enforcement of criminal sanctions and the courts of incapability litigation.The specialised interregional courts, competent to judge cases of organised crime were added.

(2013): The reduction of the number of specialised courts is primarily due to the suppression of 70 military pensions courts. The other specialised courts are: Children courts (155); Military pensions courts (36); the Rhine navigation court; commercial maritime courts (14); the National court for asylum right; the Court for the navigation on the Moselle. In contrast with 2010 and 2012 data, a part of the "other specialised courts" was distributed in the proposed categories, namely the agricultural land courts, the courts of rental cases, the Courts for enforcement of criminal sanctions and the courts of incapability litigation.The specialised interregional courts, competent to judge cases of organised crime were added.

(2012): There are 135 Commercial Courts and 8 mixed commercial courts (this of Mayotte is not included). The category "labour courts" subsumes 210 industrial courts and 6 labour courts. The category "insurance and/or social security courts" refers to the courts responsible for social security cases. The other specialised courts are: Police courts (3); local Police courts (3); Children courts (155); Incapacity Dispute courts (26); Agricultural land courts (281); Sentence enforcement courts (50); Military pensions courts (106); the Rhine navigation court; Commercial maritime courts (14); the Court for the navigation on Moselle. The military court of Paris was discontinued in January 2012. Its functions were transfered to a pole specialised in military matters in the High Court of Paris.

Germany

(General Comment): It is noteworthy that depending on the value at dispute, commercial cases are dealt with at Local or Regional Courts, on application in a chamber established at the Regional Court for commercial cases. There are no separate commercial courts. Likewise, there are no independent rent and tenancies courts, enforcement courts or courts for insurance cases. Depending on the caseload, special panels of judges are established for this purpose at the Local and Regional Courts. Family cases are dealt with at first instance in special departments of the Local Courts (second instance: Higher Regional Courts). The Federal Armed Forces do not have any military courts of their own; its members are subject to civil jurisdiction. Juvenile courts do not exist as independet courts either. They are established at the Local Courts or Regional Courts, depending on the severity of the expected sentence and the type of offence. The Juvenile Courts may be composed of a single criminal judge sitting as youth judge or one or more jugdes together with lay youth assessors.

(2021): The category “other” covers:
18 Finance Courts (first instance)
16 Constitutional Courts of the Länder, the Federal Constitutional Court, Federal Patent Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)
With regard to the Constitutional Courts please see General Comment Q 42.

(2020): The category “other” covers:
18 Finance Courts (first instance)
16 Constitutional Courts of the Länder, the Federal Constitutional Court, Federal Patent Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Social Court and the Federal Finance Court (higher instances)
With regard to the Constitutional Courts please see General Comment Q 42.

(2019): finance courts

(2018): Finance Courts

(2017): Finance courts

(2016): Other specialised 1st instance courts: Finance Courts

(2015): The data refer to the year 2014. At present, no more recent data are available.

(2014): In 2014, in comparison with 2012, the number of specialized first instance courts decreased of three labour courts in two Landers.

Greece

(General Comment): In Greece, there are no special courts for the fields of law described in the question 43, besides those already mentioned. The Greek Constitution is reluctant to provide in the Greek legal system special courts. Instead, within the Courts of First Instance and Courts of Appeal of large cities, we have special Chambers, where the task of adjudicating in special categories of law (e.g. family law, commercial law, etc.) is assigned. Judges entrusted with such duties have usually the correspondent specific studies. As far as other special courts are concerned, special provisions regulate the operation of courts for juveniles, military, navy and air force courts.We clarify that the military,navy and air force courts are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of National Defense, therefore we have no further information.

(2021): There are no special courts for resolving Internet-related disputes.

(2020): Administrative courts include: in the first instance 30, in the second instance 9 and 1 Supreme Court(the Council of State).
Juvenile courts are subject to the Courts of First Instance, according to your instructions the choice changed from non-available to non applicable.
The military courts are under a different ministry, specifically the National Defense.
The higher instance other specialized courts is the Court of Auditors that is considered one of three supreme courts in Greece.

(2017): In Greece, there are no special courts for the fields of law described in the question 43, besides those already mentioned. The Greek Constitution is reluctant to provide in the Greek legal system special courts. Instead, within the Courts of First Instance and Courts of Appeal of large cities, we have special Chambers, where the task of adjudicating in special categories of law (e.g. family law, commercial law, etc.) is assigned. Judges entrusted with such duties have usually the correspondent specific studies. As far as other special courts are concerned, special provisions regulate the operation of courts for juveniles, military, navy and air force courts.

Hungary

(General Comment): There are military departments at five Regional Courts and at one Regional Court of Appeal. Although they only deal with military related criminal cases, they are not considered as specialized courts as they are a part of the ordinary court system both in administrative and professional management.
Regional Courts deal with labour cases on first instance while administrative cases are dealt by eight Regional Court on a regional level.

(2020): "Administrative and labour courts (20) were dismissed on the 31st of March 2020. From this date Regional Courts deal with labour cases on first instance while administrative cases are dealt with by eight Regional Court on a regional level".

Ireland

(General Comment): The two specialised first instance courts listed above are Special Criminal Court No. 1 and Special Criminal Court No. 2. The latter was established in October 2015 and came into operation, sitting for the first time, in 2016. In previous cycles the category "other" (1) was referring to Special Criminal Court No. 1.
Other than distinctions between jurisdictional levels there is no specialisation - all judges within a court jurisdiction may be allocated to any category of case falling within the jurisdictional remit of the court concerned. Starting in 2013 a new cadre of specialist judges was created in the Circuit Court with specific jurisdiction in relation to certain types of personal insolvency remedy and certain pre-trial order making powers.
Ireland has a specialist regime for the trial of commercial proceedings in the form of the Commercial List of the High Court (known as the 'Commercial Court') but, as it is not a separate legal entity, being a list within and formally a part of the High Court, it is not included as a specialist court as such.

(2019): Legislation to provide for a Family Court has been proposed

Italy

(General Comment): Since 2014 in Italy there are 22 Brand Commercial courts (Tribunali delle imprese) that are legal entities of their own and not just internal court divisions for organizational purpose (such as labour, family etc.).
It is noteworthy that in Italy, some of the specialized first instance courts are not administered and financed by the Ministry of Justice. This is the case for the regional administrative courts, the regional audit commissions, the local tax commissions and military courts. These courts are not taken into consideration for the replies to questions 6, 46 and 52 for none of the exercises.
In respect of the 20 first instance administrative courts (legal entities) and their supreme court, it should be stressed that they have been encompassed within the total under question 43 for the last four exercises, but only since 2014 this approach is reflected in questions 91 and 99 (number of administrative law cases).
Moreover, in Italy specific matters (such as labour, family etc.) are dealt by specific divisions within the same Court. There are also 26 divisions called DDA (Direzioni Distrettuali Antimafia) which deal specifically with mafia and organized crime.

(2021): The appeal of some specialized courts (e.g. commercial courts, juvenile courts) are dealt by the general jurisdiction appeal courts.
Specific subject matters (e.g labour, insolvency, family, fight against terrorism and organised crime) are dealt by specific divisions within general jurisdiction courts. See general comment for details.

(2020): Tax courts fall into the “Other” category.
The appeal of some specialized courts (e.g. commercial courts, juvenile courts) are dealt by the general jurisdiction appeal courts.
Specific subject matters (e.g labour, insolvency, family, fight against terrorism and organised crime) are dealt by specific divisions within general jurisdiction courts. See general comment for details.

(2019): The category “other” subsumes 29 Minor (or Juvenile) Courts and 103 Tax Courts

(2018): The category “other” category subsumes 29 Minor (or Juvenile) Courts and 103 Tax Courts.

(2017): Other: 29 Minor (or Juvenile) Courts + 103 provincial tax commissions

(2016): OTHER: 29 Minor (or Juvenile) Courts + 103 Local Tax Commissions

(2013): In September 2013, the Italian judicial system implemented an extensive reorganization of the territorial distribution of offices with the closing (by merger) of 30 Tribunals, 30 Prosecution offices, 220 branches of Tribunals and 346 Peace Judges.

Latvia

(General Comment): In Latvia, only the Administrative court can be considered as a 1st instance specialized court (which is divided into 5 court houses). As to the category “military courts”, the reply NA is justified by the fact that according to the Law on Judicial Power, judicial power in the Republic of Latvia is vested in district (city) courts, regional courts, the Supreme Court and the Constitutional Court, but in state of emergencies or during war – also military courts. The rest of the courts in Latvia are not established, and therefore in this case should be NAP.

(2021): Military courts is established in state of emergency or during a war. On 1 July 2020, amendments to the Law on Judicial Power came into force, providing for the establishment of the Economic Court, which is competent for both certain types of civil and criminal cases. Accordingly, the Court is competent for specific commercial disputes and criminal cases, which cause significant damage to the business environment and economic development. The Economic Court is indicated as Commercial Court. As for Administrative court - first instance court is Administrative District Court and for higher instance is indicated Administrative Regional (appeal) instance Court.

(2020): Military courts is established in state of emergency or during a war. On 1 July 2020, amendments to the Law on Judicial Power came into force, providing for the establishment of the Economic Court, which is competent for both certain types of civil and criminal cases. Accordingly, the Court is competent for specific commercial disputes and criminal cases, which cause significant damage to the business environment and economic development. The Economic Court is not counted yet in the total number of specialized courts, because it will start its action on 31st March 2021. As for Administrative court - first instance court is Administrative District Court and for higher instance is indicated Administrative Regional (appeal) instance Court.

(2019): There is only Administrative court in Latvia. On July 1, 2020, amendments to the Law “On Judical Power” entered into force. The Amendments provides for the establishment of the Court of Economic Affairs. The Economic Court will take office on 1 January 2021.

(2018): There is only Administrative court in Latvia.

(2016): There is only one specialised court the administrative court with 5 court houses

Luxembourg

(General Comment): Courts of general jurisdiction are organized into specialized sections. For example, the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court. Only the administrative, military and social security courts of first instance are autonomous.

(2020): Pour 2020, seules les entités juridiques ont été prises en considération dans le tableau.

(2017): Please note that the total of 043 is not identical to the total in 042, as most of the specialized courts are in fact specialized sections of a general court. E.g. the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court (tribunal d'arrondissement). Only the administrative, military and 1st instance social security courts are selfstanding.

(2016): Please note that the total of 043 is not identical to the total in 042, as most of the specialized courts are in fact specialized sections of a general court. E.g. the commercial courts (which also deal with insolvency cases) are specialized sections of the district court (tribunal d'arrondissement). Only the administrative, military and 1st instance social security courts are selfstanding.

(2014): Most of the areas mentioned in the question are within the competence of district courts (commercial cases, insolvency cases, family law cases and all criminal cases except for offenses that are under the jurisdiction of justices of peace) and justices of peace (labour law cases, rental cases). The indicated total is a purely statistical information which does not reflect the reality.

(2012): Matters concerning trade and family law are dealt with at the level of district courts, while matters pertaining to labour law and rental cases are within the competence of the justices of peace.

Malta

(General Comment): The number of specialised courts includes non-criminal, administrative and criminal courts established as legal entities in line with the CEPEJ methodology. The seven (7) 1st Instance specialised courts referred to in Q43 are the Rent Regulation Board, the Land Arbitration Board, the Rural Leases Control Board, the Small Claims Tribunal, the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction, the Administrative Review Tribunal and the Juvenile Court. In addition, we have included the Constitutional Court as a 2nd Instance specialised court. Other courts previously counted as specialised courts, such as the Family Court and the Commercial Court, are divisions of the Civil Court, First Hall, and as such are now being included with the 1st Instance Courts of General Jurisdiction.

(2021): The first instance specialised courts are:
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction
- the Juvenile Court

Under the second instance specialised courts, we are including the Constitutional Court which is a court that deals exclusively with constitutional cases.

(2020): A number of courts that used to be previously identified as specialised courts, are not being categorised this time, given that they all make part of the First Hall, General Jurisdiction Court. These are:
- The Commercial Court (including insolvency cases)
- The Family Court

The identified specialised courts listed under 'Other specialised courts' are:
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction

The Juvenile Court is a specialised criminal court.

(2019): The courts referred to under 'Other specialised 1st Instance courts' include:
- The Civil Court, First Hall
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction

(2018): The courts referred to under 'Other specialised 1st Instance courts' include:
- The Civil Court, First Hall
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction

(2017): The other specialised 1st Instance courts include:
- the Civil Court, First Hall
- the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction - the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal

(2016): The other specialised 1st Instance courts include:
- the Civil Court, First Hall
- the Land Arbitration Board
- the Rural Leases Control Board
- the Small Claims Tribunal

Netherlands

(General Comment): The Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, also known as the Administrative High Court for Trade and Industry (College van van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven) is a specialized administrative court, which rules on disputes in the area of social-economic administrative law, and appeals for specific laws. The tribunal hears both first and second instance cases, but is categorized as a first instance court.
The Central Appeals Tribunal is counted as first instance administrative court as well, as it hears both first and second instances, in some cases. The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State is counted as Administrative court at the highest instance, although it is a division of the Council of the Judiciary and not part of the organisational structure of the judiciary.
There is no separate military court, but there is a military chamber in one of the district courts.

(2021): See also comment at Q42 on the other special (not specialized) appeal tribunals.
Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, also known as the Administrative High Court for Trade and Industry (College van van Beroep voor het Bedrijfsleven). This is a specialized administrative court, which rules on disputes in the area of social-economic administrative law, and appeals for specific laws. The tribunal hears both first and second instance cases, but is categorized as a first instance court.
The Central Appeals Tribunal (Centrale Raad van Beroep) is a court of appeal mainly active in legal areas pertaining to social security and civil service. In these areas, it is also the highest judicial authority. In some cases, it is the first and sole instance.
The Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State is the highest administrative court with general jurisdiction in the Netherlands. It hears various types of appeals (e.g. members of the public / associations / commercial companies against governmental bodies, or between public authorities).

(2020): The specialized courts are:
Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal: the administrative High Court for trade and industry. This tribunal is a specialized administrative court that rules on disputes in the area of social-economic administrative law. Categorized as administrative court.
The Central Appeals Tribunal is the highest judicial authority in areas of social security and civil service. Categorized as other.

(2017): same as last year

(2015): Currently the commercial court in the Netherlands is the specialized court CBb. Per January first 2017 starts the Netherlands Commercial Court (NCC).

Poland

(2020): There are 7 military courts of first instance and 2 military courts of higher instance in Poland.

(2019): It is noteworthy that the Land and Mortgage Courts which are within the structure of the common court system deal with specific topics, but they are departments.
Besides, the National Court Register and Pledge Registry Departments are business divisions.
The EU Trademark and Community Design Court (which existed in the XXII Division of the District Court in Warsaw)-functioned from 2004 until the creation of intellectual property courts, which took place on 1 July 2020. Cases in the field of intellectual property belong to the jurisdiction of selected District Courts (Article 47990 of the Code of Civil Procedure), while the District Court in Warsaw (XXII Division) has exclusive jurisdiction in matters of intellectual property concerning computer programs, inventions, utility models, topography of integrated circuits, plant varieties and company secrets of a technical nature.
The Court of Competition and Consumer Protection is a special department functioning within the District Court in Warsaw. In the current state of law, the scope of activity of the 17th Department of the Court of Competition and Consumer Protection includes the handling of the following cases in court proceedings of appeals and complaints against decisions and orders issued by the government: the President of the Office of Competition and Consumer Protection, the President of the Energy Regulatory Office, the President of the Railway Transport Office, the President of the Office of Electronic Communications.
When it comes to matters from lease or tenancy agreements - as long as these matters are of an economic nature, they are recognized by business departments, as are matters related to new technologies and the Internet space.

Portugal

(General Comment): Q.43 -total:The number given under Q43.1.1 includes 17 first instance courts and 3 higher instance courts of administrative jurisdiction that are not included under Q.42.2. Administrative courts are part of another jurisdiction and under our law cannot be considered specialized courts.

(2020): «Commercial courts» deal with, inter alia, winding up of the company, insolvency and suspension and revocation of company resolutions.
«Internet related disputes»: only for Internet domain system (DNS) issues, which are under the jurisdiction of the Intelectual Property Court; for all other Internet related issues, general jurisdiction courts are competent. Internet related disputes were not included in the number of specialised courts for previous cycles.
«Other specialised courts": includes all other courts that are not listed in the categories above.
This category includes Civil Central Judicial Divisions, Criminal Central Judicial Divisions, Civil Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Criminal Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Petty Criminality Local; Proximity Judicial Divisions, Criminal Examination Judicial Divisions, Enforcement Judicial Divisions, Central Criminal Examination Court, Competition Court and Maritime Court.

(2019): This category includes Civil Central Judicial Divisions, Criminal Central Judicial Divisions, Civil Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Criminal Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Petty Criminality Local Proximity Judicial Divisions, Criminal Examination Judicial Divisions, Enforcement Judicial Divisions, Central Criminal Examination Court, Intelectual Property Court, Competition Court and Maritime Court.

(2018): Changes to the judicial organization (Law n. 40-A/2016, 22 December) are in force since January 1, 2017.

(2017): Changes to the judicial organization (Law n. 40-A/2016, 22 December) are in force since January 1, 2017.
Other specialised 1st instance courts include, among others: Criminal Instruction Courts, Maritime Courts; Intelectual Property and Competition Court; Enforcement Courts.
Law 31/2012, 14 August, put in force the Rent and tenancy section (Balcão Nacional do Arrendamento) that is functioning since 8
January 2013.

(2015): In 2013-2014, the Reform of the Portuguese Judicial system was implemented. One of the major goals of this reform was to set up specialised courts on a national level, which led to a significant increase of commercial courts compared to previous years.

The difference between Q42.2 and Q43 is due to the inclusion of the 20 administrative courts in Q43. In Portugal, the administrative jurisdiction is autonomous, independent from the civil jurisdiction and cannot be considered as specialised courts.

Other courts:
Other specialised 1st instance courts include: Criminal Instruction Courts, Maritime Courts; Intelectual Property and Competition Court; Enforcement Courts.
Law 31/2012, 14 August, put in force the Rent and tenancy section (Balcão Nacional do Arrendamento) that is functioning since 8 January 2013

(2014): In 2013-2014, the Reform of the Portuguese Judicial system was implemented. One of the major goals of this reform was to set up specialised courts on a national level, which led to a significant increase of commercial courts compared to previous years.

For 2014, the category "other" subsumes as in 2012 Criminal Instruction Courts, Maritime Courts, Intellectual Property and Competition Court and Enforcement Courts. Additionally, the Rent and tenancy section (Balcão Nacional do Arrendamento) has been established by law in August 2012 and is functioning since 8 January 2013.

(2012): For 2012, the category “other” encompasses Criminal Instruction Courts, Maritime Courts, Intellectual Property and Competition Court and Enforcement Courts.

Romania

(General Comment): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.

(2020): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): In the Slovak court system there are 8 Regional courts which are the courts with dual competence. The Regional courts are the courts of appeal with the general jurisdiction in the civil, commercial and the criminal cases. In the appellate procedure they decide the appeals lodged against the decisions of all 54 District courts within their local jurisdiction. At the same time the Regional courts have the jurisdiction as the courts of first instance in administrative matters. They act as the administrative courts.
The Specialized Criminal court is competent to judge the grave criminal matters enumerated in the § 14 of the Criminal procedure Code (e. g. premeditated murder, corruption, terrorism, organised crime, severe economic crimes, damaging the financial interests of the EU etc.). Highest instance courts are the Supreme Court and the new Supreme Adminstrative Court.

(2021): The first instance administrative cases agenda is concentrated in eight regional courts, which also act as general courts of appeal. The question (43.) defines specialized courts as legal entities, so it cannot be understood that the administrative cases agenda is centralized on specialized courts as legal entities, but it is concentrated on 8 regional general courts. These 8 general regional courts are already legal entities included in Q42, line 1.2. Highest instance courts are the Supreme Court and the new Supreme Adminstrative Court.

(2020): The first instance administrative cases agenda is concentrated in eight regional courts, which also act as general courts of appeal. The question (43.) defines specialized courts as legal entities, so it cannot be understood that the administrative cases agenda is centralized on specialized courts as legal entities, but it is concentrated on 8 regional general courts. These 8 general regional courts are already legal entities included in Q42, line 1.2.

Slovenia

(General Comment): Although the given answer for 'labour courts' is 4 and 'insurance and/ or social welfare courts' at first instance is 1, the total number of these courts is 4, as one of the labour courts and the social court form a single legal entity – the Labour and social court in Ljubljana.
Concerning specialised courts – higher instances, although the given answer for 'labour courts' is 1 and 'insurance and/ or social welfare courts' is 1, the total number of these courts is 1, as they form a single legal entity – the Higher labour and social Court.

(2019): Please see general comment.

Spain

(General Comment): The Arbitration Court was created by decision of the General Council of the Judiciary of 25 November 2010. The latter assigns exclusive jurisdiction over arbitration matters to the Court of First Instance No. 101 of Madrid. This measure seeks to foster the development of uniform criteria in court proceedings for the assistance and control of arbitration in Madrid.
Other specialised courts include: Penal courts; Penal courts specialized in violence against women (courts for criminal trial, that have been assigned only to cases of gender violence); violence against women courts (courts of criminal investigation and civil proceedings related to gender violence cases); Prison courts; foreclosure proceedings courts;Civil Capacity courts and Civil registry.

(2021): "Juzgados de lo Mercantil" are in Spain in charge of insovencies and commercial cases (both). So it cannot be separated commercial and insolvency.

(2020): Commercial courts - new units have been established.

(2019): Courts of violence against women 106
Foreclosure proceedings Courts: 3
Court of arbitration: 1
Civil capacity courts: 13
Criminal courts: 348
Criminal courts specialized in Violence against women, 31
Juvenile Courts: 82
Prison courts: 51
Civil Registries: 28

(2018): Between 2016 and 2018, more first instance courts have become specialized in family matters. Courts of violence against women: 106
Foreclosure proceedings Courts: 3
Court of arbitration: 1
Civil capacity courts: 12
Criminal courts: 341
Criminal courts specialized in Violence against women, 32
Juvenile Courts: 82
Prison courts: 51
Civil Registries: 28
Additionally (and they are not accounted) there are 26 military courts that are not part of the Judiciary but they are inspected by it)

(2017): -338 Criminal courts
-32 Criminal courts specialized in violence against women
-106 violence against women courts
-82 juvenile courts
-51 Prison courts
-3 foreclosure proceedings courts
-1 Arbitration court
-18 Civil Capacity courts
- 28 Civil register offices

(2016): - 335 Criminal courts
-30 Criminal courts specialized in violence against women
-106 violence against women courts
-83 juvenile courts
-51 Prison courts
-3 foreclosure proceedings courts
-1 Arbitration court
-18 Civil Capacity courts
- 28 Civil register courts

(2015): Other specialised courts include: 343 Penal courts; 23 Penal courts specialized in violence against women; 106 violence against women courts; 83 juvenile courts; 50 Prison courts; 3 foreclosure proceedings courts; 1 Arbitration court; 12 Civil Capacity courts and 28 Civil registry.

The Commercial Courts deal with insolvency issues.

Military Courts have not been accounted because they do not belong to the Judiciary (except the Supreme Court 5th room). There are other 26 Military Courts.

(2014): In 2014, the category “other” encompasses: 357 Penal courts; 23 Penal courts specialized in violence against women; 106 violence against women courts; 83 Juvenile courts; 50 Prison courts; 16 Courts for disabled people (capacity courts), 26 Civil Register Courts, 3 Foreclosure proceedings courts (mortgage courts); 1 Arbitration court. The Decanatos exclusive are not included in this exercise because these organs are not courts and have rather administrative nature.

(2012): In 2012, the category “other” encompasses: 380 Penal courts; 17 Penal courts specialised in violence against women; 106 Violence against women courts; 82 Juvenile courts; 1 Juvenile Enforcement court; 50 Prison courts; 9 Capacity courts; 26 Civil Register courts; 8 Decanatos exclusive; 4 Labour enforcement courts; 4 Mortgage courts and one Arbitration Court.

Question 044

Austria

(2020): For this cycle, data on geographic locations is presented in respect of different locations for different instances, in compliance with the methodology developed in the Explanatory Note. The variation observed with previous cycles is only of a methodological nature.

(2016): It is planned to reduce the number of courts by 3 in 2018 (-1) and 2019 (-2)

Belgium

(2020): Deduction made on the basis of the number of buildings in which the courts are housed: 225 buildings in which all our premises are housed. In Eupen, the first instance courts combines the court of first instance, the labour court and the company court, which gives 8 for the labour and company courts (Law of 14 February 2014)

(2016): A reform of the justices of the peace is under way: 1. a reduction in the number of geographical settlements 2. expansion of their jurisdiction by increasing the amount of claims.
The reform of the cantons (justices of the peace) was launched in 2016 and resulted in the law of 25 December 2017 which formally amended or abolished the cantons. The amendments come into force over 1.5 years.

(2014):
According to 2014 data, a change in the number of seats of the justices of the peace is ongoing. Similarly, from 1 April 2014, the statutory number of courts has been decreased for commercial, labour and police first instance courts while keeping the existing geographical seats.

Bulgaria

(2018): Proposals for amendments to the Code of Administrative Procedure and Code of Civil Procedure to change the jurisdiction of the district and administrative courts with a view to regulating their workload. A model for the optimization of the judicial map at the level of district courts will be developed in implementation of a project under the Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020.

(2016): Proposals for amendments to the Administrative Procedure Code and the Code of Civil Procedure are intended to reform the jurisdiction of regional and administrative courts in order to regulate their workload. Within the implementation of a project under “Good governance” Operational Programme 2014-2020 a model for optimization of the judicial map on regional courts level will be developed.

Croatia

(2020): The reorganisation of judicial map that started in 2015 in which the number of municipal and misdemeanour courts as well as the number of municipal state attorneys' offices has been reduced continued in 2019 with the merger of municipal and misdemeanour courts into municipal courts.
The reasons for the merger were a significant decrease in the number of misdemeanour cases and overburdened municipal courts with civil cases. In the new judicial map, instead of 46 municipal and misdemeanour courts, there are now 34 municipal courts - all misdemeanour and municipal courts were merged in the same cities except in 2 largest cities, Zagreb and Split, in which specialised municipal courts for misdemeanour cases were retained, and due to geographical specificities and size of certain municipal courts they were separated and new municipal courts were established (10). Also, a new commercial court was established in Dubrovnik. The aim of this new judicial map with new courts in the network and increased jurisdiction of permanent services is to increase the efficiency of the courts, improve access to court services, ensure even distribution of the workload of judges, shorten the length of court proceedings, reduce the number of unresolved cases in municipal courts, and ensure optimisation and easier management of human resources in courts.

(2018): The reorganisation of judicial map that started in 2015 in which the number of municipal and misdemeanour courts as well as the number of municipal state attorneys' offices has been reduced continued in 2019 with the merger of municipal and misdemeanour courts into municipal courts.
The reasons for the merger were a significant decrease in the number of misdemeanour cases and overburdened municipal courts with civil cases. In the new judicial map, instead of 46 municipal and misdemeanour courts, there are now 34 municipal courts - all misdemeanour and municipal courts were merged in the same cities except in 2 largest cities, Zagreb and Split, in which specialised municipal courts for misdemeanour cases were retained, and due to geographical specificities and size of certain municipal courts they were separated and new municipal courts were established (10). Also, a new commercial court was established in Dubrovnik. The aim of this new judicial map with new courts in the network and increased jurisdiction of permanent services is to increase the efficiency of the courts, improve access to court services, ensure even distribution of the workload of judges, shorten the length of court proceedings, reduce the number of unresolved cases in municipal courts, and ensure optimisation and easier management of human resources in courts.

(2016): There is a new judicial reform in plan in which the misdemeanour courts will be merged with municipal courts (both 1st instance courts).

(2014): According to the new Act on Territories and Seats of Courts (Official Gazette 128/14), that entered into force on the 1st of April 2015, a further rationalization of the network of municipal (from 67 to 24) and misdemeanour courts (from 63 to 22) and the establishment of an additional commercial court (8 instead of 7) are to be carried out from 1st of April and 1st of July.

As well, the new Act introduces changes regarding the territorial jurisdiction with regard to dealing with appeals. In criminal cases, any county court can decide on appeals lodged against judgments, while only few county courts may decide on appeals in land, labor and family matters.

Cyprus

(2018): In 2019 a New administrative court of international protection has been established that will deal with asylum cases.

(2016): Bills are being drafted for the creation of a commercial court and a first instance asylum administrative court.

(2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been pointed out that an Administrative court has been established in Cyprus and started functioning on the 7th of January 2016.

Czech Republic

(2021): 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

(2020): 6 regional courts and 3 district courts have their branches in other cities.

Denmark

(2021): The 26 are all the 24 district courts plus the Maritime and Commercial Court and Land Registration Court. In the figure 29 is the two high courts and the Supreme Court included.

(2020): Included in first instance courts are district courts, Land Registration Court and the Maritime and Commercial Court.

Estonia

(General Comment): Estonia has 17 courthouses of county courts (first instance courts), 4 courthouses of administrative courts (first instance courts), 2 courthouses of appellate courts (second instance courts) and 1 courthouse of the Supreme Court (highest instance court), all together 24 courthouses. However, as some of the courts are situated in the same house (e.g Tallinn Administrative Court and Tallinn Circuit Court) and taking into account the fact that Pärnu County Court has a courthouse that is divided between two locations, there are 20 actual geographical locations of Estonian courts.

(2020): Tartu county court closed one courthouse, so now there's 20 geographic locations.

(2014): In the end of 2015 the Council for Administration of Courts devised the merger of two courthouses in Estonia that are situated very close to each other (20 km). Both houses will remain open but will have joint territorial jurisdiction and administration.

Finland

(2018): As of 1 January 2019, the district courts will be centralised by decreasing the number of the courts from 27 to 20. A court can have more than one office. The number of the district courts' offices will be reduced from 57 to 36 offices.
As of 1 September 2019, undisputed civil cases (for example debt collection, unpaid rents, other small debts and eviction cases) which are handled and decided in summary proceedings will be centralised from all 20 district courts to nine district courts.

(2016): In Finland is ongoing structural reform of the District Courts in which the number of the courts will be decreaced from 27 to 20. The main target is to merge smaller courts in to bigger units that would be more efficient and profitable and also maintain high quality. At the same time the geographichal locations of the District Courts will be decrased from 57 to 36. This means that in addition to the 7 administrational offices that will be shut down, 5 side offices and 13 separate locations for hearing will be closed. Instead the use of video conference, electronic services and other IT-solutions would be increased. Deadline for the new project is 31.12.2018 so that the reform would be in force in the beginning of the year 2019. The government's proposal has been given at January 2017. The handling of the proposal in the parliament is unfinished.

(2014): According to 2014 data, for the foreseeable future the next reform is the developing of the structure of the District Court network. The foreseen change is a reduction of the number of District Courts.

France

(2021): 661: this figure takes into account all courts of first instance, excluding Courts of appeal (CA). Sites hosting only a Court of appeal have therefore been excluded from this count. Sites hosting both a CA and a court of first instance have been counted only once (hence the difference of 44: 37 CAs occupying 44 sites), 43 of which are for the administrative order. 715: this figure takes into account all courts, whether on appeal or at first instance. When a court of first instance and a Court of appeal are located on the same site, they have been counted separately, including 53 for the administrative order.

(2020): "With regard to the judiciary, there are 576 courts of first instance - geographic locations. This figure takes into account, by number of sites, all the courts of first instance, excluding the second instance court. Sites hosting exclusively a second instance court have therefore been excluded from this count. Sites hosting both a CA and a trial court were counted only once. There were 619 Courts geographic locations counted. This figure takes into account, by number of sites, all the jurisdictions whether they are appeal or first instance. Moreover, when a first instance court and a second instance court are located on the same site, they have been counted twice (hence the difference of 43 with the previous question: 37 CA which occupy 43 sites).
As regards the administrative order, there are 42 first instance courts for the administrative order and 53 all courts for the administrative order. "

(2016): A reform could take place within the framework of the bill on Justice programming presented in 2018. If no court site should be closed, the organization could be modified, particularly at the level of the courts of appeal, whose map is very different from those of the current administrative regions. There could also be only one first instance court per department.

(2014): As of 1 September 2014, the high courts (TGI) were resettled in the towns of Saint-Gaudens, Saumur and Tulle. Moreover, seconded chambers (geographic locations) were created on the same date in Guingamp and Marmande and on 1 January 2015 in Millau. A draft law to modernise the justice provides that the litigation of social security affairs and disability will be brought together before the TGI. Small offences ruled before the District Court will be transferred to TGI; similarly, compensation for personal injury will be entirely the responsibility of the TGI.

Germany

(General Comment): The figures in this section are taken from the chart "Number of Federal and State Courts" (https://www.bmjv.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF/Anzahl_der_Gerichte_des_Bundes_und_der_Laender.html) that does not distinguish between legal entities and geographic location of the courts. Generally, one legal entity equals one geographic location. A small number of courts may have a additional points of presence in other geographic locations. Since the exact number of geographic locations in comparison to legal entities is unknown, the figures from the chart "Number of Federal and State Courts" were used to answer this question as well.

(2018): The possibility of combining courts is being considered by individual Länder in order to reduce costs. The regional structures have proven effective.
On 5 November 2019, the Land Government of Schleswig-Holstein adopted a statutory instrument on the concentration of jurisdiction which combines existing concentrations of jurisdiction while adding further concentration provisions. The instrument will be promulgated at the end of the month.

(2016): The possibility of combining courts is being considered by individual Länder in order to reduce costs.

Greece

(2020): The total number of courts includes the Court of Auditors

(2014): According to 2014 data, the Law 1756/1988, article 2, as modified by the Law 4123/2013, provides for a reduction of the number of courts. Besides, the Law 1756/1988, article 4, as modified by the Law 4264/2014, provides for a change in the powers of courts.

Hungary

(2018): According to proposed legislation an independent administrative court system may be established in the future.

(2016): Two new district courts will be established (one in 2017 in the city of Szigetszentmiklós, another one in 2019 in the city of Érd).

(2014): According to 2014 data, a new first instance (district) court will be established in the city of Érd on 01/01/2018.

Ireland

(2018): The Assisted Decision-Making (Capacity) Act 2015 will, when commenced, replace the existing wardship regime for persons with capacity issues and introduce new decision support arrangements for such persons. New jurisdiction will, in particular , be conferred on the Circuit Court in respect of such arrangements. The current situation is that while some parts of the 2015 Act are commenced, others remain to be commenced.

(2016): The Assisted Decision-Making (Capacity) Act 2015 will, when commenced, replace the existing wardship regime for persons with capacity issues and introduce new decision support arrangements for such persons. New jurisdiction will, in particular , be conferred on the Circuit Court in respect of such arrangements.

(2014): According to 2014 data, legislation is in preparation for the creation of specialised family courts within the High, Circuit and District Courts.

Italy

(2016): Enhancing the specialization of judges / courts. In particular, the judiciary authorities are evaluating the introduction of specific courts for family and personal matters ("Berruti" reform). Increased competence of Business Courts. Establishment of specialized sections on matters such as immigration, international protection and free movement of citizens of the European Union.
Revision of the appeal system in order to reduce the appeal rate.

Latvia

(2021): All the courts (geographic locations) - Administrative District Court in Riga and Administrative Regional Court is located in one building, there is counted as 1 court per geographical location and indicated in the number of first instance courts. The same situation is in Vidzeme region - Vidzeme Regional Court Madona Court house and Vidzeme District Court is located in 1 building, there is counted as 1 court per geographical location and indicated in the number of first instance courts.

(2018): Reform was finished in March 2018. In its course first instance court count was reduced to 10 (9 first instance + 1 first instance Administrative court).
In year 2020/2021 there is a plan of creating a court for economical cases that would be a specialised 1st instance court.

(2016): Starting from 1 of February 2016, the reform has been introduced in Latgale (administrative region of Latvia). A number of district (city) courts in territory of Latgale regional court was decreased from six to two district (city) courts (Balvi District Court and Ludza District Court had been incorporated into Rezekne District Court; Kraslava district court and Preili District Court had been incorporated into Daugavpils District Court).
in 2016, Ministry of Justice make preparatory work to make court house reform in two district (city) court in the Rigas region. Accordingly, starting from 1 of February 2017, the City of Rīga Zemgale Urban District Court has been reorganized and conjoined with the City of Rīga Kurzeme District Court and changed the name of this court to City of Rīga Pārdaugavas Court.

(2014): In the frame of the 2014 evaluation, it has been stressed that the Judicial Council and the Cabinet of Ministers have initiated the gradual unification of the territory of operation of district (city) courts, through the implementation of the reform of the Riga court region. From March 2015, the Sigulda Court is attached to the Riga District Court, while the Riga City Central District Court was attached to the Riga City Vidzeme District Court.
The Judicial Council’s decision of 8 June 2015 confirmed the restructuring plan concerning the Jurmala City Court. According to the plan, the latter must be attached to the Riga District Court from August 2015. The review of the judicial map is intended to increase the efficiency of the court system and the quality of the judicial activity, to reduce the processing times and to even out the judicial capacity. The reform is still going on.

Lithuania

(General Comment): There are 59 1st instance courts locations: 12 district courts (49 locations), 5 regional courts (5 locations) of general jurisdiction and 2 regional administrative courts (5 locations).
For all the courts 62 courts locations: The Supreme Court of Lithuania, the Court of Appeal of Lithuania, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania and 59 1st instance courts locations.

(2020): There are 59 1st instance courts locations: 12 district courts (49 locations), 5 regional courts (5 locations) of general jurisdiction and 2 regional administrative courts (5 locations).
For all the courts 62 courts locations: The Supreme Court of Lithuania, the Court of Appeal of Lithuania, the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania and 59 1st instance courts locations.

(2018): Analysis and discussion on the need and possibility to decrease the number of court houses are initiated.

(2016): From January 1, 2018, there shall be 12 district courts (instead of 49) and 2 regional administrative courts (instead of 5).

Malta

(2021): The Juvenile Court is a first instance specialised court that is located outside of the main court building in Valletta. We are therefore reflecting this different geographic location in the updated figures in Q44.

(2016): Throughout 2017, work was carried out in order to introduce a commercial division within the Civil Court in order to facilitate cases filed under the Companies Act. The bill is currently undergoing the legislative process that would see it being enacted as law by the end of the year. The Commercial Division will become operative in 2018.

Netherlands

(2021): First instance: the first instance courts, and the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal are included.
All courts: first instance, second and highest instance courts of general jurisdiction are included, as well as the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, Central Appeals Tribunal and Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State.
First instance geo.locations:
-33 first instance geo.location of general jurisdiction, with 4 locations only housing a Justice of the Peace.
-1 Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal. Counted separately, although located at the same location as a first instance court of general jurisdiction, as it is not the same court, but a separate, specialized court (different than previous evaluation). See Q43 for why this is counted as a first instance court.
All courts geo.locations:
-34 first instance geo.locations (see above).
-6 second instance geo.locations of general jurisdiction, of which 4 are located at the same geo.location as a first instance court.
-1 Supreme Court, located at a separate location.
-1 Central Appeals Tribunal, located at the same geo.location as a first instance court. Counted separately as it is not the same court.
-1 Administrative Jurisdiction Division of the Council of State, located at a separate location.

(2020): In one case (of 43), a first instance court of general jurisdiction, a specialized first instance court, and a court of appeal are housed at the same site (adding 2 sites according to the explanatory note).
In 3 cases, a first instance court of gen.jur. and a court of appeal are housed at the same site (adding 3 sites according to the explanatory note).
In 1 case, a f.i. court of gen.jur. and a specialized second instance court are housed at the same site (adding 1 site according to the explanatory note).
Finally, the Supreme Court, 1 specialized second instance court, and 2 appeal courts are housed at unique locations (adding 4 sites according to the explanatory note).

(2016): Possibility of closing subdistrict court facility?

(2014): According to 2014 data, the reforms regarding the merging of courts mentioned on the occasion of the 2012 evaluation have been implemented.

Poland

(2020): Regarding point 44, it should be noted that in the previous evaluation cycles (2016, 2017, 2018, 2019) the answer in terms of the number of all courts as geographical locations was 401, while in 2020 it is 494.
The figure of 494 indicated in 2020 is the sum of the common, administrative and military courts of first and second instance and the Supreme Court by geographic location (i.e. including the subdivisions). To the number of courts of first instance by geographical location (item 44 in line 1 - all common, administrative, military courts of first instance with localised divisions: number of courts 433) was added the number of 61 courts: - regional courts: 46; - courts of appeal: 11; - military courts: 2; - Supreme Administrative Court: 1; - Supreme Court: 1;
Total: 494 (433 + 61).
The discrepancy is due to the adoption of a different method of data presentation in 2020 (by geographical location). In compliance with the Explanatory note, the 2020 data show first-instance courts (line 1), and further all courts (line 2) together with all seats in different locations, which in the realities of the Polish legal system should be understood as a necessity to show the number of courts together with local divisions.

(2016): It is considered to reduce the number of district courts which are responsible for land and mortgage registers or abolishing external branches in district courts.

Portugal

(2020): The difference between 2019 and 2020 is justified by the increase in new buildings.

(2018): Law n.º 19/2019, 19th February.
The recent amendments to the Law of the Organization of the Judiciary System are intended to ensure the reciprocal proximity of justice and citizens in two key segments: criminal jurisdiction and family and minors jurisdiction.
These new amendements aim to facilitate people's access to courts and combat the desertification of the interior regions of the country.

(2016): Law n.40-A/2016, 22 December and Decree-Law n. 86/2016, 27 December.
On the 1st of january 2017, 20 extinct districts were reopened, as well as 23 of the so-called proximity sections, in which judicial acts may now be concluded.

Romania

(General Comment): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.
It should be mentioned that some of the first instance specialised courts share the location with „judecatorii".

(2020): Law no. 304/2004 on the judicial organisation.
It should be mentioned that some of the first instance specialised courts share the location with „judecatorii".

(2014): According to 2014 data, a bill on closing 30 courts and 30 attached prosecution offices with low volume of work was initiated by the Ministry of Justice with the support of the Superior Council of Magistracy of Romania. The bill was rejected by the Parliament. The Superior Council of Magistracy seeks for alternative solutions for the reallocation of the resources.

Slovak Republic

(2021): The Constitutional court is not included in Q44.

(2020): The Constitutional Court is not included in the 44 answer.

(2014): According to 2014 data, on 1st July 2016, the new Civil Litigious Procedure Code will enter into force. It introduces the so called “causal jurisdiction” of first instance courts. It means that certain types of civil claims will belong to the jurisdiction of only some of the first instance courts. This will apply e.g. for individual labour disputes, arbitration disputes, disputes arisen from bill of exchange etc.

Slovenia

(General Comment): First instance courts: first instance courts of general jurisdiction (55, see Q42.1) + first instance specialised courts (4 labour courts and social court + 7 branch offices of labour and social courts + 1 administrative court + 3 branch offices of the Administrative court) =70
All courts: In addition to above also 4 higher courts of general jurisdiction + 1 higher labour and social court + the Supreme court = 76.

(2018): A change in the organisation of first instance courts (judicial map), as well as first instance judges' position is being prepared by the Ministry of Justice - see Q208.

(2016): Ministry of Justice is preparing court network reform. Existent first instance court network is considered as inefficient and insufficient. The main goal of this reform is to set up a system, which could assure better quality and efficiency of adjudication, specialization of judges and even allocation of cases. Furthermore, reform still should assure proper access to the courts and financial efficiency. Ministry of Justice is also taking in consideration different system of the nomination of judges, nomination of Supreme Court judges and president of the Supreme Court. Existent nomination procedure of judges is too rigid and does not enable taking prompt actions when the post is vacant.

(2014): According to 2014 data, discussions about the reorganization of the structure of courts have been initiated. Following the CEPEJ Guidelines on the creation of judicial maps to support access to justice within a quality judicial system (CEPEJ(2013)7) the change should be gradual. The reduction in the number of courts regarding geographical locations is not foreseen, but reorganization in the powers of local courts that are organizational units of district courts might be needed. There are local courts that have only a few (3-5) judges, which is not rational in the sense of court management. Such local courts might start dealing only with certain kinds of cases, with other local courts in the same district dealing with other kinds of cases, having de facto specialized local courts.
Nevertheless, these changes are still in the initial debate phase, so no formal proposal can be presented yet.

Spain

(General Comment): One building usually houses different courts.

(2018): The traditional structure of a Court includes a Judge (or Magistrate), a Judicial Counsellor, and several civil servants (the exact number depends on many circumstances). The New Judicial Office (Nueva Oficina Judicial)has been implemented in many territories and its development continues. The New Judicial Office (NOJ) has, as base, the called ‘Procedural Unit of Direct Support' (UPAD), a small office with personnel necessary for the strict aid of the work of the Judge. On the other hand, and for the uniform processing of repetitive tasks, the called Common Procedural Services have been created. The Judicial Counsellor is the Director of these services, and is responsible of processing the phase of the judicial file of a strictly procedural nature.

(2016): The traditional structure of a Court includes a Judge (or Magistrate), a Lawyer of the Administration of Justice, and several civil servants (the exact number depends on many circumstances). The New Judicial Office (Nueva Oficina Judicial) has been implemented in many territories and its development continues. The New Judicial Office (NOJ) has, as base, the called ‘Procedural Unit of Direct Support' (UPAD), a small office with personnel necessary for the strict aid of the work of the Judge. On the other hand, and for the uniform processing of repetitive tasks, the called Common Procedural Services have been created. The Lawyer of the Administration of Justice is the Director of these services, and is responsible of processing the phase of the judicial file of a strictly procedural nature.

(2014): On the occasion of the 2014 evaluation, the attention was drawn on the deployment in the entire country of the Judicial Office, the new model for organising courts of law and the creation of the Instance Courts (Tribunales de Instancia), a new model of collegial courts aimed at replacing local courts belonging to the same judicial district.

Indicator 3: The performance of courts at all stages of the proceedings

1	First instance other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status
2	Clearance Rate and Disposition Time for first instance other than criminal cases
3	Variations of first instance other than criminal cases by case categories
4	Specific categories of first instance cases (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases)
5	Clearance rate and Disposition time for specific categories of first instance cases (employment dismissal and, insolvency cases)
6	Variations of CR and DT for specific categories of first instance cases (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases)
7	Second instance other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status
8	Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases
9	Variations of second instance other than criminal cases by case categories
10	Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status
11	Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court other than criminal cases
12	Variations of Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories
13	European Comission templates for first instance cases
14	First instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status
15	Clearance rate and Disposition time for first instance criminal cases
16	Variations for first instance criminal cases by case categories
17	Specific categories of first instance criminal cases
18	Clearance rate and Disposition time for specific categories of first instance criminal cases
19	Variation for specific categories of first instance criminal cases
20	Second instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status
21	Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance criminal cases
22	Supreme court criminal cases by case categories and by case status
23	Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court criminal cases
24	Variations for Supreme Courts criminal cases by case categories

First instance other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.1.1.1a(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2021

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**513 679**	**31 551**	**332 879**	283 712	49 167	*20 069*	*29 098*	*NAP*	NAP	**61 271**	**87 978**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 581**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**92 645**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**9 932**	**NA**
Croatia	**302 035**	**168 368**	**127 233**	77 391	49 482	*37 766*	*12 076*	*NAP*	NAP	**6 434**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**54 620**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 616**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**426 426**	**135 373**	**165 998**	161 741	3 825	*NAP*	*3 825*	*NAP*	432	**9 784**	**115 271**
Denmark	**137 817**	**26 655**	**81 027**	63 009	14 776	*2 751*	*12 025*	*NAP*	3 242	**NAP**	**30 135**
Estonia	**21 132**	**7 083**	**13 042**	8 155	4 887	*2 938*	*1 949*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 007**	**NAP**
Finland	**131 983**	**7 290**	**101 762**	101 762	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**18 324**	**4 607**
France	**1 987 671**	**1 732 374**	**72 374**	72 374	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**182 923**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**775 875**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 859 927*	*NA*	NA	**748 074**	**450 740**
Greece	**407 689**	**270 910**	**20 769**	17 520	1 514	*1 466*	*45*	*3*	1 735	**112 789**	**3 221**
Hungary	**137 467**	**57 741**	**58 749**	19 101	39 299	*NAP*	*37 456*	*1 843*	349	**7 889**	**13 088**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**3 573 715**	**2 214 956**	**1 222 726**	1 222 726	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**136 033**	**NAP**
Latvia	**28 669**	**18 059**	**9 515**	9 515	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 095**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**34 997**	**28 015**	**881**	487	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	394	**4 302**	**1 799**
Luxembourg	**5 507**	**3 133**	**1 029**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 029	**1 345**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 242**	**10 147**	**748**	748	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**347**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Poland	**3 315 952**	**876 489**	**2 160 397**	564 282	1 709 100	*1 602 361*	*106 739*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 785**	**139 296**
Portugal	**NA**	**189 999**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**60 580**	**NAP**
Romania	**630 313**	**542 528**	**15 506**	3 988	11 518	*6 065*	*5 453*	*NAP*	NAP	**72 279**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**183 324**	**61 305**	**95 672**	29 024	17 090	*NAP*	*16 874*	*216*	49 558	**7 052**	**19 295**
Slovenia	**103 842**	**30 914**	**42 189**	40 088	2 101	*1 778*	*323*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 751**	**26 988**
Spain	**2 012 093**	**1 343 436**	**497 186**	497 186	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**171 471**	**NAP**
Sweden	**98 324**	**28 470**	**9 032**	9 032	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**57 410**	**3 412**
Average	**645 961**	**389 121**	**251 436**	167 465	158 563	186 133	173 816	687	8 106	**71 961**	**74 653**
Median	**137 642**	**59 523**	**65 562**	40 088	13 147	2 938	12 051	216	1 029	**14 128**	**23 142**
Minimum	**5 507**	**3 133**	**748**	487	0	0	45	3	349	**347**	**1 799**
Maximum	**3 573 715**	**2 214 956**	**2 160 397**	1 222 726	1 709 100	1 602 361	1 859 927	1 843	49 558	**748 074**	**450 740**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**19%**	**26%**	22%	15%	11%	11%	11%	11%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.1b(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,7**	**0,4**	**3,7**	3,2	0,5	*0,2*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**1,0**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**1,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**7,8**	**4,3**	**3,3**	2,0	1,3	*1,0*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**6,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,6**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**4,1**	**1,3**	**1,6**	1,5	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,3**	**0,5**	**1,4**	1,1	0,3	*0,0*	*0,2*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**0,5**
Estonia	**1,6**	**0,5**	**1,0**	0,6	0,4	*0,2*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,4**	**0,1**	**1,8**	1,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,1**
France	**2,9**	**2,6**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,2*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**0,5**
Greece	**3,8**	**2,5**	**0,2**	0,2	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**1,1**	**0,0**
Hungary	**1,4**	**0,6**	**0,6**	0,2	0,4	*NAP*	*0,4*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,1**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**6,1**	**3,8**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,5**	**1,0**	**0,5**	0,5	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,2**	**1,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,1**
Luxembourg	**0,9**	**0,5**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,2**	**2,0**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Poland	**8,7**	**2,3**	**5,7**	1,5	4,5	*4,2*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,4**
Portugal	**NA**	**1,8**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,3**	**2,8**	**0,1**	0,0	0,1	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3,4**	**1,1**	**1,8**	0,5	0,3	*NAP*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,9	**0,1**	**0,4**
Slovenia	**4,9**	**1,5**	**2,0**	1,9	0,1	*0,1*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**1,3**
Spain	**4,2**	**2,8**	**1,0**	1,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,9**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**0,0**
Average	**3,5**	**1,6**	**1,4**	1,0	0,7	*0,6*	*0,4*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,3**	**0,5**
Median	**3,1**	**1,2**	**1,0**	0,6	0,3	*0,1*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,4**
Minimum	**0,9**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**8,7**	**4,3**	**5,7**	3,2	4,5	*4,2*	*2,2*	*0,0*	0,9	**1,1**	**1,3**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**19%**	**26%**	22%	15%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	11%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.2a(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 116 628**	**74 906**	**2 426 687**	1 419 837	1 006 850	*672 088*	*334 762*	*NAP*	NAP	**46 281**	**568 754**
Belgium	**970 825**	**678 697**	**274 779**	NAP	274 779	*NAP*	*274 779*	*NAP*	NAP	**17 349**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**348 759**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**28 924**	**NA**
Croatia	**1 035 730**	**162 358**	**859 964**	137 236	722 728	*590 608*	*132 120*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 408**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**28 386**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**10 797**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**901 344**	**311 244**	**553 375**	441 040	110 313	*NAP*	*110 313*	*NAP*	2 022	**9 303**	**27 422**
Denmark	**2 708 751**	**43 581**	**2 471 484**	259 987	2 206 088	*2 188 515*	*17 573*	*NAP*	5 409	**NAP**	**193 686**
Estonia	**323 542**	**17 521**	**302 902**	60 406	242 496	*120 806*	*121 690*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 119**	**NAP**
Finland	**489 605**	**8 666**	**450 037**	450 037	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**21 782**	**9 120**
France	**1 502 201**	**1 136 137**	**124 680**	124 680	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**241 384**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 084 145**	**NA**	2 094 853	NA	*5 670 394*	*158 904*	*NA*	NA	**547 248**	**851 889**
Greece	**259 735**	**184 820**	**22 149**	15 752	1 832	*1 325*	*502*	*5*	4 565	**46 741**	**6 025**
Hungary	**618 991**	**121 597**	**461 604**	164 808	294 857	*NAP*	*289 609*	*5 248*	1 939	**20 582**	**15 208**
Ireland	**138 451**	**107 330**	**31 121**	31 121	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**3 020 529**	**1 256 233**	**1 716 184**	1 716 184	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**48 112**	**NAP**
Latvia	**342 598**	**28 464**	**312 229**	76 178	236 051	*236 051*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 905**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**184 008**	**91 411**	**58 482**	53 508	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	4 974	**16 194**	**17 921**
Luxembourg	**13 081**	**7 692**	**4 312**	835	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	3 477	**1 077**	**NAP**
Malta	**13 292**	**9 719**	**3 420**	3 420	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**151**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 082 103**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**87 030**	**NAP**
Poland	**10 494 438**	**906 409**	**9 063 077**	3 429 768	5 806 611	*4 970 090*	*836 521*	*NAP*	NAP	**86 264**	**265 386**
Portugal	**NA**	**260 787**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**25 401**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 328 056**	**1 217 738**	**29 614**	23 090	6 524	*5 508*	*1 016*	*NAP*	NAP	**80 704**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**789 795**	**97 161**	**371 806**	125 537	154 399	*NAP*	*141 649*	*12 750*	91 870	**5 470**	**315 358**
Slovenia	**601 311**	**31 540**	**446 889**	141 947	304 942	*260 603*	*44 339*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 751**	**120 131**
Spain	**2 672 976**	**1 350 155**	**1 138 259**	1 138 259	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**184 562**	**NAP**
Sweden	**269 022**	**64 267**	**19 907**	19 907	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**178 003**	**6 845**
Average	**1 330 166**	**385 524**	**961 044**	542 200	874 498	1 471 599	189 521	6 001	16 322	**68 982**	**199 812**
Median	**618 991**	**114 464**	**342 018**	131 387	274 779	425 606	132 120	5 248	4 565	**21 782**	**73 777**
Minimum	**13 081**	**7 692**	**3 420**	835	1 832	1 325	502	5	1 939	**151**	**6 025**
Maximum	**10 494 438**	**1 350 155**	**9 063 077**	3 429 768	5 806 611	5 670 394	836 521	12 750	91 870	**547 248**	**851 889**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	**19%**	15%	11%	7%	7%	11%	11%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.2b(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**34,7**	**0,8**	**27,0**	15,8	11,2	*7,5*	*3,7*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**6,3**
Belgium	**8,4**	**5,9**	**2,4**	NAP	2,4	*NAP*	*2,4*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**5,1**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,4**	**NA**
Croatia	**26,8**	**4,2**	**22,2**	3,5	18,7	*15,3*	*3,4*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**3,1**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1,2**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**8,6**	**3,0**	**5,3**	4,2	1,0	*NAP*	*1,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Denmark	**46,1**	**0,7**	**42,1**	4,4	37,6	*37,3*	*0,3*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**3,3**
Estonia	**24,3**	**1,3**	**22,8**	4,5	18,2	*9,1*	*9,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**8,8**	**0,2**	**8,1**	8,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,2**
France	**2,2**	**1,7**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,3**	**NA**	2,5	NA	*6,8*	*0,2*	*NA*	NA	**0,7**	**1,0**
Greece	**2,4**	**1,7**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,4**	**0,1**
Hungary	**6,4**	**1,3**	**4,8**	1,7	3,0	*NAP*	*3,0*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,2**
Ireland	**2,7**	**2,1**	**0,6**	0,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**5,1**	**2,1**	**2,9**	2,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**18,3**	**1,5**	**16,6**	4,1	12,6	*12,6*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**6,6**	**3,3**	**2,1**	1,9	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,2	**0,6**	**0,6**
Luxembourg	**2,0**	**1,2**	**0,7**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,5	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,6**	**1,9**	**0,7**	0,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**6,2**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**NAP**
Poland	**27,6**	**2,4**	**23,8**	9,0	15,2	*13,0*	*2,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,7**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,5**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Romania	**7,0**	**6,4**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**14,5**	**1,8**	**6,8**	2,3	2,8	*NAP*	*2,6*	*0,2*	1,7	**0,1**	**5,8**
Slovenia	**28,5**	**1,5**	**21,2**	6,7	14,5	*12,4*	*2,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**5,7**
Spain	**5,6**	**2,8**	**2,4**	2,4	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,6**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,7**	**0,1**
Average	**12,2**	**2,2**	**9,7**	3,5	10,6	*11,4*	*2,3*	*0,1*	0,4	**0,4**	**2,0**
Median	**6,6**	**1,8**	**3,8**	2,5	11,2	*10,7*	*2,2*	*0,1*	0,1	**0,3**	**0,7**
Minimum	**2,0**	**0,2**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,1**
Maximum	**46,1**	**6,4**	**42,1**	15,8	37,6	*37,3*	*9,1*	*0,2*	1,7	**1,7**	**6,3**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	**19%**	15%	11%	*7%*	*7%*	*11%*	11%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.3a(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 110 435**	**77 651**	**2 380 761**	1 374 260	1 006 501	*675 380*	*331 121*	*NAP*	NAP	**57 965**	**594 058**
Belgium	**1 014 929**	**717 402**	**274 779**	NAP	274 779	*NAP*	*274 779*	*NAP*	NAP	**22 748**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**353 084**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**28 946**	**NA**
Croatia	**1 008 162**	**130 784**	**863 733**	132 528	731 205	*589 231*	*141 974*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 645**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**23 084**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**4 957**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**924 994**	**322 125**	**560 692**	449 043	109 784	*NAP*	*109 784*	*NAP*	1 865	**11 064**	**31 113**
Denmark	**2 717 756**	**42 543**	**2 483 238**	267 842	2 210 157	*2 190 963*	*19 194*	*NAP*	5 239	**NAP**	**191 975**
Estonia	**320 307**	**17 525**	**299 987**	57 846	242 141	*120 735*	*121 406*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 795**	**NAP**
Finland	**501 069**	**8 695**	**461 131**	461 131	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**22 161**	**9 082**
France	**1 581 821**	**1 218 052**	**130 515**	130 515	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**233 254**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 139 270**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*90 278*	*NA*	NA	**601 187**	**886 352**
Greece	**236 814**	**152 235**	**19 456**	13 703	1 875	*1 483*	*387*	*5*	3 878	**60 628**	**4 495**
Hungary	**641 876**	**128 335**	**475 427**	169 687	303 727	*NAP*	*298 499*	*5 228*	2 013	**22 194**	**15 920**
Ireland	**104 396**	**76 841**	**28 095**	28 095	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**3 226 518**	**1 370 343**	**1 796 226**	1 796 226	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**59 949**	**NAP**
Latvia	**343 170**	**29 231**	**312 176**	76 125	236 051	*236 051*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 763**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**186 003**	**92 543**	**58 566**	53 566	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	5 000	**15 874**	**19 020**
Luxembourg	**12 964**	**7 616**	**4 354**	835	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	3 519	**994**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 859**	**7 586**	**4 168**	4 168	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**105**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 119 962**	**129 831**	**896 026**	896 026	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**94 105**	**NAP**
Poland	**10 673 352**	**936 347**	**9 205 456**	3 465 180	5 910 868	*5 091 804*	*819 064*	*NAP*	NAP	**80 032**	**280 925**
Portugal	**NA**	**266 423**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 130**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 360 484**	**1 247 055**	**28 539**	22 709	5 830	*5 170*	*660*	*NAP*	NAP	**84 890**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**792 515**	**101 227**	**370 114**	128 361	162 844	*NAP*	*150 094*	*12 750*	78 909	**4 379**	**316 795**
Slovenia	**613 749**	**33 822**	**446 873**	144 318	302 555	*258 271*	*44 284*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 604**	**130 450**
Spain	**2 717 332**	**1 382 050**	**1 153 446**	1 153 446	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**181 836**	**NAP**
Sweden	**278 184**	**65 992**	**21 322**	21 322	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**184 010**	**6 860**
Average	**1 354 993**	**388 061**	**968 482**	493 042	884 486	1 018 788	184 733	5 994	14 346	**72 769**	**207 254**
Median	**641 876**	**128 335**	**370 114**	131 522	274 779	258 271	121 406	5 228	3 878	**22 748**	**80 782**
Minimum	**11 859**	**7 586**	**4 168**	835	1 875	1 483	387	5	1 865	**105**	**4 495**
Maximum	**10 673 352**	**1 382 050**	**9 205 456**	3 465 180	5 910 868	5 091 804	819 064	12 750	78 909	**601 187**	**886 352**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**15%**	15%	11%	11%	7%	11%	11%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.3b(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**34,6**	**0,9**	**26,5**	15,3	11,2	*7,5*	*3,7*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**6,6**
Belgium	**8,8**	**6,2**	**2,4**	NAP	2,4	*NAP*	*2,4*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**5,2**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,4**	**NA**
Croatia	**26,0**	**3,4**	**22,3**	3,4	18,9	*15,2*	*3,7*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**2,6**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,5**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**8,8**	**3,1**	**5,3**	4,3	1,0	*NAP*	*1,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Denmark	**46,3**	**0,7**	**42,3**	4,6	37,6	*37,3*	*0,3*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**3,3**
Estonia	**24,1**	**1,3**	**22,6**	4,3	18,2	*9,1*	*9,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**9,0**	**0,2**	**8,3**	8,3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,2**
France	**2,3**	**1,8**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,4**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*0,1*	*NA*	NA	**0,7**	**1,1**
Greece	**2,2**	**1,4**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,6**	**0,0**
Hungary	**6,6**	**1,3**	**4,9**	1,8	3,1	*NAP*	*3,1*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,2**
Ireland	**2,0**	**1,5**	**0,5**	0,5	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**5,5**	**2,3**	**3,0**	3,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**18,3**	**1,6**	**16,6**	4,1	12,6	*12,6*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**6,6**	**3,3**	**2,1**	1,9	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,2	**0,6**	**0,7**
Luxembourg	**2,0**	**1,2**	**0,7**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,5	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,3**	**1,5**	**0,8**	0,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**6,4**	**0,7**	**5,1**	5,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**NAP**
Poland	**28,0**	**2,5**	**24,2**	9,1	15,5	*13,4*	*2,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,7**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,6**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Romania	**7,1**	**6,6**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**14,6**	**1,9**	**6,8**	2,4	3,0	*NAP*	*2,8*	*0,2*	1,5	**0,1**	**5,8**
Slovenia	**29,1**	**1,6**	**21,2**	6,8	14,4	*12,3*	*2,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**6,2**
Spain	**5,7**	**2,9**	**2,4**	2,4	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,7**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,8**	**0,1**
Average	**12,3**	**2,1**	**9,5**	3,6	10,6	*11,9*	*2,3*	*0,1*	0,3	**0,4**	**2,1**
Median	**6,6**	**1,6**	**4,9**	2,7	11,2	*12,3*	*2,2*	*0,1*	0,1	**0,3**	**0,7**
Minimum	**2,0**	**0,2**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**46,3**	**6,6**	**42,3**	15,3	37,6	*37,3*	*9,1*	*0,2*	1,5	**1,8**	**6,6**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**15%**	15%	11%	*11%*	*7%*	*11%*	11%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.4a(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2021

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**519 872**	**28 806**	**378 805**	329 289	49 516	*16 777*	*32 739*	*NAP*	NAP	**49 587**	**62 674**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**14 673**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**88 320**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**9 910**	**NA**
Croatia	**331 289**	**200 356**	**124 739**	82 859	41 880	*39 660*	*2 220*	*NAP*	NAP	**6 194**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**59 922**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**11 456**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**402 776**	**124 492**	**158 681**	153 738	4 354	*NAP*	*4 354*	*NAP*	589	**8 023**	**111 580**
Denmark	**128 812**	**27 693**	**69 273**	55 154	10 707	*303*	*10 404*	*NAP*	3 412	**NAP**	**31 846**
Estonia	**24 086**	**6 994**	**15 852**	10 610	5 242	*3 009*	*2 233*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 240**	**NAP**
Finland	**120 519**	**7 261**	**90 668**	90 668	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**17 945**	**4 645**
France	**1 908 051**	**1 650 459**	**66 539**	66 539	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**191 053**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**720 756**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 928 477*	*NA*	NA	**694 461**	**417 233**
Greece	**430 610**	**303 495**	**23 462**	19 569	1 471	*1 308*	*160*	*3*	2 422	**98 902**	**4 751**
Hungary	**114 582**	**51 003**	**44 926**	14 222	30 429	*NAP*	*28 566*	*1 863*	275	**6 277**	**12 376**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**3 367 726**	**2 100 846**	**1 142 684**	1 142 684	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**124 196**	**NAP**
Latvia	**28 097**	**17 292**	**9 568**	9 568	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 237**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**33 002**	**26 883**	**797**	429	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	368	**4 622**	**700**
Luxembourg	**5 624**	**3 209**	**987**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	987	**1 428**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 378**	**10 986**	**0**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**390**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**231 932**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**68 380**	**NAP**
Poland	**3 137 038**	**846 551**	**2 018 018**	528 870	1 604 843	*1 480 647*	*124 196*	*NAP*	NAP	**33 017**	**123 757**
Portugal	**NA**	**184 363**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**58 851**	**NAP**
Romania	**597 885**	**513 211**	**16 581**	4 369	12 212	*6 403*	*5 809*	*NAP*	NAP	**68 093**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**180 604**	**57 239**	**97 364**	26 200	8 645	*NAP*	*8 429*	*216*	62 519	**8 143**	**17 858**
Slovenia	**91 286**	**28 631**	**42 088**	37 602	4 486	*4 108*	*378*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 898**	**16 668**
Spain	**1 969 897**	**1 303 069**	**491 417**	491 417	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**175 411**	**NAP**
Sweden	**89 162**	**26 745**	**7 617**	7 617	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**51 403**	**3 397**
Average	**603 151**	**374 561**	**240 003**	161 653	147 815	172 468	178 997	694	10 082	**68 352**	**67 290**
Median	**128 812**	**54 121**	**55 733**	37 602	9 676	4 108	7 119	216	987	**14 673**	**17 263**
Minimum	**5 624**	**3 209**	**0**	0	0	0	160	3	275	**390**	**700**
Maximum	**3 367 726**	**2 100 846**	**2 018 018**	1 142 684	1 604 843	1 480 647	1 928 477	1 863	62 519	**694 461**	**417 233**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**19%**	**26%**	22%	11%	7%	7%	7%	11%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	44%	59%	48%	81%	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.4b(2021): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,8**	**0,3**	**4,2**	3,7	0,6	*0,2*	*0,4*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**0,7**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**1,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**8,6**	**5,2**	**3,2**	2,1	1,1	*1,0*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**6,6**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1,3**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**3,8**	**1,2**	**1,5**	1,5	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,2**	**0,5**	**1,2**	0,9	0,2	*0,0*	*0,2*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**0,5**
Estonia	**1,8**	**0,5**	**1,2**	0,8	0,4	*0,2*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,2**	**0,1**	**1,6**	1,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,1**
France	**2,8**	**2,4**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,3*	*NA*	NA	**0,8**	**0,5**
Greece	**4,0**	**2,8**	**0,2**	0,2	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,9**	**0,0**
Hungary	**1,2**	**0,5**	**0,5**	0,1	0,3	*NAP*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,1**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**5,7**	**3,6**	**1,9**	1,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,5**	**0,9**	**0,5**	0,5	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,2**	**1,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,0**
Luxembourg	**0,9**	**0,5**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,2**	**2,1**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Poland	**8,2**	**2,2**	**5,3**	1,4	4,2	*3,9*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,3**
Portugal	**NA**	**1,8**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,1**	**2,7**	**0,1**	0,0	0,1	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3,3**	**1,1**	**1,8**	0,5	0,2	*NAP*	*0,2*	*0,0*	1,2	**0,1**	**0,3**
Slovenia	**4,3**	**1,4**	**2,0**	1,8	0,2	*0,2*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,8**
Spain	**4,2**	**2,7**	**1,0**	1,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,9**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**0,0**
Average	**3,4**	**1,6**	**1,3**	1,0	0,6	*0,6*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,3**	**0,4**
Median	**2,8**	**1,1**	**1,1**	0,8	0,2	*0,2*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,3**
Minimum	**0,9**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**8,6**	**5,2**	**5,3**	3,7	4,2	*3,9*	*2,3*	*0,0*	1,2	**1,3**	**1,1**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**19%**	**26%**	22%	11%	*7%*	*7%*	*7%*	11%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	44%	*59%*	*48%*	*81%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.5(2021): First instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2021

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q91)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	NA	NA	21 804	43,97%
Belgium	NA	NA	1 428	9,73%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	62 640	31,3%	245	3,96%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	569	8,1%	23	1,85%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	19 045	9,97%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	3 883	1,3%	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	NA	72 198	58,13%
Latvia	1 235	7,1%	22	1,78%
Lithuania	1 322	4,9%	458	9,91%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	4 664	42,5%	227	58,21%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	35 582	19,3%	NA	NA
Romania	23 400	4,6%	4 267	6,27%
Slovak Republic	17 864	31,2%	2 005	24,62%
Slovenia	8 796	30,7%	438	11,24%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	600	2,2%	380	0,74%
Average	**14 596**	**16,7%**	**9 426**	**18,5%**
Median	**4 664**	**8,1%**	**458**	**9,9%**
Minimum	**569**	**1,3%**	**22**	**0,7%**
Maximum	**62 640**	**42,5%**	**72 198**	**58,2%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**59%**	**59%**	**48%**	**48%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	**4%**

Romania: Due to the peculiarity of the national statistical system, cases older than 3 years instead of 2 are communicated.

Table 3.1.1.1a(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**531 048**	**31 407**	**372 350**	335 714	36 636	*20 086*	*16 550*	*NAP*	NAP	**73 172**	**54 119**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**21 794**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**95 459**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**9 999**	**NA**
Croatia	**331 188**	**150 832**	**173 078**	114 965	58 113	*55 990*	*2 123*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 278**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**54 058**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 146**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**409 216**	**129 181**	**152 957**	147 291	5 009	*NAP*	*5 009*	*NAP*	657	**11 044**	**116 034**
Denmark	**153 654**	**28 176**	**94 970**	77 017	15 105	*3 173*	*11 932*	*NAP*	2 848	**NAP**	**30 508**
Estonia	**24 913**	**7 097**	**16 910**	11 968	4 942	*3 159*	*1 783*	*NAP*	NAP	**906**	**NAP**
Finland	**155 291**	**6 497**	**125 526**	125 526	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**18 029**	**5 242**
France	**1 903 120**	**1 655 997**	**73 331**	73 331	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**173 792**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**753 054**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 806 827*	*NA*	NA	**806 128**	**453 757**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**139 880**	**NAP**
Hungary	**126 602**	**57 987**	**48 405**	17 714	30 336	*NAP*	*28 523*	*1 813*	355	**4 768**	**15 442**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**3 610 366**	**2 233 438**	**1 226 175**	1 226 175	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**150 753**	**NAP**
Latvia	**23 847**	**17 006**	**5 628**	5 628	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 213**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**28 622**	**22 385**	**964**	566	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	398	**3 943**	**1 330**
Luxembourg	**4 871**	**2 561**	**1 103**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 103	**1 207**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 243**	**10 429**	**453**	453	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**361**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Poland	**3 763 652**	**915 899**	**2 682 304**	684 051	1 998 253	*1 884 456*	*113 797*	*NAP*	NAP	**23 363**	**142 086**
Portugal	**NA**	**185 390**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**66 089**	**NAP**
Romania	**587 819**	**543 619**	**12 698**	2 453	10 245	*5 108*	*5 137*	*NAP*	NAP	**31 502**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**270 433**	**59 870**	**175 807**	32 340	100 710	*NAP*	*100 462*	*248*	42 757	**6 381**	**28 375**
Slovenia	**98 134**	**31 115**	**44 288**	39 854	4 434	*4 061*	*373*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 946**	**18 785**
Spain	**1 769 954**	**1 175 930**	**423 548**	423 548	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**170 476**	**NAP**
Sweden	**104 472**	**30 234**	**9 078**	9 078	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**61 698**	**3 462**
Average	**669 427**	**383 243**	**296 820**	184 871	205 798	247 004	190 229	1 031	8 020	**74 703**	**79 013**
Median	**153 654**	**57 987**	**73 331**	56 593	15 105	4 585	11 932	1 031	880	**14 537**	**28 375**
Minimum	**4 871**	**2 561**	**453**	453	0	0	373	248	355	**361**	**1 330**
Maximum	**3 763 652**	**2 233 438**	**2 682 304**	1 226 175	1 998 253	1 884 456	1 806 827	1 813	42 757	**806 128**	**453 757**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**22%**	**30%**	22%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	11%	44%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.1b(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,9**	**0,4**	**4,2**	3,8	0,4	*0,2*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,8**	**0,6**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**1,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**8,2**	**3,7**	**4,3**	2,8	1,4	*1,4*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**6,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,6**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**3,8**	**1,2**	**1,4**	1,4	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,6**	**0,5**	**1,6**	1,3	0,3	*0,1*	*0,2*	*NAP*	0,0	**NAP**	**0,5**
Estonia	**1,9**	**0,5**	**1,3**	0,9	0,4	*0,2*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,8**	**0,1**	**2,3**	2,3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,1**
France	**2,8**	**2,5**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,2*	*NA*	NA	**1,0**	**0,5**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1,3**	**NAP**
Hungary	**1,3**	**0,6**	**0,5**	0,2	0,3	*NAP*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,2**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**6,1**	**3,8**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,3**	**0,9**	**0,3**	0,3	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,0**	**0,8**	**0,0**	0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Luxembourg	**0,8**	**0,4**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,2**	**2,0**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Poland	**9,8**	**2,4**	**7,0**	1,8	5,2	*4,9*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,4**
Portugal	**NA**	**1,8**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,1**	**2,8**	**0,1**	0,0	0,1	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**5,0**	**1,1**	**3,2**	0,6	1,8	*NAP*	*1,8*	*0,0*	0,8	**0,1**	**0,5**
Slovenia	**4,7**	**1,5**	**2,1**	1,9	0,2	*0,2*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,9**
Spain	**3,7**	**2,5**	**0,9**	0,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**1,0**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**0,0**
Average	**3,6**	**1,5**	**1,7**	1,1	0,9	*0,9*	*0,5*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,3**	**0,4**
Median	**2,8**	**1,1**	**1,3**	0,9	0,3	*0,2*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,5**
Minimum	**0,8**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**9,8**	**3,8**	**7,0**	3,8	5,2	*4,9*	*2,2*	*0,0*	0,8	**1,3**	**1,1**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**22%**	**30%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	11%	44%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.2a(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2020

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 123 339**	**73 755**	**2 208 341**	1 273 208	935 133	*643 942*	*291 191*	*NAP*	NAP	**45 806**	**795 437**
Belgium	**985 887**	**698 480**	**261 035**	NAP	261 035	*NAP*	*261 035*	*NAP*	NAP	**17 364**	**9 008**
Bulgaria	**312 117**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**29 349**	**NA**
Croatia	**890 021**	**110 253**	**767 513**	113 184	654 329	*496 119*	*158 210*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 255**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**21 530**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**2 829**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**930 125**	**305 443**	**583 503**	471 957	109 904	*NAP*	*109 904*	*NAP*	1 642	**10 015**	**31 164**
Denmark	**2 774 689**	**40 928**	**2 557 380**	296 786	2 255 423	*2 238 608*	*16 815*	*NAP*	5 171	**NAP**	**176 381**
Estonia	**310 988**	**18 950**	**289 301**	60 270	229 031	*108 686*	*120 345*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 737**	**NAP**
Finland	**467 946**	**9 201**	**425 171**	425 171	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**24 743**	**8 831**
France	**1 400 368**	**1 068 850**	**121 004**	121 004	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**210 514**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 219 203**	**NA**	2 299 376	NA	*5 550 420*	*140 297*	*NA*	NA	**582 323**	**933 856**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**45 159**	**NAP**
Hungary	**634 257**	**127 410**	**458 787**	165 017	291 916	*NAP*	*286 917*	*4 999*	1 854	**29 254**	**18 806**
Ireland	**208 579**	**162 065**	**46 514**	46 514	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**2 671 545**	**1 139 154**	**1 490 342**	1 490 342	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**42 049**	**NAP**
Latvia	**365 086**	**28 907**	**334 482**	59 368	275 114	*275 114*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 697**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**194 686**	**92 723**	**64 005**	58 023	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	5 982	**14 353**	**23 605**
Luxembourg	**13 339**	**7 665**	**4 579**	865	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	3 714	**1 095**	**NAP**
Malta	**10 915**	**7 433**	**3 353**	3 353	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**129**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 124 792**	**128 180**	**896 895**	896 895	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99 717**	**NAP**
Poland	**10 556 712**	**946 036**	**9 291 234**	3 526 218	5 765 016	*4 991 059*	*773 957*	*NAP*	NAP	**68 475**	**250 967**
Portugal	**NA**	**254 568**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 731**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 282 448**	**1 174 754**	**28 673**	22 356	6 317	*5 329*	*988*	*NAP*	NAP	**79 021**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**677 851**	**107 829**	**375 489**	129 278	170 357	*NAP*	*157 881*	*12 476*	75 854	**5 071**	**189 462**
Slovenia	**551 822**	**32 097**	**382 730**	135 459	247 271	*204 992*	*42 279*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 893**	**134 102**
Spain	**2 332 870**	**1 206 721**	**971 172**	971 172	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**154 977**	**NAP**
Sweden	**284 482**	**62 676**	**22 682**	22 682	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**191 832**	**7 292**
Average	**1 338 600**	**375 970**	**981 099**	572 204	933 404	1 612 697	196 652	8 738	15 703	**67 776**	**214 909**
Median	**656 054**	**118 832**	**379 110**	132 369	268 075	496 119	149 089	8 738	4 443	**24 743**	**82 633**
Minimum	**10 915**	**7 433**	**3 353**	865	6 317	5 329	988	4 999	1 642	**129**	**7 292**
Maximum	**10 556 712**	**1 219 203**	**9 291 234**	3 526 218	5 765 016	5 550 420	773 957	12 476	75 854	**582 323**	**933 856**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**19%**	11%	15%	11%	11%	15%	15%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.2b(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**35,0**	**0,8**	**24,7**	14,3	10,5	*7,2*	*3,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**8,9**
Belgium	**8,6**	**6,1**	**2,3**	NAP	2,3	*NAP*	*2,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,1**
Bulgaria	**4,5**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,4**	**NA**
Croatia	**22,1**	**2,7**	**19,0**	2,8	16,2	*12,3*	*3,9*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**2,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,3**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**8,7**	**2,9**	**5,5**	4,4	1,0	*NAP*	*1,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Denmark	**47,5**	**0,7**	**43,8**	5,1	38,6	*38,3*	*0,3*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**3,0**
Estonia	**23,4**	**1,4**	**21,8**	4,5	17,2	*8,2*	*9,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**8,5**	**0,2**	**7,7**	7,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,2**
France	**2,1**	**1,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,5**	**NA**	2,8	NA	*6,7*	*0,2*	*NA*	NA	**0,7**	**1,1**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,4**	**NAP**
Hungary	**6,4**	**1,3**	**4,6**	1,7	3,0	*NAP*	*2,9*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,3**	**0,2**
Ireland	**4,2**	**3,3**	**0,9**	0,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**4,5**	**1,9**	**2,5**	2,5	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**19,3**	**1,5**	**17,7**	3,1	14,5	*14,5*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**7,0**	**3,3**	**2,3**	2,1	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,2	**0,5**	**0,8**
Luxembourg	**2,1**	**1,2**	**0,7**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,6	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,1**	**1,4**	**0,7**	0,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**6,4**	**0,7**	**5,1**	5,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Poland	**27,6**	**2,5**	**24,3**	9,2	15,1	*13,1*	*2,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,7**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,5**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Romania	**6,7**	**6,1**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**12,4**	**2,0**	**6,9**	2,4	3,1	*NAP*	*2,9*	*0,2*	1,4	**0,1**	**3,5**
Slovenia	**26,2**	**1,5**	**18,1**	6,4	11,7	*9,7*	*2,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**6,4**
Spain	**4,9**	**2,5**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,7**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,8**	**0,1**
Average	**12,3**	**2,1**	**9,6**	3,6	11,1	*12,2*	*2,5*	*0,1*	0,4	**0,4**	**2,1**
Median	**6,8**	**1,6**	**4,9**	2,6	11,1	*9,7*	*2,1*	*0,1*	0,2	**0,3**	**0,8**
Minimum	**2,1**	**0,2**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,1**
Maximum	**47,5**	**6,1**	**43,8**	14,3	38,6	*38,3*	*9,1*	*0,2*	1,4	**1,8**	**8,9**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**19%**	11%	15%	*11%*	*11%*	*15%*	15%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.3a(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2020

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 115 226**	**73 611**	**2 222 330**	1 299 718	922 612	*643 959*	*278 653*	*NAP*	NAP	**57 707**	**761 578**
Belgium	**969 727**	**689 858**	**261 035**	NAP	261 035	*NAP*	*261 035*	*NAP*	NAP	**18 834**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**314 849**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**29 388**	**NA**
Croatia	**922 454**	**93 760**	**815 596**	151 148	664 448	*516 191*	*148 257*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 098**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**19 005**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**2 371**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**913 104**	**299 306**	**570 574**	457 632	111 067	*NAP*	*111 067*	*NAP*	1 875	**11 275**	**31 949**
Denmark	**2 795 569**	**45 458**	**2 573 426**	312 743	2 255 800	*2 239 046*	*16 754*	*NAP*	4 883	**NAP**	**176 685**
Estonia	**315 176**	**18 920**	**293 725**	64 011	229 714	*108 869*	*120 845*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 531**	**NAP**
Finland	**491 856**	**8 616**	**449 309**	449 309	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**24 432**	**9 499**
France	**1 310 960**	**992 473**	**118 076**	118 076	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**200 411**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 196 562**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*89 367*	*NA*	NA	**640 706**	**942 192**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**73 525**	**NAP**
Hungary	**623 392**	**127 656**	**448 443**	163 630	282 953	*NAP*	*277 984*	*4 969*	1 860	**26 133**	**21 160**
Ireland	**129 390**	**97 689**	**31 701**	31 701	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**2 741 198**	**1 184 941**	**1 498 906**	1 498 906	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**57 351**	**NAP**
Latvia	**361 417**	**27 766**	**331 836**	56 722	275 114	*275 114*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 815**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**188 311**	**87 093**	**64 088**	58 102	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	5 986	**13 994**	**23 136**
Luxembourg	**12 703**	**7 093**	**4 653**	865	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	3 788	**957**	**NAP**
Malta	**9 923**	**6 728**	**3 058**	3 058	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**137**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 107 740**	**127 753**	**893 907**	893 907	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**86 080**	**NAP**
Poland	**11 005 552**	**995 781**	**9 692 030**	3 639 200	6 052 830	*5 271 833*	*780 997*	*NAP*	NAP	**65 053**	**252 688**
Portugal	**NA**	**248 992**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 144**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 239 954**	**1 175 845**	**25 865**	20 821	5 044	*4 372*	*672*	*NAP*	NAP	**38 244**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**766 088**	**107 522**	**455 624**	132 594	253 977	*NAP*	*241 469*	*12 508*	69 053	**4 400**	**198 542**
Slovenia	**545 936**	**32 262**	**384 687**	135 087	249 600	*207 271*	*42 329*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 088**	**125 899**
Spain	**2 095 258**	**1 040 838**	**900 234**	900 234	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**154 186**	**NAP**
Sweden	**290 710**	**64 457**	**22 700**	22 700	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**196 212**	**7 341**
Average	**1 345 229**	**364 624**	**1 002 809**	495 722	963 683	1 158 332	197 452	8 739	14 574	**69 923**	**231 879**
Median	**694 740**	**102 606**	**416 565**	135 087	268 075	395 653	134 551	8 739	4 336	**26 133**	**125 899**
Minimum	**9 923**	**6 728**	**3 058**	865	5 044	4 372	672	4 969	1 860	**137**	**7 341**
Maximum	**11 005 552**	**1 196 562**	**9 692 030**	3 639 200	6 052 830	5 271 833	780 997	12 508	69 053	**640 706**	**942 192**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**19%**	15%	15%	15%	11%	15%	15%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.3b(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**34,9**	**0,8**	**24,9**	14,6	10,3	*7,2*	*3,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**8,5**
Belgium	**8,4**	**6,0**	**2,3**	NAP	2,3	*NAP*	*2,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**4,6**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,4**	**NA**
Croatia	**22,9**	**2,3**	**20,2**	3,7	16,5	*12,8*	*3,7*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**2,1**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,3**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**8,5**	**2,8**	**5,3**	4,3	1,0	*NAP*	*1,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Denmark	**47,9**	**0,8**	**44,1**	5,4	38,6	*38,3*	*0,3*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**3,0**
Estonia	**23,7**	**1,4**	**22,1**	4,8	17,3	*8,2*	*9,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**8,9**	**0,2**	**8,1**	8,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,2**
France	**1,9**	**1,5**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,4**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*0,1*	*NA*	NA	**0,8**	**1,1**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,7**	**NAP**
Hungary	**6,3**	**1,3**	**4,5**	1,7	2,9	*NAP*	*2,8*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,3**	**0,2**
Ireland	**2,6**	**2,0**	**0,6**	0,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**4,6**	**2,0**	**2,5**	2,5	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**19,1**	**1,5**	**17,5**	3,0	14,5	*14,5*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**6,7**	**3,1**	**2,3**	2,1	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,2	**0,5**	**0,8**
Luxembourg	**2,0**	**1,1**	**0,7**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,6	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**1,9**	**1,3**	**0,6**	0,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**6,3**	**0,7**	**5,1**	5,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**NAP**
Poland	**28,8**	**2,6**	**25,3**	9,5	15,8	*13,8*	*2,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,7**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,4**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Romania	**6,5**	**6,1**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**14,0**	**2,0**	**8,3**	2,4	4,7	*NAP*	*4,4*	*0,2*	1,3	**0,1**	**3,6**
Slovenia	**25,9**	**1,5**	**18,2**	6,4	11,8	*9,8*	*2,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**6,0**
Spain	**4,4**	**2,2**	**1,9**	1,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,8**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,9**	**0,1**
Average	**12,3**	**2,0**	**9,8**	3,7	11,3	*13,1*	*2,6*	*0,1*	0,4	**0,4**	**2,2**
Median	**6,6**	**1,5**	**4,8**	2,5	11,1	*11,3*	*2,2*	*0,1*	0,1	**0,3**	**0,8**
Minimum	**1,9**	**0,2**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,1**
Maximum	**47,9**	**6,1**	**44,1**	14,6	38,6	*38,3*	*9,1*	*0,2*	1,3	**1,9**	**8,5**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**19%**	15%	15%	*15%*	*11%*	*15%*	15%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.4a(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**539 161**	**31 551**	**358 361**	309 204	49 157	*20 069*	*29 088*	*NAP*	NAP	**61 271**	**87 978**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 569**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**92 727**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**9 960**	**NA**
Croatia	**302 035**	**168 368**	**127 233**	77 391	49 842	*37 766*	*12 076*	*NAP*	NAP	**6 434**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**56 583**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 604**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**426 237**	**135 318**	**165 886**	161 616	3 846	*NAP*	*3 846*	*NAP*	424	**9 784**	**115 249**
Denmark	**132 774**	**23 646**	**78 924**	61 060	14 728	*2 735*	*11 993*	*NAP*	3 136	**NAP**	**30 204**
Estonia	**21 402**	**6 998**	**13 416**	8 120	5 296	*4 013*	*1 283*	*NAP*	NAP	**988**	**NAP**
Finland	**131 384**	**7 082**	**101 388**	101 388	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**18 340**	**4 574**
France	**1 991 346**	**1 732 374**	**76 259**	76 259	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**182 713**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**776 359**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 861 202*	*NA*	NA	**748 038**	**450 720**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**110 993**	**NAP**
Hungary	**137 467**	**57 741**	**58 749**	19 101	39 299	*NAP*	*37 456*	*1 843*	349	**7 889**	**13 088**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**3 540 713**	**2 187 651**	**1 217 611**	1 217 611	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**135 451**	**NAP**
Latvia	**27 516**	**18 147**	**8 274**	8 274	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 095**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**34 997**	**28 015**	**881**	487	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	394	**4 302**	**1 799**
Luxembourg	**5 507**	**3 133**	**1 029**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 029	**1 345**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 242**	**10 147**	**748**	748	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**347**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**276 260**	**44 560**	**159 930**	159 930	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**71 770**	**NAP**
Poland	**3 314 812**	**866 154**	**2 281 508**	571 069	1 710 439	*1 603 682*	*106 757*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 785**	**140 365**
Portugal	**NA**	**190 966**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**60 676**	**NAP**
Romania	**630 313**	**542 528**	**15 506**	3 988	11 518	*6 065*	*5 453*	*NAP*	NAP	**72 279**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**182 196**	**60 177**	**95 672**	29 024	17 090	*NAP*	*16 874*	*216*	49 558	**7 052**	**19 295**
Slovenia	**103 876**	**30 950**	**42 187**	40 086	2 101	*1 778*	*323*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 751**	**26 988**
Spain	**2 002 069**	**1 333 257**	**497 263**	497 263	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**171 549**	**NAP**
Sweden	**98 244**	**28 453**	**9 060**	9 060	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**57 318**	**3 413**
Average	**639 039**	**376 526**	**265 494**	176 404	173 029	209 514	189 668	1 030	9 148	**71 852**	**81 243**
Median	**135 121**	**51 151**	**77 592**	61 060	14 728	5 039	12 076	1 030	727	**18 340**	**26 988**
Minimum	**5 507**	**3 133**	**748**	487	0	0	323	216	349	**347**	**1 799**
Maximum	**3 540 713**	**2 187 651**	**2 281 508**	1 217 611	1 710 439	1 603 682	1 861 202	1 843	49 558	**748 038**	**450 720**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**19%**	**26%**	19%	15%	11%	11%	11%	15%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	11%	44%	59%	48%	81%	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.4b(2020): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**6,0**	**0,4**	**4,0**	3,5	0,6	*0,2*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**1,0**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**1,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**7,5**	**4,2**	**3,2**	1,9	1,2	*0,9*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**6,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,6**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**4,0**	**1,3**	**1,6**	1,5	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,3**	**0,4**	**1,4**	1,0	0,3	*0,0*	*0,2*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**0,5**
Estonia	**1,6**	**0,5**	**1,0**	0,6	0,4	*0,3*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,4**	**0,1**	**1,8**	1,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,1**
France	**3,0**	**2,6**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,2*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**0,5**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1,0**	**NAP**
Hungary	**1,4**	**0,6**	**0,6**	0,2	0,4	*NAP*	*0,4*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,1**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**6,0**	**3,7**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,5**	**1,0**	**0,4**	0,4	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,3**	**1,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,1**
Luxembourg	**0,9**	**0,5**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,2**	**2,0**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,6**	**0,3**	**0,9**	0,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Poland	**8,7**	**2,3**	**6,0**	1,5	4,5	*4,2*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,4**
Portugal	**NA**	**1,9**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,3**	**2,8**	**0,1**	0,0	0,1	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3,3**	**1,1**	**1,8**	0,5	0,3	*NAP*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,9	**0,1**	**0,4**
Slovenia	**4,9**	**1,5**	**2,0**	1,9	0,1	*0,1*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**1,3**
Spain	**4,2**	**2,8**	**1,1**	1,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,9**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**0,0**
Average	**3,4**	**1,5**	**1,4**	1,0	0,7	*0,7*	*0,4*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,3**	**0,5**
Median	**2,7**	**1,1**	**1,0**	0,9	0,3	*0,2*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,4**
Minimum	**0,9**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**8,7**	**4,2**	**6,0**	3,5	4,5	*4,2*	*2,2*	*0,0*	0,9	**1,0**	**1,3**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**19%**	**26%**	19%	15%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	11%	44%	*59%*	*48%*	*81%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.1.1.5(2020): First instance civil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2020

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q91)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	NA	NA	22 923	37,41%
Belgium	NA	NA	1 489	7,24%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	46 677	27,7%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	487	7,0%	35	3,54%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	16 309	8,93%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	NA	79 771	58,89%
Latvia	1 918	10,6%	53	4,84%
Lithuania	1 252	4,5%	345	8,02%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	3 972	39,1%	206	59,37%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	33 923	17,8%	NA	NA
Romania	21 415	3,9%	2 465	3,41%
Slovak Republic	18 593	30,9%	1 412	20,02%
Slovenia	8 338	26,9%	379	10,10%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	711	2,5%	820	1,43%
Average	**13 729**	**17,1%**	**10 517**	**18,6%**
Median	**6 155**	**14,2%**	**1 116**	**8,5%**
Minimum	**487**	**2,5%**	**35**	**1,4%**
Maximum	**46 677**	**39,1%**	**79 771**	**59,4%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**63%**	**63%**	**52%**	**52%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	**4%**

Romania: Due to the peculiarity of the national statistical system, cases older than 3 years instead of 2 are communicated.

Table 3.1.1.1a(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2019

Absolute number (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**522 141**	**31 779**	**357 258**	324 114	33 144	*15 495*	*17 649*	NAP	NAP	**79 024**	**54 080**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	NAP	NAP	**23 838**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**91 896**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	**9 509**	**NA**
Croatia	**257 110**	**133 976**	**114 713**	66 192	48 521	*46 432*	*2 089*	NAP	NAP	**8 421**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**48 837**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	NA	**5 700**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**425 103**	**143 208**	**153 253**	146 828	5 017	*NAP*	*5 017*	NAP	1 408	**11 799**	**116 843**
Denmark	**164 281**	**23 273**	**110 970**	87 757	20 541	*2 223*	*18 318*	NAP	2 672	**NA**	**30 043**
Estonia	**25 371**	**6 157**	**18 394**	11 338	7 056	*4 717*	*2 339*	NAP	NAP	**820**	**NAP**
Finland	**115 918**	**6 451**	**86 233**	86 233	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**17 620**	**5 614**
France	**1 892 584**	**1 651 625**	**75 218**	75 218	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**165 741**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**738 824**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 766 395*	*NA*	NA	**867 035**	**444 077**
Greece	**NA**	**281 705**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**131 158**	**63 848**	**43 355**	17 886	25 208	*NAP*	*23 606*	*1 602*	261	**5 180**	**18 775**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**3 691 867**	**2 304 755**	**1 221 344**	1 221 344	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**165 768**	**NAP**
Latvia	**24 757**	**18 609**	**4 836**	4 836	0	*0*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**1 312**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**30 934**	**23 582**	**1 144**	721	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	423	**4 599**	**1 609**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 649**	**1 319**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 319	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**10 138**	**9 727**	**23**	23	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**388**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**266 100**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**51 840**	**NAP**
Poland	**2 414 543**	**912 519**	**1 367 290**	657 899	709 391	*589 726*	*119 665*	NAP	NAP	**22 374**	**112 360**
Portugal	**NA**	**202 485**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**68 923**	**NAP**
Romania	**591 192**	**548 530**	**10 887**	1 546	9 341	*4 629*	*4 712*	NAP	NAP	**31 775**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**198 434**	**71 384**	**84 730**	32 557	7 719	*NAP*	*7 719*	NAP	44 454	**5 352**	**36 968**
Slovenia	**109 533**	**34 645**	**49 196**	44 203	4 993	*4 610*	*383*	NAP	NAP	**3 600**	**22 092**
Spain	**1 615 361**	**1 105 539**	**354 118**	354 118	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**155 704**	**NAP**
Sweden	**105 443**	**28 499**	**8 701**	8 701	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**64 646**	**3 597**
Average	**606 319**	**379 217**	**213 841**	174 529	79 176	83 479	178 899	1 602	8 423	**76 999**	**76 914**
Median	**164 281**	**67 616**	**75 218**	55 198	9 341	4 673	7 719	1 602	1 364	**17 620**	**30 043**
Minimum	**10 138**	**1 649**	**23**	23	0	0	383	1 602	261	**388**	**1 609**
Maximum	**3 691 867**	**2 304 755**	**1 367 290**	1 221 344	709 391	589 726	1 766 395	1 602	44 454	**867 035**	**444 077**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**19%**	**30%**	26%	19%	15%	15%	11%	15%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	56%	44%	85%	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.1b(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,9**	**0,4**	**4,0**	3,6	0,4	*0,2*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,9**	**0,6**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**1,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**6,3**	**3,3**	**2,8**	1,6	1,2	*1,1*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**5,5**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**0,6**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**4,0**	**1,3**	**1,4**	1,4	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,8**	**0,4**	**1,9**	1,5	0,4	*0,0*	*0,3*	*NAP*	0,0	**NA**	**0,5**
Estonia	**1,9**	**0,5**	**1,4**	0,9	0,5	*0,4*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,1**	**0,1**	**1,6**	1,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,1**
France	**2,8**	**2,5**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,1*	*NA*	NA	**1,0**	**0,5**
Greece	**NA**	**2,6**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**1,3**	**0,7**	**0,4**	0,2	0,3	*NAP*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,2**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**6,1**	**3,8**	**2,0**	2,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,3**	**1,0**	**0,3**	0,3	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,1**	**0,8**	**0,0**	0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,1**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,3**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,1**	**2,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,5**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Poland	**6,3**	**2,4**	**3,6**	1,7	1,8	*1,5*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,3**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,0**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,0**	**2,8**	**0,1**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3,6**	**1,3**	**1,6**	0,6	0,1	*NAP*	*0,1*	*NAP*	0,8	**0,1**	**0,7**
Slovenia	**5,2**	**1,7**	**2,3**	2,1	0,2	*0,2*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**1,1**
Spain	**3,4**	**2,3**	**0,7**	0,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Sweden	**1,0**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**0,0**
Average	**3,3**	**1,5**	**1,3**	1,0	0,5	*0,4*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,3**	**0,5**
Median	**2,8**	**1,3**	**1,4**	0,8	0,3	*0,2*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,5**
Minimum	**1,0**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**6,3**	**3,8**	**4,0**	3,6	1,8	*1,5*	*2,1*	*0,0*	0,8	**1,0**	**1,1**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**19%**	**30%**	26%	19%	*15%*	*15%*	*11%*	15%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*85%*	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.2a(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2019

Absolute number (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 223 321**	**83 399**	**2 587 121**	1 629 337	957 784	*640 454*	*317 330*	*NAP*	NAP	**54 894**	**497 907**
Belgium	**983 230**	**701 218**	**264 970**	NAP	264 970	*NAP*	*264 970*	*NAP*	NAP	**17 042**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**377 325**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**34 724**	**NA**
Croatia	**999 495**	**128 985**	**857 476**	197 628	659 848	*519 274*	*140 574*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 034**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**20 817**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**1 900**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**959 983**	**355 323**	**560 321**	438 605	119 871	*NAP*	*119 871*	*NAP*	1 845	**10 576**	**33 763**
Denmark	**2 869 512**	**48 940**	**2 650 449**	359 176	2 285 719	*2 267 166*	*18 553*	*NAP*	5 554	**NA**	**170 123**
Estonia	**300 762**	**18 501**	**279 728**	52 590	227 138	*112 455*	*114 683*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 533**	**NAP**
Finland	**522 977**	**8 448**	**480 320**	480 320	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**25 396**	**8 813**
France	**1 801 871**	**1 403 505**	**167 086**	167 086	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**231 280**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 282 250**	**NA**	2 515 303	NA	*5 531 883*	*132 566*	*NA*	NA	**680 061**	**953 399**
Greece	**NA**	**206 387**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**663 594**	**133 406**	**497 329**	178 014	317 207	*NAP*	*311 808*	*5 399*	2 108	**16 432**	**16 427**
Ireland	**230 240**	**135 208**	**93 740**	93 740	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**1 292**
Italy	**3 443 248**	**1 469 215**	**1 923 159**	1 923 159	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**50 874**	**NAP**
Latvia	**357 072**	**30 196**	**325 004**	44 727	280 277	*280 277*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 872**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**200 534**	**92 883**	**66 772**	59 748	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	7 024	**14 273**	**26 606**
Luxembourg	**14 208**	**7 626**	**5 126**	1 047	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	4 079	**1 456**	**NAP**
Malta	**13 066**	**8 909**	**4 027**	4 027	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**130**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 214 258**	**138 752**	**969 669**	969 669	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**105 837**	**NAP**
Poland	**13 677 355**	**1 254 576**	**12 062 299**	4 583 880	7 478 419	*6 644 391*	*834 028*	*NAP*	NAP	**70 227**	**290 253**
Portugal	**NA**	**323 236**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 335**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 410 632**	**1 296 445**	**31 416**	24 567	6 849	*5 856*	*993*	*NAP*	NAP	**82 771**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**802 886**	**116 709**	**464 061**	121 067	269 255	*NAP*	*269 255*	*NAP*	73 739	**5 525**	**216 591**
Slovenia	**630 234**	**36 979**	**438 320**	164 614	273 706	*224 102*	*49 604*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 139**	**151 796**
Spain	**2 514 806**	**1 292 934**	**1 022 349**	1 022 349	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**199 523**	**NAP**
Sweden	**274 598**	**67 885**	**22 331**	22 331	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**177 144**	**7 238**
Average	**1 562 751**	**425 677**	**1 171 503**	684 227	1 095 087	1 802 873	214 520	5 399	15 725	**76 166**	**197 851**
Median	**733 240**	**133 406**	**451 191**	172 550	276 992	519 274	136 570	5 399	4 817	**21 219**	**92 780**
Minimum	**13 066**	**7 626**	**4 027**	1 047	6 849	5 856	993	5 399	1 845	**130**	**1 292**
Maximum	**13 677 355**	**1 469 215**	**12 062 299**	4 583 880	7 478 419	6 644 391	834 028	5 399	73 739	**680 061**	**953 399**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	15%	15%	11%	11%	11%	15%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	85%	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.2b(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2019

Absolute number (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**36,2**	**0,9**	**29,1**	18,3	10,8	*7,2*	*3,6*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**5,6**
Belgium	**8,6**	**6,1**	**2,3**	NAP	2,3	*NAP*	*2,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**5,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,5**	**NA**
Croatia	**24,6**	**3,2**	**21,1**	4,9	16,3	*12,8*	*3,5*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**2,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**9,0**	**3,3**	**5,3**	4,1	1,1	*NAP*	*1,1*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Denmark	**49,3**	**0,8**	**45,5**	6,2	39,3	*38,9*	*0,3*	*NAP*	0,1	**NA**	**2,9**
Estonia	**22,7**	**1,4**	**21,1**	4,0	17,1	*8,5*	*8,7*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**9,5**	**0,2**	**8,7**	8,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**0,2**
France	**2,7**	**2,1**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,5**	**NA**	3,0	NA	*6,7*	*0,2*	*NA*	NA	**0,8**	**1,1**
Greece	**NA**	**1,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**6,8**	**1,4**	**5,1**	1,8	3,2	*NAP*	*3,2*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,2**
Ireland	**4,7**	**2,7**	**1,9**	1,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,0**
Italy	**5,7**	**2,4**	**3,2**	3,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**18,7**	**1,6**	**17,0**	2,3	14,7	*14,7*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**7,2**	**3,3**	**2,4**	2,1	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,3	**0,5**	**1,0**
Luxembourg	**2,3**	**1,2**	**0,8**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,7	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,6**	**1,8**	**0,8**	0,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**7,0**	**0,8**	**5,6**	5,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Poland	**35,6**	**3,3**	**31,4**	11,9	19,5	*17,3*	*2,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,8**
Portugal	**NA**	**3,1**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Romania	**7,3**	**6,7**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**14,7**	**2,1**	**8,5**	2,2	4,9	*NAP*	*4,9*	*NAP*	1,4	**0,1**	**4,0**
Slovenia	**30,1**	**1,8**	**20,9**	7,9	13,1	*10,7*	*2,4*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**7,2**
Spain	**5,3**	**2,7**	**2,2**	2,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,7**	**0,7**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,7**	**0,1**
Average	**13,4**	**2,3**	**10,6**	4,2	11,9	*13,0*	*2,7*	*0,1*	0,4	**0,4**	**1,9**
Median	**7,2**	**1,9**	**5,2**	2,7	11,9	*10,7*	*2,3*	*0,1*	0,2	**0,2**	**0,9**
Minimum	**2,3**	**0,2**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**49,3**	**6,7**	**45,5**	18,3	39,3	*38,9*	*8,7*	*0,1*	1,4	**1,7**	**7,2**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	15%	15%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*85%*	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.3a(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2019

Absolute number (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 236 623**	**83 771**	**2 594 238**	1 639 927	954 311	*635 863*	*318 448*	*NAP*	NAP	**60 746**	**497 868**
Belgium	**990 917**	**706 901**	**264 970**	NAP	264 970	*NAP*	*264 970*	*NAP*	NAP	**19 046**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**373 760**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**34 226**	**NA**
Croatia	**927 384**	**112 813**	**800 375**	149 571	650 804	*510 264*	*140 540*	*NAP*	NAP	**14 178**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**20 382**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**3 227**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**967 488**	**360 375**	**560 670**	438 211	119 862	*NAP*	*119 862*	*NAP*	2 597	**11 333**	**35 110**
Denmark	**2 885 425**	**44 924**	**2 670 673**	373 901	2 291 277	*2 266 404*	*24 873*	*NAP*	5 495	**NA**	**169 828**
Estonia	**300 911**	**17 433**	**281 090**	52 873	228 217	*112 976*	*115 241*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 388**	**NAP**
Finland	**495 812**	**8 436**	**452 792**	452 792	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**25 348**	**9 236**
France	**1 791 335**	**1 399 133**	**168 973**	168 973	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**223 229**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 267 995**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*90 370*	*NA*	NA	**741 004**	**953 682**
Greece	**NA**	**177 813**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**668 015**	**139 267**	**492 145**	178 186	311 945	*NAP*	*306 757*	*5 188*	2 014	**16 844**	**19 759**
Ireland	**173 602**	**85 193**	**87 117**	87 117	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**1 292**
Italy	**3 556 819**	**1 535 123**	**1 955 012**	1 955 012	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**66 684**	**NAP**
Latvia	**357 017**	**30 836**	**324 210**	43 933	280 277	*280 277*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 971**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**202 846**	**94 080**	**66 952**	59 903	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	7 049	**14 929**	**26 885**
Luxembourg	**13 151**	**6 714**	**5 342**	1 047	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	4 295	**1 095**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 932**	**8 178**	**3 597**	3 597	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**157**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 209 419**	**138 986**	**971 301**	971 301	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99 132**	**NAP**
Poland	**12 333 858**	**1 245 830**	**10 747 291**	4 557 728	6 189 563	*5 349 662*	*839 901*	*NAP*	NAP	**69 238**	**271 499**
Portugal	**NA**	**339 370**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**29 018**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 414 005**	**1 301 356**	**29 605**	23 660	5 945	*5 377*	*568*	*NAP*	NAP	**83 044**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**731 135**	**128 223**	**373 232**	121 284	176 512	*NAP*	*176 512*	*NAP*	75 436	**4 496**	**225 184**
Slovenia	**641 379**	**40 444**	**443 040**	168 777	274 263	*224 654*	*49 609*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 792**	**155 103**
Spain	**2 354 827**	**1 215 252**	**955 535**	955 535	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**184 040**	**NAP**
Sweden	**275 581**	**66 155**	**21 945**	21 945	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**180 107**	**7 374**
Average	**1 497 234**	**422 184**	**1 103 187**	591 680	978 996	1 173 185	203 971	5 188	16 148	**78 678**	**197 735**
Median	**699 575**	**128 223**	**408 136**	168 777	277 270	395 271	130 201	5 188	4 895	**22 197**	**95 107**
Minimum	**11 932**	**6 714**	**3 597**	1 047	5 945	5 377	568	5 188	2 014	**157**	**1 292**
Maximum	**12 333 858**	**1 535 123**	**10 747 291**	4 557 728	6 189 563	5 349 662	839 901	5 188	75 436	**741 004**	**953 682**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	15%	11%	11%	15%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	85%	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.3b(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**36,4**	**0,9**	**29,1**	18,4	10,7	*7,1*	*3,6*	NAP	NAP	**0,7**	**5,6**
Belgium	**8,7**	**6,2**	**2,3**	NAP	2,3	NAP	*2,3*	NAP	NAP	**0,2**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**5,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**0,5**	**NA**
Croatia	**22,9**	**2,8**	**19,7**	3,7	16,0	*12,6*	*3,5*	NAP	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**2,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	**0,4**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**9,1**	**3,4**	**5,3**	4,1	1,1	NAP	*1,1*	NAP	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Denmark	**49,6**	**0,8**	**45,9**	6,4	39,4	*38,9*	*0,4*	NAP	0,1	**NA**	**2,9**
Estonia	**22,7**	**1,3**	**21,2**	4,0	17,2	*8,5*	*8,7*	NAP	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**9,0**	**0,2**	**8,2**	8,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,5**	**0,2**
France	**2,7**	**2,1**	**0,3**	0,3	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,5**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	*0,1*	NA	NA	**0,9**	**1,1**
Greece	**NA**	**1,7**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**6,8**	**1,4**	**5,0**	1,8	3,2	NAP	*3,1*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,2**
Ireland	**3,5**	**1,7**	**1,8**	1,8	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**0,0**
Italy	**5,9**	**2,5**	**3,2**	3,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**18,7**	**1,6**	**17,0**	2,3	14,7	*14,7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**7,3**	**3,4**	**2,4**	2,1	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,3	**0,5**	**1,0**
Luxembourg	**2,1**	**1,1**	**0,9**	0,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,7	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,4**	**1,7**	**0,7**	0,7	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**6,9**	**0,8**	**5,6**	5,6	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Poland	**32,1**	**3,2**	**28,0**	11,9	16,1	*13,9*	*2,2*	NAP	NAP	**0,2**	**0,7**
Portugal	**NA**	**3,3**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Romania	**7,3**	**6,7**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	NAP	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**13,4**	**2,3**	**6,8**	2,2	3,2	NAP	*3,2*	NAP	1,4	**0,1**	**4,1**
Slovenia	**30,6**	**1,9**	**21,1**	8,1	13,1	*10,7*	*2,4*	NAP	NAP	**0,1**	**7,4**
Spain	**5,0**	**2,6**	**2,0**	2,0	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,7**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1,7**	**0,1**
Average	**13,1**	**2,2**	**10,3**	4,2	11,4	*13,3*	*2,6*	*0,1*	0,4	**0,4**	**2,0**
Median	**7,3**	**1,7**	**5,1**	2,3	11,9	*11,6*	*2,3*	*0,1*	0,2	**0,3**	**0,8**
Minimum	**2,1**	**0,2**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,1*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**49,6**	**6,7**	**45,9**	18,4	39,4	*38,9*	*8,7*	*0,1*	1,4	**1,7**	**7,4**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	*15%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*85%*	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.4a(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2019

Absolute number (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**520 057**	**31 407**	**361 359**	324 742	36 617	*20 086*	*16 531*	*NAP*	NAP	**73 172**	**54 119**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**21 807**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**95 461**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**10 007**	**NA**
Croatia	**331 188**	**150 832**	**173 078**	114 965	58 113	*55 990*	*2 123*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 278**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**49 272**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**4 373**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**417 598**	**138 156**	**152 904**	147 222	5 026	*NAP*	*5 026*	*NAP*	656	**11 042**	**115 496**
Denmark	**148 368**	**27 289**	**90 746**	73 032	14 983	*2 985*	*11 998*	*NAP*	2 731	**NA**	**30 333**
Estonia	**25 990**	**7 021**	**18 079**	11 954	6 125	*4 342*	*1 783*	*NAP*	NAP	**890**	**NAP**
Finland	**143 083**	**6 463**	**113 761**	113 761	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**17 668**	**5 191**
France	**1 903 120**	**1 655 997**	**73 331**	73 331	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**173 792**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**753 049**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 808 598*	*NA*	NA	**806 072**	**453 747**
Greece	**NA**	**310 279**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**126 736**	**57 987**	**48 539**	17 714	30 470	*NAP*	*28 657*	*1 813*	355	**4 768**	**15 442**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**3 578 296**	**2 238 847**	**1 189 491**	1 189 491	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**149 958**	**NAP**
Latvia	**24 812**	**17 969**	**5 630**	5 630	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 213**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**28 622**	**22 385**	**964**	566	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	398	**3 943**	**1 330**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**2 561**	**1 103**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 103	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 243**	**10 429**	**453**	453	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**361**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**264 130**	**41 905**	**163 855**	163 855	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**58 370**	**NAP**
Poland	**3 758 040**	**921 265**	**2 682 298**	684 051	1 998 247	*1 884 455*	*113 792*	*NAP*	NAP	**23 363**	**131 114**
Portugal	**NA**	**186 351**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**67 240**	**NAP**
Romania	**587 819**	**543 619**	**12 698**	2 453	10 245	*5 108*	*5 137*	*NAP*	NAP	**31 502**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**270 185**	**59 870**	**175 559**	32 340	100 462	*NAP*	*100 462*	*NAP*	42 757	**6 381**	**28 375**
Slovenia	**98 206**	**31 180**	**44 298**	39 862	4 436	*4 058*	*378*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 947**	**18 781**
Spain	**1 769 599**	**1 175 900**	**423 223**	423 223	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**170 476**	**NAP**
Sweden	**104 460**	**30 229**	**9 087**	9 087	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**61 683**	**3 461**
Average	**678 871**	**366 130**	**287 023**	180 407	205 884	247 128	190 408	1 813	8 000	**74 318**	**77 944**
Median	**148 368**	**57 987**	**82 039**	73 032	14 983	4 725	11 998	1 813	880	**17 668**	**28 375**
Minimum	**11 243**	**2 561**	**453**	453	0	0	378	1 813	355	**361**	**1 330**
Maximum	**3 758 040**	**2 238 847**	**2 682 298**	1 189 491	1 998 247	1 884 455	1 808 598	1 813	42 757	**806 072**	**453 747**
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	15%	15%	11%	15%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	56%	44%	85%	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.4b(2019): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,8**	**0,4**	**4,1**	3,6	0,4	*0,2*	*0,2*	NAP	NAP	**0,8**	**0,6**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**1,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**8,2**	**3,7**	**4,3**	2,8	1,4	*1,4*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**5,5**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**0,5**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**3,9**	**1,3**	**1,4**	1,4	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,5**	**0,5**	**1,6**	1,3	0,3	*0,1*	*0,2*	*NAP*	0,0	**NA**	**0,5**
Estonia	**2,0**	**0,5**	**1,4**	0,9	0,5	*0,3*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,6**	**0,1**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,1**
France	**2,8**	**2,5**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,2*	*NA*	NA	**1,0**	**0,5**
Greece	**NA**	**2,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**1,3**	**0,6**	**0,5**	0,2	0,3	*NAP*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,2**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**5,9**	**3,7**	**2,0**	2,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,3**	**0,9**	**0,3**	0,3	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,0**	**0,8**	**0,0**	0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,4**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,3**	**2,1**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,5**	**0,2**	**0,9**	0,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Poland	**9,8**	**2,4**	**7,0**	1,8	5,2	*4,9*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,3**
Portugal	**NA**	**1,8**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,0**	**2,8**	**0,1**	0,0	0,1	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**5,0**	**1,1**	**3,2**	0,6	1,8	*NAP*	*1,8*	*NAP*	0,8	**0,1**	**0,5**
Slovenia	**4,7**	**1,5**	**2,1**	1,9	0,2	*0,2*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,9**
Spain	**3,7**	**2,5**	**0,9**	0,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**1,0**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**0,0**
Average	**3,6**	**1,5**	**1,6**	1,1	0,9	*0,9*	*0,5*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,3**	**0,4**
Median	**2,8**	**1,1**	**1,2**	0,9	0,3	*0,2*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,5**
Minimum	**1,0**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**9,8**	**3,7**	**7,0**	3,6	5,2	*4,9*	*2,2*	*0,0*	0,8	**1,0**	**1,1**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	*15%*	*15%*	*11%*	15%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*85%*	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.5(2019): First instance civil (and commercial litigious) and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2019

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q91)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	NA	NA	24 005	32,8%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	43 224	28,7%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	359	5,1%	30	03,4%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	12 255	07,1%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	NA	NA	72 949	48,6%
Latvia	3 894	21,7%	99	08,2%
Lithuania	1 253	5,6%	77	02,0%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	222	61,5%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	34 445	18,5%	NA	NA
Romania	17 809	3,3%	1 480	04,7%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	9 625	30,9%	82	02,1%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	829	2,7%	418	00,7%
Average	**13 930**	**14,6%**	**11 162**	**17,1%**
Median	**6 760**	**12,0%**	**320**	**5,9%**
Minimum	**359**	**2,7%**	**30**	**0,7%**
Maximum	**43 224**	**30,9%**	**72 949**	**61,5%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**70%**	**70%**	**59%**	**59%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	**4%**

Romania: Due to the peculiarity of the national statistical system, cases older than 3 years instead of 2 are communicated.

France: administrative matters: in contrast with previous cycle, 2019 data are expressed in net figures, excluding serial cases presenting the same legal issue for trial.

Table 3.1.1.1(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 1st Jan. 2018

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**522 569**	**32 437**	**366 196**	324 166	42 030	*16 644*	*25 386*	NAP	NAP	**71 648**	**52 288**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**21 318**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**82 931**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**9 426**	**NA**
Croatia	**297 507**	**148 828**	**138 113**	91 062	47 051	*44 709*	*2 342*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 566**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**57 972**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**8 025**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**446 370**	**148 655**	**162 410**	153 009	7 459	*NAP*	*7 459*	*NAP*	1 942	**10 377**	**124 928**
Denmark	**144 319**	**20 458**	**94 887**	83 319	9 229	*3 094*	*6 135*	*NAP*	2 339	**NAP**	**28 974**
Estonia	**26 056**	**6 280**	**18 884**	9 294	9 590	*4 775*	*4 815*	*NAP*	NAP	**892**	**NAP**
Finland	**154 229**	**6 487**	**121 848**	121 848	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 765**	**5 129**
France	**1 821 752**	**1 588 116**	**73 162**	73 162	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**160 474**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**703 935**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 727 738*	*NA*	NA	**845 199**	**440 716**
Greece	**NA**	**252 811**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**200 803**	**NA**
Hungary	**174 020**	**85 430**	**58 332**	20 389	37 436	*NAP*	*35 986*	*1 450*	507	**5 467**	**24 791**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**3 797 952**	**2 331 797**	**1 282 107**	1 282 107	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**184 048**	**NAP**
Latvia	**25 433**	**19 522**	**4 499**	4 499	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 412**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**33 101**	**27 167**	**1 720**	1 301	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	419	**2 748**	**1 466**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 306**	**1 314**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 314	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**9 492**	**8 856**	**262**	262	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**374**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**279 950**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**47 290**	**NAP**
Poland	**2 324 337**	**807 970**	**1 404 323**	780 007	624 316	*470 502*	*153 814*	*NAP*	NAP	**25 726**	**86 318**
Portugal	**NA**	**230 602**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**71 446**	**NAP**
Romania	**639 082**	**581 464**	**10 770**	1 354	9 416	*4 322*	*5 094*	*NAP*	NAP	**46 848**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**269 114**	**110 221**	**89 392**	31 105	9 390	*NAP*	*9 390*	*0*	48 897	**5 155**	**64 346**
Slovenia	**122 514**	**38 624**	**61 003**	56 402	4 601	*4 119*	*482*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 292**	**19 595**
Spain	**1 426 264**	**942 844**	**331 391**	331 391	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**152 029**	**NAP**
Sweden	**97 859**	**26 858**	**8 692**	8 692	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**59 299**	**3 010**
Average	**607 277**	**369 121**	**222 595**	187 409	72 774	68 521	179 876	725	9 236	**81 859**	**77 415**
Median	**174 020**	**97 826**	**73 162**	64 782	9 416	4 549	7 459	725	1 628	**21 042**	**28 974**
Minimum	**9 492**	**1 306**	**262**	262	0	0	482	0	419	**374**	**1 466**
Maximum	**3 797 952**	**2 331 797**	**1 404 323**	1 282 107	624 316	470 502	1 727 738	1 450	48 897	**845 199**	**440 716**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**19%**	**30%**	26%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	**4%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	44%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**7%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.2a(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2018

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 267 183**	**83 403**	**2 598 742**	1 669 386	929 356	*621 199*	*308 157*	*NAP*	NAP	**71 553**	**513 485**
Belgium	**1 060 896**	**767 255**	**267 025**	NAP	267 025	*NAP*	*267 025*	*NAP*	NAP	**16 665**	**9 951**
Bulgaria	**378 948**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**31 146**	**NA**
Croatia	**882 675**	**116 412**	**752 833**	120 873	631 960	*495 739*	*136 221*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 430**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**20 937**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**1 950**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**936 757**	**346 240**	**553 409**	440 015	111 788	*NAP*	*111 788*	*NAP*	1 606	**11 865**	**25 243**
Denmark	**2 277 208**	**41 854**	**2 076 446**	357 316	1 714 131	*1 689 592*	*24 539*	*NAP*	4 999	**NAP**	**158 908**
Estonia	**297 825**	**15 382**	**279 965**	48 177	231 788	*111 522*	*120 266*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 478**	**NAP**
Finland	**499 995**	**8 244**	**457 303**	457 303	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**24 593**	**9 855**
France	**1 882 289**	**1 498 080**	**171 180**	171 180	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**213 029**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 261 954**	**NA**	2 509 519	NA	*5 428 233*	*126 423*	*NA*	NA	**748 328**	**945 094**
Greece	**NA**	**213 468**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**60 320**	**NA**
Hungary	**719 282**	**132 557**	**550 507**	203 997	344 358	*NAP*	*339 852*	*4 506*	2 152	**17 120**	**19 098**
Ireland	**223 906**	**131 159**	**91 655**	91 655	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**1 092**
Italy	**3 518 409**	**1 539 174**	**1 929 267**	1 929 267	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**49 968**	**NAP**
Latvia	**317 227**	**27 778**	**287 606**	42 345	245 261	*245 261*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 843**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**210 779**	**99 292**	**71 599**	63 208	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	8 391	**14 899**	**24 989**
Luxembourg	**11 820**	**5 248**	**5 326**	1 031	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	4 295	**1 246**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 827**	**8 640**	**3 040**	3 040	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**147**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 199 579**	**134 710**	**965 230**	965 230	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99 629**	**NAP**
Poland	**10 983 338**	**1 324 787**	**9 272 680**	4 621 436	4 651 244	*3 691 685*	*959 559*	*NAP*	NAP	**65 963**	**319 908**
Portugal	**NA**	**296 748**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**24 382**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 354 351**	**1 240 508**	**30 103**	23 618	6 485	*5 631*	*854*	*NAP*	NAP	**83 740**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**592 842**	**126 997**	**278 255**	93 784	110 402	*NAP*	*110 323*	*79*	74 069	**5 063**	**182 527**
Slovenia	**638 075**	**40 700**	**437 669**	163 899	273 770	*222 701*	*51 069*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 540**	**156 166**
Spain	**2 324 441**	**1 284 086**	**868 023**	868 023	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**172 332**	**NAP**
Sweden	**260 016**	**64 117**	**21 490**	21 490	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**167 245**	**7 164**
Average	**1 411 275**	**432 352**	**998 607**	675 718	793 131	1 390 174	213 006	2 293	15 919	**76 099**	**182 575**
Median	**678 679**	**131 159**	**362 638**	167 540	270 398	495 739	123 345	2 293	4 647	**24 382**	**25 243**
Minimum	**11 820**	**5 248**	**3 040**	1 031	6 485	5 631	854	79	1 606	**147**	**1 092**
Maximum	**10 983 338**	**1 539 174**	**9 272 680**	4 621 436	4 651 244	5 428 233	959 559	4 506	74 069	**748 328**	**945 094**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	15%	15%	11%	11%	11%	15%	**0%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	81%	63%	**7%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.2b(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2018

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**37,0**	**0,9**	**29,5**	18,9	10,5	*7,0*	*3,5*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,8**	**5,8**
Belgium	**9,3**	**6,7**	**2,3**	NAP	2,3	*NAP*	*2,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,1**
Bulgaria	**5,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,4**	**NA**
Croatia	**21,7**	**2,9**	**18,5**	3,0	15,5	*12,2*	*3,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**2,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**8,8**	**3,3**	**5,2**	4,1	1,0	*NAP*	*1,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,2**
Denmark	**39,2**	**0,7**	**35,8**	6,2	29,5	*29,1*	*0,4*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**2,7**
Estonia	**22,6**	**1,2**	**21,2**	3,7	17,6	*8,5*	*9,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**9,1**	**0,1**	**8,3**	8,3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,2**
France	**2,8**	**2,2**	**0,3**	0,3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,5**	**NA**	3,0	NA	*6,5*	*0,2*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**1,1**
Greece	**NA**	**2,0**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,6**	**NA**
Hungary	**7,5**	**1,4**	**5,7**	2,1	3,6	*NAP*	*3,5*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,2**
Ireland	**4,6**	**2,7**	**1,9**	1,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,0**
Italy	**5,8**	**2,6**	**3,2**	3,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**16,5**	**1,4**	**15,0**	2,2	12,8	*12,8*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**7,5**	**3,6**	**2,6**	2,3	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,3	**0,5**	**0,9**
Luxembourg	**1,9**	**0,9**	**0,9**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,7	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,5**	**1,8**	**0,6**	0,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**6,9**	**0,8**	**5,6**	5,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Poland	**28,6**	**3,4**	**24,1**	12,0	12,1	*9,6*	*2,5*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,8**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,9**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Romania	**7,0**	**6,4**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**10,9**	**2,3**	**5,1**	1,7	2,0	*NAP*	*2,0*	*0,0*	1,4	**0,1**	**3,3**
Slovenia	**30,7**	**2,0**	**21,0**	7,9	13,2	*10,7*	*2,5*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**7,5**
Spain	**4,9**	**2,7**	**1,8**	1,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,5**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,6**	**0,1**
Average	**12,3**	**2,3**	**9,5**	4,1	10,0	*10,7*	*2,5*	*0,0*	0,4	**0,4**	**1,8**
Median	**7,5**	**2,0**	**5,2**	2,6	11,3	*9,6*	*2,4*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,2**	**0,8**
Minimum	**1,9**	**0,1**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**39,2**	**6,7**	**35,8**	18,9	29,5	*29,1*	*9,1*	*0,0*	1,4	**1,6**	**7,5**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	15%	15%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**0%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*81%*	63%	**7%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.3(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2018

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 274 813**	**84 061**	**2 614 882**	1 676 640	938 242	*622 348*	*315 894*	NAP	NAP	**64 177**	**511 693**
Belgium	**1 149 719**	**862 888**	**267 025**	NAP	267 025	NAP	*267 025*	NAP	NAP	**19 806**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**369 915**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**31 044**	**NA**
Croatia	**922 780**	**130 931**	**776 278**	143 939	632 339	*495 865*	*136 474*	NAP	NAP	**15 571**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**26 147**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**4 275**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**958 742**	**351 743**	**562 658**	446 312	114 206	NAP	*114 206*	NAP	2 140	**10 445**	**33 896**
Denmark	**2 267 599**	**39 768**	**2 070 226**	357 728	1 707 761	*1 690 470*	*17 291*	NAP	4 737	**NAP**	**157 605**
Estonia	**299 371**	**15 473**	**281 421**	46 060	235 361	*112 715*	*122 646*	NAP	NAP	**2 477**	**NAP**
Finland	**529 974**	**8 427**	**484 490**	484 490	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**27 608**	**9 449**
France	**1 813 313**	**1 434 571**	**169 124**	169 124	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**209 618**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 227 172**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*87 651*	*NA*	NA	**726 730**	**960 583**
Greece	**NA**	**184 131**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**98 633**	**NA**
Hungary	**762 142**	**154 139**	**565 484**	206 500	356 586	NAP	*352 232*	*4 354*	2 398	**17 407**	**25 112**
Ireland	**175 913**	**82 744**	**92 077**	92 077	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**1 092**
Italy	**3 618 916**	**1 583 707**	**1 967 089**	1 967 089	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**68 120**	**NAP**
Latvia	**317 970**	**28 712**	**287 320**	42 059	245 261	*245 261*	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 938**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**212 946**	**102 877**	**72 175**	63 788	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	8 387	**13 048**	**24 846**
Luxembourg	**11 297**	**4 905**	**5 321**	1 031	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	4 290	**1 071**	**NAP**
Malta	**11 481**	**8 068**	**3 279**	3 279	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**134**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 207 954**	**136 326**	**976 807**	976 807	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**94 821**	**NAP**
Poland	**10 873 270**	**1 220 249**	**9 305 584**	4 743 532	4 562 052	*3 572 462*	*989 590*	NAP	NAP	**69 315**	**278 122**
Portugal	**NA**	**323 967**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**27 055**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 402 241**	**1 273 442**	**29 986**	23 426	6 560	*5 324*	*1 236*	NAP	NAP	**98 813**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**660 330**	**165 833**	**280 349**	91 943	112 073	NAP	*111 994*	*79*	76 333	**4 866**	**209 282**
Slovenia	**650 931**	**44 677**	**449 352**	175 982	273 370	*222 205*	*51 165*	NAP	NAP	**3 233**	**153 669**
Spain	**2 132 393**	**1 113 252**	**847 428**	847 428	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**171 713**	**NAP**
Sweden	**252 458**	**62 507**	**21 445**	21 445	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**161 929**	**6 577**
Average	**1 412 609**	**425 783**	**1 005 900**	599 080	787 570	870 831	213 950	2 217	16 381	**77 754**	**197 661**
Median	**711 236**	**136 326**	**368 336**	169 124	270 198	370 563	118 426	2 217	4 514	**27 055**	**93 783**
Minimum	**11 297**	**4 905**	**3 279**	1 031	6 560	5 324	1 236	79	2 140	**134**	**1 092**
Maximum	**10 873 270**	**1 583 707**	**9 305 584**	4 743 532	4 562 052	3 572 462	989 590	4 354	76 333	**726 730**	**960 583**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	15%	11%	15%	15%	**0%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**7%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.4a(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2018

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**514 939**	**31 779**	**350 056**	316 912	33 144	*15 495*	*17 649*	*NAP*	NAP	**79 024**	**54 080**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 089**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**91 964**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**9 528**	**NA**
Croatia	**257 110**	**134 271**	**114 418**	65 897	48 521	*46 432*	*2 089*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 421**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**52 762**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 700**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**424 385**	**143 152**	**153 161**	146 712	5 041	*NAP*	*5 041*	*NAP*	1 408	**11 797**	**116 275**
Denmark	**149 974**	**22 544**	**97 182**	82 907	11 674	*2 216*	*9 458*	*NAP*	2 601	**NAP**	**30 248**
Estonia	**24 225**	**6 069**	**17 349**	11 328	6 021	*3 660*	*2 361*	*NAP*	NAP	**807**	**NAP**
Finland	**124 250**	**6 304**	**94 661**	94 661	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**17 750**	**5 535**
France	**1 890 728**	**1 651 625**	**75 218**	75 218	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**163 885**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**738 819**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 766 513*	*NA*	NA	**866 972**	**443 995**
Greece	**NA**	**282 148**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**162 490**	**NA**
Hungary	**131 158**	**63 848**	**43 355**	17 886	25 208	*NAP*	*23 606*	*1 602*	261	**5 180**	**18 775**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**3 697 445**	**2 287 264**	**1 244 285**	1 244 285	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**165 896**	**NAP**
Latvia	**24 690**	**18 588**	**4 785**	4 785	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 317**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**30 934**	**23 582**	**1 144**	721	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	423	**4 599**	**1 609**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 649**	**1 319**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 319	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**10 138**	**9 727**	**23**	23	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**388**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**266 100**	**40 981**	**173 279**	173 279	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**51 846**	**NAP**
Poland	**2 434 405**	**912 508**	**1 371 419**	657 911	713 508	*589 725*	*123 783*	*NAP*	NAP	**22 374**	**128 104**
Portugal	**NA**	**203 383**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**68 773**	**NAP**
Romania	**591 192**	**548 530**	**10 887**	1 546	9 341	*4 629*	*4 712*	*NAP*	NAP	**31 775**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**201 626**	**71 385**	**87 298**	32 946	7 719	*NAP*	*7 719*	*0*	46 633	**5 352**	**37 591**
Slovenia	**109 512**	**34 647**	**49 175**	44 175	5 000	*4 614*	*386*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 599**	**22 091**
Spain	**1 613 295**	**1 103 465**	**354 118**	354 118	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**155 712**	**NAP**
Sweden	**105 417**	**28 468**	**8 737**	8 737	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**64 615**	**3 597**
Average	**606 964**	**363 684**	**212 593**	175 476	78 652	83 346	178 483	801	8 774	**80 329**	**78 355**
Median	**149 974**	**63 848**	**81 258**	65 897	9 341	4 622	7 719	801	1 364	**18 920**	**30 248**
Minimum	**10 138**	**1 649**	**23**	23	0	0	386	0	261	**388**	**1 609**
Maximum	**3 697 445**	**2 287 264**	**1 371 419**	1 244 285	713 508	589 725	1 766 513	1 602	46 633	**866 972**	**443 995**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	15%	15%	15%	15%	**4%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**7%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.4b(2018): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2018

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,8**	**0,4**	**4,0**	3,6	0,4	*0,2*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,9**	**0,6**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**1,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**6,3**	**3,3**	**2,8**	1,6	1,2	*1,1*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**6,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,7**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**4,0**	**1,3**	**1,4**	1,4	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,6**	**0,4**	**1,7**	1,4	0,2	*0,0*	*0,2*	*NAP*	0,0	**NAP**	**0,5**
Estonia	**1,8**	**0,5**	**1,3**	0,9	0,5	*0,3*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,3**	**0,1**	**1,7**	1,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,1**
France	**2,8**	**2,5**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,1*	*NA*	NA	**1,0**	**0,5**
Greece	**NA**	**2,6**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1,5**	**NA**
Hungary	**1,4**	**0,7**	**0,5**	0,2	0,3	*NAP*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,2**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**6,1**	**3,8**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,3**	**1,0**	**0,2**	0,2	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,1**	**0,8**	**0,0**	0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,1**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,3**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,1**	**2,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,5**	**0,2**	**1,0**	1,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Poland	**6,3**	**2,4**	**3,6**	1,7	1,9	*1,5*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,3**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,0**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,0**	**2,8**	**0,1**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3,7**	**1,3**	**1,6**	0,6	0,1	*NAP*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,9	**0,1**	**0,7**
Slovenia	**5,3**	**1,7**	**2,4**	2,1	0,2	*0,2*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**1,1**
Spain	**3,4**	**2,3**	**0,8**	0,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Sweden	**1,0**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**0,0**
Average	**3,3**	**1,5**	**1,3**	1,0	0,4	*0,4*	*0,3*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,4**	**0,5**
Median	**2,8**	**1,3**	**1,2**	0,9	0,2	*0,2*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,5**
Minimum	**1,0**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**6,3**	**3,8**	**4,0**	3,6	1,9	*1,5*	*2,1*	*0,0*	0,9	**1,5**	**1,1**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	15%	**4%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**7%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.5(2018): First instance civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pendingmore than 2 years in 2018

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q91)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	NA	NA	19 367	24,51%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	47 305	35,2%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	318	5,2%	30	3,72%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	27 136	16,56%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	NA	NA	84 621	51,01%
Latvia	2 603	14,0%	61	4,63%
Lithuania	1 502	6,4%	97	2,11%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	4 152	42,7%	247	63,66%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	47 476	23,3%	NA	NA
Romania	17 182	3,1%	1 437	4,52%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	10 543	30,4%	14	0,39%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	997	3,5%	126	0,20%
Average	**14 675**	**18,2%**	**13 314**	**17,1%**
Median	**4 152**	**14,0%**	**187**	**4,6%**
Minimum	**318**	**3,1%**	**14**	**0,2%**
Maximum	**47 476**	**42,7%**	**84 621**	**63,7%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**67%**	**67%**	**59%**	**59%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	**4%**

Romania: Due to the peculiarity of the national statistical system, cases older than 3 years instead of 2 years are communicated.

France: administrative matters: raw data are communicated including serial cases presenting the same legal issue for trial.

Table 3.1.1.1(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2017

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	*Registry cases*	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	Other registry cases	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	*2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3*	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	2.2.3	2.3	3	4
Austria	**530 969**	**31 532**	**390 281**	350 894	39 387	*18 711*	*20 676*	*NAP*	NAP	**57 010**	**52 146**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 615**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**77 396**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 743**	**NA**
Croatia	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Cyprus	**54 586**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**7 540**	**898**
Czech Republic	**465 609**	**163 222**	**164 996**	159 112	3 871	*NAP*	*3 871*	*NAP*	2 013	**10 377**	**127 014**
Denmark	**136 043**	**20 909**	**87 083**	77 671	7 012	*1 728*	*5 284*	*NAP*	2 400	**NAP**	**28 051**
Estonia	**29 923**	**6 193**	**22 802**	2 039	20 763	*3 674*	*17 089*	*NAP*	NAP	**928**	**NAP**
Finland	**136 237**	**7 358**	**100 644**	100 644	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**22 940**	**5 295**
France	**1 899 497**	**1 630 342**	**105 064**	105 064	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**164 091**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**719 662**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 691 876*	*NA*	NA	**701 598**	**462 519**
Greece	**NA**	**244 637**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**240 650**	**NA**
Hungary	**138 168**	**79 099**	**25 806**	25 130	704	*NAP*	*NA*	*704*	492	**5 827**	**27 436**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**3 982 989**	**2 478 381**	**1 292 897**	1 292 897	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**211 711**	**NAP**
Latvia	**29 430**	**25 078**	**2 947**	2 947	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 405**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**38 475**	**29 543**	**1 862**	867	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	995	**4 270**	**2 800**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 136**	**1 440**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 440	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**413**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**284 649**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**52 649**	**NAP**
Poland	**2 390 468**	**724 720**	**1 534 191**	1 030 834	503 357	*388 192*	*115 165*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 867**	**100 690**
Portugal	**NA**	**271 902**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**72 589**	**NAP**
Romania	**630 979**	**570 748**	**10 112**	1 756	8 356	*4 193*	*4 163*	*NAP*	NAP	**50 119**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**264 068**	**94 328**	**81 504**	28 850	8 442	*NAP*	*8 442*	*NAP*	44 212	**5 509**	**82 727**
Slovenia	**148 701**	**42 220**	**82 719**	77 127	5 592	*5 179*	*413*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 000**	**21 762**
Spain	**1 281 288**	**795 775**	**328 098**	328 098	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**157 415**	**NAP**
Sweden	**81 014**	**26 667**	**8 385**	8 385	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**42 627**	**3 335**
Average	**663 184**	**398 173**	**249 461**	224 520	66 387	70 280	207 442	704	**8 592**	**81 648**	**76 223**
Median	**148 701**	**86 714**	**82 719**	77 399	8 356	4 686	8 442	704	**1 727**	**27 615**	**27 744**
Minimum	**29 430**	**1 136**	**1 440**	867	704	1 728	413	704	**492**	**413**	**898**
Maximum	**3 982 989**	**2 478 381**	**1 534 191**	1 292 897	503 357	388 192	1 691 876	704	**44 212**	**701 598**	**462 519**
Nb of values	**26**	**26**	**26**	26	26	26	26	26	**26**	**26**	**26**
% of NA	**27%**	**23%**	**31%**	31%	15%	15%	15%	15%	**12%**	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	8%	50%	62%	50%	81%	**65%**	**8%**	**38%**

Greece: In 2017 new management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.2a(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2017

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 229 560**	**84 716**	**2 569 287**	1 644 273	925 014	*633 837*	*291 177*	*NAP*	NAP	**74 227**	**501 330**
Belgium	**498 495**	**214 533**	**253 629**	NAP	253 629	*NAP*	*253 629*	*NAP*	NAP	**19 835**	**10 498**
Bulgaria	**397 399**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**31 333**	**NA**
Croatia	**940 095**	**129 130**	**799 149**	165 077	634 072	*497 577*	*136 495*	*NAP*	NAP	**11 816**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**15 160**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 840**	**1 031**
Czech Republic	**1 007 787**	**361 160**	**613 082**	478 629	132 610	*NAP*	*132 610*	*NAP*	1 843	**11 031**	**22 514**
Denmark	**2 286 018**	**41 329**	**2 104 528**	368 012	1 732 276	*1 713 233*	*19 043*	*NAP*	4 240	**NAP**	**140 161**
Estonia	**267 703**	**16 159**	**248 558**	14 020	234 538	*121 455*	*113 083*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 986**	**NAP**
Finland	**496 472**	**8 259**	**450 958**	450 958	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 817**	**9 438**
France	**2 135 602**	**1 658 004**	**280 355**	280 355	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**197 243**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 244 697**	**NA**	2 525 579	NA	*5 476 346*	*122 799*	*NA*	NA	**866 662**	**970 975**
Greece	**NA**	**200 426**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**60 100**	**NA**
Hungary	**847 148**	**178 330**	**623 259**	201 591	418 418	*NAP*	*414 067*	*4 351*	3 250	**16 908**	**28 651**
Ireland	**225 215**	**128 820**	**95 363**	95 363	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**1 032**
Italy	**3 454 018**	**1 492 837**	**1 912 626**	1 912 626	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**48 555**	**NAP**
Latvia	**319 637**	**28 652**	**288 911**	43 123	245 788	*245 788*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 074**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**267 278**	**113 871**	**110 043**	80 626	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	29 417	**11 699**	**31 665**
Luxembourg	**10 776**	**4 604**	**4 959**	987	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	3 972	**1 213**	**NAP**
Malta	**10 911**	**7 656**	**3 174**	3 174	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**81**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 243 209**	**147 954**	**995 731**	995 731	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99 524**	**NAP**
Poland	**11 628 150**	**1 352 948**	**9 952 141**	5 066 262	4 885 879	*3 678 725*	*1 207 154*	*NAP*	NAP	**72 426**	**250 635**
Portugal	**NA**	**300 833**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**25 091**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 455 782**	**1 279 631**	**30 051**	23 094	6 957	*5 393*	*1 564*	*NAP*	NAP	**146 100**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**855 880**	**192 663**	**278 475**	67 178	132 197	*NAP*	*132 197*	*NAP*	79 100	**5 036**	**379 706**
Slovenia	**664 648**	**44 772**	**457 958**	169 702	288 256	*234 035*	*54 221*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 976**	**157 942**
Spain	**2 144 395**	**1 186 759**	**792 497**	792 497	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**165 139**	**NAP**
Sweden	**253 319**	**61 931**	**21 729**	21 729	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**163 550**	**6 109**
Average	**1 443 944**	**419 227**	**1 040 294**	700 027	824 136	1 400 710	239 837	4 351	20 304	**82 650**	**179 406**
Median	**755 898**	**147 954**	**369 935**	185 647	270 943	497 577	132 404	4 351	4 106	**25 091**	**30 158**
Minimum	**10 776**	**4 604**	**3 174**	987	6 957	5 393	1 564	4 351	1 843	**81**	**1 031**
Maximum	**11 628 150**	**1 658 004**	**9 952 141**	5 066 262	4 885 879	5 476 346	1 207 154	4 351	79 100	**866 662**	**970 975**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	15%	15%	11%	11%	15%	11%	**0%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	81%	67%	**7%**	**41%**

Greece: In 2017 new management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.2b(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2017

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**36,7**	**1,0**	**29,2**	18,7	10,5	*7,2*	*3,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,8**	**5,7**
Belgium	**4,4**	**1,9**	**2,2**	NAP	2,2	*NAP*	*2,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,1**
Bulgaria	**5,6**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NA**
Croatia	**22,9**	**3,1**	**19,5**	4,0	15,4	*12,1*	*3,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**1,8**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,2**	**0,1**
Czech Republic	**9,5**	**3,4**	**5,8**	4,5	1,3	*NAP*	*1,3*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,2**
Denmark	**39,5**	**0,7**	**36,4**	6,4	30,0	*29,6*	*0,3*	*NAP*	0,1	**NAP**	**2,4**
Estonia	**20,3**	**1,2**	**18,9**	1,1	17,8	*9,2*	*8,6*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**9,0**	**0,1**	**8,2**	8,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**0,2**
France	**3,2**	**2,5**	**0,4**	0,4	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,5**	**NA**	3,1	NA	*6,6*	*0,1*	*NA*	NA	**1,0**	**1,2**
Greece	**NA**	**1,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,6**	**NA**
Hungary	**8,6**	**1,8**	**6,3**	2,0	4,2	*NAP*	*4,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,3**
Ireland	**4,7**	**2,7**	**2,0**	2,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,0**
Italy	**5,7**	**2,5**	**3,2**	3,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**16,4**	**1,5**	**14,8**	2,2	12,6	*12,6*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**9,5**	**4,1**	**3,9**	2,9	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	1,0	**0,4**	**1,1**
Luxembourg	**1,8**	**0,8**	**0,8**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,7	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,3**	**1,6**	**0,7**	0,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**7,2**	**0,9**	**5,8**	5,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Poland	**30,3**	**3,5**	**25,9**	13,2	12,7	*9,6*	*3,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,7**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,9**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Romania	**7,5**	**6,6**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**15,7**	**3,5**	**5,1**	1,2	2,4	*NAP*	*2,4*	*NAP*	1,5	**0,1**	**7,0**
Slovenia	**32,2**	**2,2**	**22,2**	8,2	13,9	*11,3*	*2,6*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**7,6**
Spain	**4,6**	**2,5**	**1,7**	1,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,5**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,6**	**0,1**
Average	**12,6**	**2,2**	**9,7**	4,1	10,3	*10,9*	*2,6*	*0,0*	0,5	**0,4**	**1,9**
Median	**8,0**	**1,9**	**5,5**	2,5	11,6	*9,6*	*2,5*	*0,0*	0,4	**0,2**	**0,5**
Minimum	**1,8**	**0,1**	**0,2**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**39,5**	**6,6**	**36,4**	18,7	30,0	*29,6*	*8,6*	*0,0*	1,5	**1,6**	**7,6**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	15%	15%	*11%*	*11%*	*15%*	11%	**0%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*81%*	67%	**7%**	**41%**

Greece: In 2017 new management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.3(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2017

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 248 636**	**83 811**	**2 604 602**	1 682 179	922 423	*635 904*	*286 519*	*NAP*	NAP	**59 035**	**501 188**
Belgium	**NA**	**240 963**	**253 629**	NAP	253 629	*NAP*	*253 629*	*NAP*	NAP	**19 986**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**386 923**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**29 666**	**NA**
Croatia	**956 115**	**140 364**	**800 808**	170 317	630 491	*494 181*	*136 310*	*NAP*	NAP	**14 943**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**17 168**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 355**	**1 065**
Czech Republic	**1 018 171**	**366 389**	**610 340**	479 403	129 022	*NAP*	*129 022*	*NAP*	1 915	**10 113**	**31 329**
Denmark	**2 280 231**	**42 325**	**2 098 695**	365 470	1 728 773	*1 711 887*	*16 886*	*NAP*	4 452	**NAP**	**139 211**
Estonia	**278 506**	**16 043**	**259 496**	14 025	245 471	*120 113*	*125 358*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 967**	**NAP**
Finland	**478 438**	**9 152**	**429 811**	429 811	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**29 878**	**9 597**
France	**2 213 947**	**1 700 230**	**312 257**	312 257	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**201 460**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 260 439**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*87 136*	*NA*	NA	**727 832**	**994 402**
Greece	**NA**	**192 482**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**99 772**	**NA**
Hungary	**840 592**	**171 999**	**620 029**	206 332	410 463	*NAP*	*406 858*	*3 605*	3 235	**17 268**	**31 296**
Ireland	**183 793**	**93 729**	**89 032**	89 032	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**1 032**
Italy	**3 554 193**	**1 588 435**	**1 889 902**	1 889 902	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**75 856**	**NAP**
Latvia	**323 093**	**34 197**	**286 829**	41 571	245 258	*245 258*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 067**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**272 652**	**116 247**	**110 185**	80 192	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	29 993	**13 221**	**32 999**
Luxembourg	**10 637**	**4 434**	**5 059**	987	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	4 072	**1 144**	**NAP**
Malta	**10 458**	**7 427**	**2 912**	2 912	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**119**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 237 649**	**146 581**	**986 489**	986 489	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**104 579**	**NAP**
Poland	**11 693 624**	**1 269 714**	**10 081 986**	5 317 072	4 764 914	*3 596 416*	*1 168 498*	*NAP*	NAP	**77 567**	**264 357**
Portugal	**NA**	**340 071**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 343**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 447 679**	**1 268 915**	**29 393**	23 496	5 897	*5 264*	*633*	*NAP*	NAP	**149 371**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**929 579**	**248 958**	**274 229**	65 911	131 932	*NAP*	*131 932*	*NAP*	76 386	**5 950**	**400 442**
Slovenia	**690 542**	**48 354**	**479 405**	190 165	289 240	*235 094*	*54 146*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 682**	**160 101**
Spain	**2 011 650**	**1 042 698**	**796 432**	796 432	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**172 520**	**NAP**
Sweden	**236 486**	**61 758**	**21 405**	21 405	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**146 888**	**6 435**
Average	**1 492 207**	**419 829**	**1 047 406**	626 922	813 126	880 515	233 077	3 605	20 009	**79 703**	**197 958**
Median	**840 592**	**146 581**	**371 034**	190 165	271 435	369 720	130 477	3 605	4 262	**26 343**	**32 999**
Minimum	**10 458**	**4 434**	**2 912**	987	5 897	5 264	633	3 605	1 915	**119**	**1 032**
Maximum	**11 693 624**	**1 700 230**	**10 081 986**	5 317 072	4 764 914	3 596 416	1 168 498	3 605	76 386	**727 832**	**994 402**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	15%	11%	15%	11%	**0%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	81%	67%	**7%**	**41%**

Greece: In 2017 new management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.4a(2017): First instance other than criminal cases- pending on 31 Dec. 2017

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**523 071**	**32 437**	**366 144**	324 166	41 978	*16 644*	*25 334*	*NAP*	NAP	**72 202**	**52 288**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 213**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**87 872**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 410**	**NA**
Croatia	**297 507**	**148 828**	**138 113**	91 062	47 051	*44 709*	*2 342*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 566**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**52 578**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**8 025**	**864**
Czech Republic	**455 225**	**157 993**	**167 738**	158 338	7 459	*NAP*	*7 459*	*NAP*	1 941	**11 295**	**118 199**
Denmark	**140 504**	**19 913**	**91 552**	80 213	9 151	*3 074*	*6 077*	*NAP*	2 188	**NAP**	**29 039**
Estonia	**18 556**	**6 175**	**11 501**	1 943	9 558	*4 743*	*4 815*	*NAP*	NAP	**880**	**NAP**
Finland	**154 271**	**6 465**	**121 791**	121 791	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 879**	**5 136**
France	**1 821 152**	**1 588 116**	**73 162**	73 162	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**159 874**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**703 920**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 727 539*	*NA*	NA	**840 158**	**440 747**
Greece	**NA**	**252 654**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**200 978**	**NA**
Hungary	**144 724**	**85 430**	**29 036**	20 389	8 659	*NAP*	*NA*	*1 450*	507	**5 467**	**24 791**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**3 882 814**	**2 382 783**	**1 315 621**	1 315 621	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**184 410**	**NAP**
Latvia	**25 444**	**19 533**	**4 499**	4 499	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 412**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**33 101**	**27 167**	**1 720**	1 301	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	419	**2 748**	**1 466**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 306**	**1 341**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 341	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**9 492**	**8 856**	**262**	262	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**374**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**279 950**	**49 944**	**182 716**	182 716	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**47 290**	**NAP**
Poland	**2 324 994**	**807 954**	**1 404 346**	780 024	624 322	*470 501*	*153 821*	*NAP*	NAP	**25 726**	**86 968**
Portugal	**NA**	**232 664**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**71 337**	**NAP**
Romania	**639 082**	**581 464**	**10 770**	1 354	9 416	*4 322*	*5 094*	*NAP*	NAP	**46 848**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**273 420**	**116 418**	**89 567**	31 780	9 391	*NAP*	*9 391*	*NAP*	48 396	**5 166**	**62 269**
Slovenia	**122 613**	**38 638**	**61 078**	56 472	4 606	*4 118*	*488*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 294**	**19 603**
Spain	**1 421 091**	**941 138**	**327 930**	327 930	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**152 023**	**NAP**
Sweden	**97 847**	**26 840**	**8 709**	8 709	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**59 289**	**3 009**
Average	**609 777**	**358 115**	**220 380**	188 512	77 159	78 302	194 236	1 450	9 132	**81 953**	**70 365**
Median	**154 271**	**85 430**	**81 365**	73 162	9 404	4 743	6 768	1 450	1 641	**23 303**	**26 915**
Minimum	**9 492**	**1 306**	**262**	262	4 606	3 074	488	1 450	419	**374**	**864**
Maximum	**3 882 814**	**2 382 783**	**1 404 346**	1 315 621	624 322	470 501	1 727 539	1 450	48 396	**840 158**	**440 747**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**22%**	22%	15%	15%	15%	15%	11%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	48%	59%	48%	81%	67%	**7%**	**41%**

Greece: In 2017 new management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.4b(2017): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2017

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,9**	**0,4**	**4,2**	3,7	0,5	*0,2*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,8**	**0,6**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**1,2**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**7,2**	**3,6**	**3,4**	2,2	1,1	*1,1*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**6,2**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**0,1**
Czech Republic	**4,3**	**1,5**	**1,6**	1,5	0,1	*NAP*	*0,1*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,4**	**0,3**	**1,6**	1,4	0,2	*0,1*	*0,1*	*NAP*	0,0	**NAP**	**0,5**
Estonia	**1,4**	**0,5**	**0,9**	0,1	0,7	*0,4*	*0,4*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,8**	**0,1**	**2,2**	2,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,1**
France	**2,7**	**2,4**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,1*	*NA*	NA	**1,0**	**0,5**
Greece	**NA**	**2,3**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1,9**	**NA**
Hungary	**1,5**	**0,9**	**0,3**	0,2	0,1	*NAP*	*NA*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**6,4**	**3,9**	**2,2**	2,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,3**	**1,0**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,2**	**1,0**	**0,1**	0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,1**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,2**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,0**	**1,9**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,6**	**0,3**	**1,1**	1,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Poland	**6,0**	**2,1**	**3,7**	2,0	1,6	*1,2*	*0,4*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,2**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,3**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,3**	**3,0**	**0,1**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**5,0**	**2,1**	**1,6**	0,6	0,2	*NAP*	*0,2*	*NAP*	0,9	**0,1**	**1,1**
Slovenia	**5,9**	**1,9**	**3,0**	2,7	0,2	*0,2*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**0,9**
Spain	**3,0**	**2,0**	**0,7**	0,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Sweden	**1,0**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**0,0**
Average	**3,5**	**1,5**	**1,4**	1,1	0,5	*0,4*	*0,4*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,4**	**0,5**
Median	**2,8**	**1,5**	**1,0**	0,7	0,2	*0,2*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,4**
Minimum	**1,0**	**0,1**	**0,1**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**7,2**	**3,9**	**4,2**	3,7	1,6	*1,2*	*2,1*	*0,0*	0,9	**1,9**	**1,1**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**22%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	11%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	48%	*59%*	*48%*	*81%*	67%	**7%**	**41%**

Greece: In 2017 new management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.5(2017): First instance civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2017

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q91)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	4 358	13,4%	17 082	23,66%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	49 253	33,1%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	263	4,3%	28	3,18%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	1 535	5,7%	71	2,58%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	268	71,66%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	63 789	27,4%	NA	NA
Romania	25 174	4,3%	1 399	2,99%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	10 542	27,3%	8	0,24%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	865	3,2%	41	0,07%
Average	**19 472**	**14,8%**	**2 700**	**14,9%**
Median	**7 450**	**9,5%**	**71**	**3,0%**
Minimum	**263**	**3,2%**	**8**	**0,1%**
Maximum	**63 789**	**33,1%**	**17 082**	**71,7%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**70%**	**70%**	**70%**	**70%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	**4%**

Romania: Due to the peculiarity of the national statistical system, cases older than 3 years instead of 2 years are communicated.

Table 3.1.1.1(2016): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2016

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**524 240**	**33 222**	**388 908**	356 361	32 556	*28 491*	*4 056*	NAP	NAP	**48 297**	**53 813**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**32 080**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**73 159**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**8 759**	**NA**
Croatia	**331 743**	**184 289**	**132 430**	97 339	35 091	*32 551*	*2 540*	*NAP*	NAP	**15 024**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**52 412**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**7 737**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**517 801**	**186 136**	**205 370**	191 171	12 622	*NAP*	*12 622*	*NAP*	1 577	**8 296**	**117 999**
Denmark	**122 137**	**20 790**	**73 598**	66 980	6 618	*971*	*5 647*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**27 749**
Estonia	**28 828**	**5 845**	**21 836**	7 727	14 109	*3 682*	*10 427*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 147**	**NAP**
Finland	**128 042**	**9 530**	**97 217**	97 217	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**15 553**	**5 742**
France	**1 863 243**	**1 611 461**	**88 926**	88 926	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**162 856**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**754 864**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 657 420*	*NA*	NA	**644 890**	**1 468 300**
Greece	**NA**	**241 441**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**263 476**	**NA**
Hungary	**148 425**	**76 124**	**31 335**	30 442	893	*NAP*	*NA*	*893*	391	**5 776**	**35 190**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**4 215 937**	**2 687 388**	**1 287 283**	1 287 283	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**241 266**	**NAP**
Latvia	**32 312**	**28 001**	**3 018**	3 018	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 293**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**44 147**	**27 595**	**870**	410	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	460	**10 893**	**4 789**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 137**	**1 646**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 646	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**9 459**	**9 041**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**418**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**299 580**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**47 570**	**NAP**
Poland	**1 579 497**	**713 029**	**725 695**	371 152	354 543	*298 505*	*56 038*	*NAP*	NA	**33 167**	**107 606**
Portugal	**NA**	**312 255**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**75 515**	**NAP**
Romania	**649 920**	**597 721**	**11 750**	3 049	8 701	*4 788*	*3 913*	*NAP*	NAP	**40 449**	**NAP**
Slovakia	**320 952**	**158 706**	**71 485**	24 605	6 946	*NAP*	*6 946*	*NAP*	39 934	**6 575**	**84 186**
Slovenia	**192 231**	**45 550**	**118 604**	113 760	4 844	*4 442*	*402*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 619**	**26 458**
Spain	**1 382 963**	**840 840**	**365 705**	365 705	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**176 418**	**NAP**
Sweden	**71 388**	**26 196**	**8 399**	8 399	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**33 796**	**2 997**
Average	**599 448**	**389 598**	**201 893**	183 150	47 692	53 347	176 001	893	8 802	**78 453**	**175 894**
Median	**192 231**	**117 415**	**81 262**	88 926	10 662	4 788	6 297	893	1 577	**23 817**	**35 190**
Minimum	**9 459**	**1 137**	**870**	410	893	971	402	893	391	**418**	**2 997**
Maximum	**4 215 937**	**2 687 388**	**1 287 283**	1 287 283	354 543	298 505	1 657 420	893	39 934	**644 890**	**1 468 300**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**19%**	**30%**	26%	19%	15%	19%	15%	19%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	11%	44%	59%	44%	81%	63%	**7%**	**44%**

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.2a(2016): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2016

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 284 414**	**84 708**	**2 641 124**	1 670 674	970 450	*683 624*	*286 826*	*NAP*	NAP	**56 583**	**501 999**
Belgium	**990 337**	**727 238**	**263 653**	NAP	243 653	*NAP*	*243 653*	*NAP*	NAP	**19 446**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**340 272**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**25 072**	**NA**
Croatia	**963 825**	**135 583**	**813 903**	183 550	630 353	*490 091*	*140 262*	*NAP*	NAP	**14 339**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**20 394**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 543**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**1 039 521**	**332 407**	**660 677**	490 606	167 963	*NAP*	*167 963*	*NAP*	2 108	**11 416**	**35 021**
Denmark	**2 232 881**	**41 620**	**2 060 019**	352 091	1 707 928	*1 689 939*	*17 989*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**131 242**
Estonia	**325 147**	**16 408**	**305 783**	43 717	262 066	*107 351*	*154 715*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 956**	**NAP**
Finland	**451 430**	**8 587**	**393 960**	393 960	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**38 831**	**10 052**
France	**2 253 976**	**1 698 704**	**361 740**	361 740	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**193 532**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 308 135**	**NA**	2 639 044	NA	*5 551 746*	*122 206*	*NA*	NA	**739 325**	**1 348 599**
Greece	**NA**	**146 569**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**53 934**	**NA**
Hungary	**870 257**	**184 824**	**637 091**	191 575	441 767	*NAP*	*437 387*	*4 380*	3 749	**19 590**	**28 752**
Ireland	**233 058**	**127 395**	**104 848**	104 848	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**815**
Italy	**3 657 690**	**1 554 837**	**2 048 288**	2 048 288	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**54 565**	**NAP**
Latvia	**318 677**	**39 260**	**277 057**	29 479	247 578	*247 578*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 360**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**333 886**	**124 885**	**108 033**	81 613	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	26 420	**14 917**	**86 051**
Luxembourg	**10 911**	**4 533**	**5 195**	1 111	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	4 084	**1 183**	**NAP**
Malta	**6 730**	**6 640**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**90**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 245 537**	**161 171**	**971 332**	971 332	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**113 034**	**NAP**
Poland	**10 778 246**	**1 196 509**	**9 256 718**	4 815 988	4 440 730	*3 578 837*	*861 893*	*NAP*	NA	**76 692**	**248 327**
Portugal	**NA**	**308 880**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 049**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 477 959**	**1 335 498**	**25 099**	18 421	6 678	*5 904*	*774*	*NAP*	NAP	**117 362**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**922 805**	**201 368**	**256 154**	61 557	114 075	*NAP*	*114 075*	*NAP*	80 522	**8 861**	**456 422**
Slovenia	**710 366**	**51 659**	**483 065**	184 457	298 608	*240 849*	*57 759*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 972**	**172 670**
Spain	**1 972 326**	**999 383**	**808 117**	808 117	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**164 826**	**NAP**
Sweden	**231 823**	**59 591**	**21 366**	21 366	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**143 970**	**6 896**
Average	**1 444 686**	**434 256**	**1 071 582**	736 835	794 321	1 399 547	217 125	4 380	23 377	**76 138**	**252 237**
Median	**896 531**	**146 569**	**393 960**	191 575	280 337	490 091	147 489	4 380	4 084	**25 072**	**108 647**
Minimum	**6 730**	**4 533**	**5 195**	1 111	6 678	5 904	774	4 380	2 108	**90**	**815**
Maximum	**10 778 246**	**1 698 704**	**9 256 718**	4 815 988	4 440 730	5 551 746	861 893	4 380	80 522	**739 325**	**1 348 599**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	15%	15%	11%	11%	15%	19%	**0%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	41%	56%	44%	81%	63%	**7%**	**44%**

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.2b(2016): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2016

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**37,6**	**1,0**	**30,2**	19,1	11,1	*7,8*	*3,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**5,7**
Belgium	**8,7**	**6,4**	**2,3**	NAP	2,2	*NAP*	*2,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**4,8**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,4**	**NA**
Croatia	**23,2**	**3,3**	**19,6**	4,4	15,2	*11,8*	*3,4*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**2,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,2**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**9,8**	**3,1**	**6,2**	4,6	1,6	*NAP*	*1,6*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Denmark	**38,8**	**0,7**	**35,8**	6,1	29,7	*29,4*	*0,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**2,3**
Estonia	**24,7**	**1,2**	**23,2**	3,3	19,9	*8,2*	*11,8*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Finland	**8,2**	**0,2**	**7,2**	7,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**0,2**
France	**3,4**	**2,5**	**0,5**	0,5	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,6**	**NA**	3,2	NA	*6,8*	*0,1*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**1,6**
Greece	**NA**	**1,4**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,5**	**NA**
Hungary	**8,9**	**1,9**	**6,5**	2,0	4,5	*NAP*	*4,5*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,3**
Ireland	**5,0**	**2,7**	**2,2**	2,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,0**
Italy	**6,0**	**2,6**	**3,4**	3,4	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**16,2**	**2,0**	**14,1**	1,5	12,6	*12,6*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**11,7**	**4,4**	**3,8**	2,9	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,9	**0,5**	**3,0**
Luxembourg	**1,8**	**0,8**	**0,9**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,7	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**1,5**	**1,4**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**7,3**	**0,9**	**5,7**	5,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**NAP**
Poland	**28,0**	**3,1**	**24,1**	12,5	11,6	*9,3*	*2,2*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	**0,6**
Portugal	**NA**	**3,0**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Romania	**7,5**	**6,8**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**17,0**	**3,7**	**4,7**	1,1	2,1	*NAP*	*2,1*	*NAP*	1,5	**0,2**	**8,4**
Slovenia	**34,4**	**2,5**	**23,4**	8,9	14,5	*11,7*	*2,8*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**8,4**
Spain	**4,2**	**2,1**	**1,7**	1,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2,3**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,4**	**0,1**
Average	**13,1**	**2,4**	**10,3**	4,3	10,4	*10,8*	*2,9*	*0,0*	0,6	**0,4**	**2,6**
Median	**8,5**	**2,1**	**5,7**	3,2	11,3	*9,3*	*2,2*	*0,0*	0,7	**0,3**	**1,1**
Minimum	**1,5**	**0,2**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**38,8**	**6,8**	**35,8**	19,1	29,7	*29,4*	*11,8*	*0,0*	1,5	**1,4**	**8,4**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	15%	15%	*11%*	*11%*	*15%*	19%	**0%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*81%*	63%	**7%**	**44%**

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.3(2016): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2016

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 298 090**	**86 398**	**2 656 631**	1 676 141	980 490	*693 404*	*287 086*	*NAP*	NAP	**51 395**	**503 666**
Belgium	**1 012 332**	**745 166**	**263 653**	NAP	243 653	*NAP*	*243 653*	*NAP*	NAP	**23 513**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**336 056**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**26 117**	**NA**
Croatia	**980 816**	**160 153**	**804 991**	185 317	619 674	*479 167*	*140 507*	*NAP*	NAP	**15 672**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**21 661**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 740**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**1 093 080**	**365 678**	**692 231**	517 490	173 069	*NAP*	*173 069*	*NAP*	1 672	**9 157**	**26 014**
Denmark	**2 225 000**	**42 116**	**2 052 009**	344 729	1 707 280	*1 689 196*	*18 084*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**130 875**
Estonia	**317 757**	**16 007**	**298 627**	44 042	254 585	*106 635*	*147 950*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 123**	**NAP**
Finland	**442 641**	**10 718**	**390 607**	390 607	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 815**	**10 501**
France	**2 219 465**	**1 682 166**	**345 602**	345 602	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**191 697**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 343 337**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*87 843*	*NA*	NA	**682 617**	**1 355 615**
Greece	**NA**	**145 221**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**79 872**	**NA**
Hungary	**888 592**	**181 849**	**650 977**	196 915	450 414	*NAP*	*445 845*	*4 569*	3 648	**19 539**	**36 227**
Ireland	**177 247**	**75 463**	**100 969**	100 969	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**815**
Italy	**3 822 644**	**1 760 695**	**1 978 213**	1 978 213	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**83 736**	**NAP**
Latvia	**321 955**	**42 183**	**277 524**	29 550	247 974	*247 974*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 248**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**339 558**	**122 937**	**107 041**	81 156	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	25 885	**21 540**	**88 040**
Luxembourg	**11 091**	**4 534**	**5 401**	1 111	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	4 290	**1 156**	**NAP**
Malta	**7 231**	**7 128**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**103**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 247 910**	**162 270**	**977 958**	977 958	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**107 682**	**NAP**
Poland	**10 015 117**	**1 182 200**	**8 491 429**	4 156 304	4 335 125	*3 489 148*	*845 977*	*NAP*	NA	**78 992**	**262 496**
Portugal	**NA**	**346 863**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**29 048**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 496 900**	**1 362 471**	**26 737**	19 714	7 023	*6 499*	*524*	*NAP*	NAP	**107 692**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**979 689**	**265 746**	**246 135**	57 312	112 579	*NAP*	*112 579*	*NAP*	76 244	**9 927**	**457 881**
Slovenia	**753 615**	**54 982**	**518 674**	220 914	297 760	*240 018*	*57 742*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 589**	**177 370**
Spain	**2 062 884**	**1 030 805**	**848 098**	848 098	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**183 981**	**NAP**
Sweden	**222 225**	**59 146**	**21 361**	21 361	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**135 150**	**6 568**
Average	**1 428 898**	**450 249**	**1 035 946**	609 675	785 802	869 005	213 405	4 569	22 348	**75 964**	**254 672**
Median	**934 141**	**160 153**	**390 607**	208 915	276 173	363 571	144 229	4 569	4 290	**26 117**	**109 458**
Minimum	**7 231**	**4 534**	**5 401**	1 111	7 023	6 499	524	4 569	1 672	**103**	**815**
Maximum	**10 015 117**	**1 760 695**	**8 491 429**	4 156 304	4 335 125	3 489 148	845 977	4 569	76 244	**682 617**	**1 355 615**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	15%	11%	15%	19%	**0%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	41%	56%	44%	81%	63%	**7%**	**44%**

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.4a(2016): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2016

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**510 564**	**31 532**	**373 401**	350 894	22 507	*18 711*	*3 796*	*NAP*	NAP	**53 485**	**52 146**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 615**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**77 375**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**7 714**	**NA**
Croatia	**313 515**	**159 713**	**140 109**	95 943	44 166	*42 009*	*2 157*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 693**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**51 145**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**7 540**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**464 242**	**152 865**	**173 816**	164 287	7 516	*NAP*	*7 516*	*NAP*	2 013	**10 555**	**127 006**
Denmark	**129 683**	**20 294**	**81 302**	74 342	6 960	*1 714*	*5 246*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**28 087**
Estonia	**35 078**	**6 110**	**28 047**	7 326	20 721	*3 674*	*17 047*	*NAP*	NAP	**921**	**NAP**
Finland	**136 831**	**7 399**	**100 570**	100 570	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**23 569**	**5 293**
France	**1 897 754**	**1 627 999**	**105 064**	105 064	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**164 691**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**719 662**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*1 691 795*	*NA*	NA	**701 598**	**1 463 852**
Greece	**NA**	**242 789**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**237 593**	**NA**
Hungary	**138 177**	**79 099**	**25 806**	25 102	704	*NAP*	*NA*	*704*	492	**5 827**	**27 445**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**4 050 983**	**2 481 530**	**1 357 358**	1 357 358	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**212 095**	**NAP**
Latvia	**29 430**	**25 078**	**2 947**	2 947	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 405**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**38 475**	**29 543**	**1 862**	867	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	995	**4 270**	**2 800**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 136**	**1 440**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1 440	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**8 843**	**8 430**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**413**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**284 649**	**53 826**	**178 174**	178 174	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**52 649**	**NAP**
Poland	**2 342 626**	**727 338**	**1 490 984**	1 030 836	460 148	*388 194*	*71 954*	*NAP*	NA	**30 867**	**93 437**
Portugal	**NA**	**274 272**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**72 516**	**NAP**
Romania	**630 979**	**570 748**	**10 112**	1 756	8 356	*4 193*	*4 163*	*NAP*	NAP	**50 119**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**264 068**	**94 328**	**81 504**	28 850	8 442	*NAP*	*8 442*	*NAP*	44 212	**5 509**	**82 727**
Slovenia	**148 653**	**42 227**	**82 668**	77 068	5 600	*5 181*	*419*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 000**	**21 758**
Spain	**1 284 483**	**795 722**	**331 285**	331 285	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**157 476**	**NAP**
Sweden	**80 986**	**26 641**	**8 404**	8 404	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**42 616**	**3 325**
Average	**615 169**	**355 577**	**240 782**	218 949	58 512	66 239	181 254	704	9 830	**78 614**	**173 443**
Median	**148 653**	**79 099**	**82 668**	86 506	8 399	5 181	6 381	704	1 440	**25 592**	**28 087**
Minimum	**8 843**	**1 136**	**1 440**	867	704	1 714	419	704	492	**413**	**2 800**
Maximum	**4 050 983**	**2 481 530**	**1 490 984**	1 357 358	460 148	388 194	1 691 795	704	44 212	**701 598**	**1 463 852**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	15%	19%	15%	19%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	11%	44%	59%	44%	81%	63%	**7%**	**44%**

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.4b(2016): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 31 Dec. 2016

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,8**	**0,4**	**4,3**	4,0	0,3	*0,2*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**0,6**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**1,1**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**7,5**	**3,8**	**3,4**	2,3	1,1	*1,0*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**6,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**4,4**	**1,4**	**1,6**	1,6	0,1	*NAP*	*0,1*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,2**
Denmark	**2,3**	**0,4**	**1,4**	1,3	0,1	*0,0*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,5**
Estonia	**2,7**	**0,5**	**2,1**	0,6	1,6	*0,3*	*1,3*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,5**	**0,1**	**1,8**	1,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,1**
France	**2,8**	**2,4**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,1*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**1,8**
Greece	**NA**	**2,3**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**2,2**	**NA**
Hungary	**1,4**	**0,8**	**0,3**	0,3	0,0	*NAP*	*NA*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**6,7**	**4,1**	**2,2**	2,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,5**	**1,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,4**	**1,0**	**0,1**	0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,1**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,2**	**0,2**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,2	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**1,9**	**1,8**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,7**	**0,3**	**1,0**	1,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Poland	**6,1**	**1,9**	**3,9**	2,7	1,2	*1,0*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**0,2**
Portugal	**NA**	**2,7**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,2**	**2,9**	**0,1**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**4,9**	**1,7**	**1,5**	0,5	0,2	*NAP*	*0,2*	*NAP*	0,8	**0,1**	**1,5**
Slovenia	**7,2**	**2,0**	**4,0**	3,7	0,3	*0,3*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**1,1**
Spain	**2,8**	**1,7**	**0,7**	0,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,8**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,0**
Average	**3,6**	**1,5**	**1,5**	1,3	0,5	*0,4*	*0,4*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,4**	**0,7**
Median	**2,8**	**1,4**	**1,4**	0,9	0,2	*0,3*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,3**	**0,5**
Minimum	**0,8**	**0,1**	**0,1**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**7,5**	**4,1**	**4,3**	4,0	1,6	*1,0*	*2,1*	*0,0*	0,8	**2,2**	**1,8**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	19%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	11%	44%	*59%*	*44%*	*81%*	63%	**7%**	**44%**

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.1.1.5(2016): First instance civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending more than 2 years in 2016

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q91)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	4 411	14,0%	12 917	24,2%
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	52 400	32,8%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	241	3,9%	14	01,5%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	1 882	6,4%	270	06,3%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	294	71,2%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	81 019	29,5%	NA	NA
Romania	24 571	4,3%	1 731	03,5%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	9 660	22,9%	7	00,4%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	763	2,9%	329	00,8%
Average	**21 868**	**14,6%**	**2 223**	**15,4%**
Median	**7 036**	**10,2%**	**294**	**3,5%**
Minimum	**241**	**2,9%**	**7**	**0,4%**
Maximum	**81 019**	**32,8%**	**12 917**	**71,2%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**70%**	**70%**	**67%**	**67%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**7%**	**7%**

Romania: Due to the peculiarity of the national statistical system, cases older than 3 years instead of 2 years are communicated.

Table 3.1.1.1(2015): First instance other than criminal cases - Pending on 1st Jan. 2015

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**482 779**	**35 068**	**397 794**	372 342	25 452	*21 827*	*3 625*	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**49 917**
Belgium	**NA**	**180 894**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	**37 624**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**69 865**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**8 460**	**NA**
Croatia	**354 707**	**195 718**	**145 013**	102 786	42 227	*39 262*	*2 965*	NAP	NAP	**13 976**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**58 568**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**8 074**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**546 992**	**215 113**	**221 076**	210 783	8 995	NAP	*8 995*	NAP	1 298	**9 374**	**101 429**
Denmark	**116 296**	**20 933**	**66 789**	60 220	6 569	*1 616*	*4 953*	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**28 574**
Estonia	**23 838**	**6 116**	**16 392**	9 510	6 882	*3 125*	*3 757*	NAP	NAP	**1 330**	**NAP**
Finland	**127 125**	**8 883**	**91 790**	91 790	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**20 955**	**5 497**
France	**1 810 803**	**1 571 438**	**80 597**	80 597	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**158 768**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**782 964**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**662 009**	**1 748 709**
Greece	**NA**	**246 691**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**308 860**	**NA**
Hungary	**150 305**	**74 290**	**26 626**	25 154	1 076	NAP	NA	*1 076*	396	**6 734**	**42 655**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**4 618 528**	**2 987 907**	**1 362 885**	1 362 885	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**267 736**	**NAP**
Latvia	**37 504**	**31 407**	**4 671**	4 671	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**1 426**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**45 735**	**30 149**	**1 041**	729	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	312	**10 845**	**3 700**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 382**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**10 568**	**9 885**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**683**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**310 170**	**51 794**	**204 372**	204 372	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**51 020**	**NAP**
Poland	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**369 190**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**68 332**	**NAP**
Romania	**733 382**	**661 619**	**13 356**	4 375	8 981	*5 550*	*3 431*	NAP	NAP	**61 838**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**396 248**	**199 203**	**71 696**	65 066	6 630	NAP	*6 630*	NAP	NA	**16 271**	**109 078**
Slovenia	**251 889**	**48 384**	**170 745**	164 736	6 009	*5 376*	*633*	NAP	NAP	**1 668**	**31 092**
Spain	**1 445 180**	**857 047**	**384 727**	384 727	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**203 406**	**NAP**
Sweden	**74 407**	**28 538**	**8 744**	8 744	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**34 000**	**3 125**
Average	**583 244**	**374 548**	**192 254**	185 499	12 536	12 793	4 374	1 076	669	**88 790**	**212 378**
Median	**201 097**	**74 290**	**80 597**	80 597	6 882	5 463	3 691	1 076	396	**18 613**	**36 874**
Minimum	**10 568**	**1 382**	**1 041**	729	1 076	1 616	633	1 076	312	**683**	**3 125**
Maximum	**4 618 528**	**2 987 907**	**1 362 885**	1 362 885	42 227	39 262	8 995	1 076	1 298	**662 009**	**1 748 709**
Nb of values	**26**	**26**	**26**	26	26	26	26	26	26	**26**	**26**
% of NA	**23%**	**12%**	**31%**	27%	15%	12%	19%	12%	27%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	8%	50%	65%	50%	85%	62%	**12%**	**46%**

Belgium: The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Table 3.1.1.2a(2015): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2015

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 287 147**	**91 057**	**2 684 699**	1 721 024	963 675	*684 737*	*278 938*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**511 391**
Belgium	**NA**	**767 875**	**NA**	NA	240 044	*NAP*	*240 044*	*NAP*	NA	**22 577**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**345 327**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**26 472**	**NA**
Croatia	**903 398**	**160 537**	**728 522**	157 484	571 038	*449 321*	*121 717*	*NAP*	NAP	**14 339**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**29 667**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 694**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**1 136 003**	**398 243**	**690 653**	508 617	179 997	*NAP*	*179 997*	*NAP*	2 039	**9 143**	**37 964**
Denmark	**2 592 856**	**42 053**	**2 420 680**	346 762	2 073 918	*2 061 209*	*12 709*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**130 123**
Estonia	**236 230**	**15 189**	**217 670**	44 407	173 263	*72 800*	*100 463*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 371**	**NAP**
Finland	**441 823**	**11 108**	**393 554**	393 554	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 112**	**10 049**
France	**2 288 643**	**1 740 302**	**356 334**	356 334	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**192 007**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 423 489**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**657 108**	**1 203 321**
Greece	**NA**	**230 068**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**54 402**	**NA**
Hungary	**902 411**	**176 407**	**678 103**	212 034	463 007	*NAP*	*459 210*	*3 797*	3 062	**18 149**	**29 752**
Ireland	**245 462**	**138 540**	**105 623**	105 623	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**1 299**
Italy	**3 483 179**	**1 545 092**	**1 938 087**	1 938 087	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**61 723**	**NAP**
Latvia	**308 909**	**39 504**	**267 173**	29 066	238 107	*238 107*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 232**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**321 474**	**102 793**	**103 334**	90 640	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	12 694	**16 923**	**98 424**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**4 555**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**1 264**	**NAP**
Malta	**6 991**	**6 916**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**75**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 253 987**	**161 950**	**991 752**	991 752	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**100 285**	**NAP**
Poland	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**316 060**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**34 850**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 443 850**	**1 353 189**	**26 313**	19 224	7 089	*6 001*	*1 088*	*NAP*	NAP	**65 436**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**535 414**	**111 489**	**222 348**	115 467	106 881	*NAP*	*106 881*	*NAP*	NA	**10 764**	**190 813**
Slovenia	**800 360**	**57 277**	**533 591**	205 756	327 835	*266 056*	*61 779*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 804**	**204 688**
Spain	**2 230 166**	**1 085 451**	**973 915**	973 915	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**170 800**	**NAP**
Sweden	**189 467**	**60 313**	**21 489**	21 489	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**101 889**	**5 776**
Average	**1 094 417**	**418 311**	**741 880**	457 291	485 896	539 747	156 283	3 797	5 932	**69 453**	**220 327**
Median	**800 360**	**149 539**	**463 573**	208 895	240 044	266 056	114 299	3 797	3 062	**22 577**	**98 424**
Minimum	**6 991**	**4 555**	**21 489**	19 224	7 089	6 001	1 088	3 797	2 039	**75**	**1 299**
Maximum	**3 483 179**	**1 740 302**	**2 684 699**	1 938 087	2 073 918	2 061 209	459 210	3 797	12 694	**657 108**	**1 203 321**
Nb of values	**26**	**26**	**26**	26	26	26	26	26	26	**26**	**26**
% of NA	**19%**	**8%**	**27%**	23%	12%	12%	12%	12%	27%	**0%**	**12%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	8%	46%	62%	50%	85%	62%	**12%**	**46%**

Belgium: The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Table 3.1.1.2b(2015): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2015

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**37,8**	**1,0**	**30,9**	19,8	11,1	*7,9*	*3,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**5,9**
Belgium	**NA**	**6,8**	**NA**	NA	2,1	*NAP*	*2,1*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**4,8**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,4**	**NA**
Croatia	**21,6**	**3,8**	**17,4**	3,8	13,6	*10,7*	*2,9*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**3,5**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,2**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**10,8**	**3,8**	**6,5**	4,8	1,7	*NAP*	*1,7*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,4**
Denmark	**45,4**	**0,7**	**42,4**	6,1	36,3	*36,1*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**2,3**
Estonia	**18,0**	**1,2**	**16,5**	3,4	13,2	*5,5*	*7,6*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Finland	**8,1**	**0,2**	**7,2**	7,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**0,2**
France	**3,4**	**2,6**	**0,5**	0,5	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1,7**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,8**	**1,5**
Greece	**NA**	**2,1**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,5**	**NA**
Hungary	**9,2**	**1,8**	**6,9**	2,2	4,7	*NAP*	*4,7*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,3**
Ireland	**5,3**	**3,0**	**2,3**	2,3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,0**
Italy	**5,7**	**2,5**	**3,2**	3,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Latvia	**15,7**	**2,0**	**13,6**	1,5	12,1	*12,1*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**11,1**	**3,6**	**3,6**	3,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,4	**0,6**	**3,4**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,8**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	**NAP**
Malta	**1,6**	**1,5**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**7,4**	**1,0**	**5,8**	5,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	**NAP**
Poland	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	*-*	*-*	*-*	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**3,1**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Romania	**7,3**	**6,8**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**9,9**	**2,1**	**4,1**	2,1	2,0	*NAP*	*2,0*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	**3,5**
Slovenia	**38,8**	**2,8**	**25,8**	10,0	15,9	*12,9*	*3,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**9,9**
Spain	**4,8**	**2,3**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**1,9**	**0,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,0**	**0,1**
Average	**12,9**	**2,4**	**10,5**	4,3	10,2	*12,2*	*2,7*	*0,0*	0,2	**0,3**	**2,5**
Median	**8,1**	**2,1**	**6,2**	3,2	11,1	*10,7*	*2,5*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,3**	**1,5**
Minimum	**1,6**	**0,2**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**45,4**	**6,8**	**42,4**	19,8	36,3	*36,1*	*7,6*	*0,0*	0,4	**1,0**	**9,9**
Nb of values	**26**	**26**	**26**	26	26	26	26	26	26	**26**	**26**
% of NA	**19%**	**8%**	**27%**	23%	12%	*12%*	*12%*	*12%*	27%	**0%**	**12%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	8%	46%	*62%*	*50%*	*85%*	62%	**12%**	**46%**

Belgium: The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Table 3.1.1.3(2015): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2015

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 293 774**	**92 903**	**2 693 376**	1 737 005	956 371	*678 073*	*278 298*	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**507 495**
Belgium	**NA**	**759 712**	**NA**	NA	240 044	NAP	*240 044*	NAP	NA	**26 377**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**341 715**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**26 196**	**NA**
Croatia	**917 569**	**171 980**	**732 299**	162 888	569 411	*447 160*	*122 251*	NAP	NAP	**13 290**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**26 751**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**2 030**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**1 161 795**	**427 241**	**704 714**	527 754	175 198	NAP	*175 198*	NAP	1 762	**8 425**	**21 415**
Denmark	**2 592 317**	**42 867**	**2 418 335**	344 907	2 073 428	*2 061 886*	*11 542*	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**131 115**
Estonia	**329 909**	**15 504**	**310 882**	46 104	264 778	*163 565*	*101 213*	NAP	NAP	**3 523**	**NAP**
Finland	**436 443**	**10 463**	**388 228**	388 228	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**27 595**	**10 157**
France	**2 237 067**	**1 700 279**	**348 005**	348 005	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**188 783**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 451 589**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**674 226**	**1 224 780**
Greece	**NA**	**233 954**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**99 763**	**NA**
Hungary	**914 672**	**174 573**	**681 609**	206 746	471 796	NAP	*467 816*	*3 980*	3 067	**19 107**	**39 383**
Ireland	**187 987**	**87 505**	**99 183**	99 183	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NAP**	**1 299**
Italy	**3 890 953**	**1 855 663**	**2 035 290**	2 035 290	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**87 594**	**NAP**
Latvia	**312 004**	**42 910**	**266 729**	30 719	236 010	*236 010*	NAP	NAP	NAP	**2 365**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**323 062**	**105 347**	**103 505**	90 959	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	12 546	**16 875**	**97 335**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**4 800**	**NA**	1 104	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	**1 146**	**NAP**
Malta	**7 727**	**7 419**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**308**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 261 182**	**162 533**	**995 325**	995 325	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**103 324**	**NAP**
Poland	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**367 725**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**27 810**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 531 225**	**1 417 087**	**27 919**	20 550	7 369	*6 763*	*606*	NAP	NAP	**86 825**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**562 478**	**148 107**	**221 995**	116 136	105 859	NAP	*105 859*	NAP	NA	**13 361**	**179 015**
Slovenia	**859 760**	**60 082**	**585 504**	256 504	329 000	*266 990*	*62 010*	NAP	NAP	**4 853**	**209 321**
Spain	**2 222 912**	**1 028 225**	**994 312**	994 312	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**200 375**	**NAP**
Sweden	**196 006**	**62 668**	**21 811**	21 811	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**105 625**	**5 902**
Average	**1 124 158**	**434 631**	**757 168**	443 344	493 569	551 492	156 484	3 980	5 792	**75 642**	**220 656**
Median	**859 760**	**155 320**	**486 866**	206 746	264 778	266 990	114 055	3 980	3 067	**26 196**	**97 335**
Minimum	**7 727**	**4 800**	**21 811**	1 104	7 369	6 763	606	3 980	1 762	**308**	**1 299**
Maximum	**3 890 953**	**1 855 663**	**2 693 376**	2 035 290	2 073 428	2 061 886	467 816	3 980	12 546	**674 226**	**1 224 780**
Nb of values	**26**	**26**	**26**	26	26	26	26	26	26	**26**	**26**
% of NA	**19%**	**8%**	**27%**	23%	12%	12%	12%	12%	27%	**0%**	**12%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	4%	46%	62%	50%	85%	62%	**12%**	**46%**

Belgium: The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Table 3.1.1.4a(2015): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2015

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**476 152**	**33 222**	**389 117**	356 361	32 756	*28 491*	*4 265*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**53 813**
Belgium	**NA**	**180 480**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**32 080**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**73 477**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**8 736**	**NA**
Croatia	**331 744**	**184 289**	**132 430**	97 339	35 091	*32 551*	*2 540*	*NAP*	NAP	**15 025**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**61 484**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**7 738**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**521 200**	**186 115**	**207 015**	191 646	13 794	*NAP*	*13 794*	*NAP*	1 575	**10 092**	**117 978**
Denmark	**119 689**	**20 458**	**71 458**	64 876	6 582	*939*	*5 643*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**27 773**
Estonia	**35 228**	**5 767**	**28 333**	7 724	20 609	*17 628*	*2 981*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 128**	**NAP**
Finland	**132 586**	**9 528**	**97 116**	97 116	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 475**	**5 467**
France	**1 862 379**	**1 611 461**	**88 926**	88 926	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**161 992**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**754 864**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**644 891**	**1 728 710**
Greece	**NA**	**242 209**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**263 473**	**NA**
Hungary	**146 650**	**76 124**	**31 726**	30 442	893	*NAP*	*NA*	*893*	391	**5 776**	**33 024**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**4 184 883**	**2 677 336**	**1 265 682**	1 265 682	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**241 865**	**NAP**
Latvia	**32 312**	**28 001**	**3 018**	3 018	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 293**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**44 147**	**27 595**	**870**	410	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	460	**10 893**	**4 789**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 137**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**9 459**	**9 041**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**418**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**299 580**	**51 211**	**200 799**	200 799	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**47 570**	**NAP**
Poland	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**317 525**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**75 372**	**NAP**
Romania	**646 007**	**597 721**	**11 750**	3 049	8 701	*4 788*	*3 913*	*NAP*	NAP	**40 449**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**369 184**	**162 585**	**72 049**	64 397	7 652	*NAP*	*7 652*	*NAP*	NA	**13 674**	**120 876**
Slovenia	**192 153**	**45 579**	**118 497**	113 655	4 842	*4 440*	*402*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 619**	**26 458**
Spain	**1 452 434**	**914 273**	**364 330**	364 330	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**173 831**	**NAP**
Sweden	**67 868**	**26 183**	**8 422**	8 422	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 264**	**2 999**
Average	**552 931**	**354 900**	**181 855**	174 011	14 547	14 806	5 149	893	809	**82 212**	**212 189**
Median	**169 402**	**76 124**	**88 926**	88 926	8 701	11 208	4 089	893	460	**17 750**	**30 399**
Minimum	**9 459**	**1 137**	**870**	410	893	939	402	893	391	**418**	**2 999**
Maximum	**4 184 883**	**2 677 336**	**1 265 682**	1 265 682	35 091	32 551	13 794	893	1 575	**644 891**	**1 728 710**
Nb of values	**26**	**26**	**26**	26	26	26	26	26	26	**26**	**26**
% of NA	**23%**	**12%**	**31%**	27%	15%	12%	15%	12%	27%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	8%	50%	65%	54%	85%	62%	**12%**	**46%**

Belgium: The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Table 3.1.1.4b(2015): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2015

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5,5**	**0,4**	**4,5**	4,1	0,4	*0,3*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,6**
Belgium	**NA**	**1,6**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,3**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**1,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**7,9**	**4,4**	**3,2**	2,3	0,8	*0,8*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**7,2**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**4,9**	**1,8**	**2,0**	1,8	0,1	*NAP*	*0,1*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**1,1**
Denmark	**2,1**	**0,4**	**1,3**	1,1	0,1	*0,0*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,5**
Estonia	**2,7**	**0,4**	**2,2**	0,6	1,6	*1,3*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Finland	**2,4**	**0,2**	**1,8**	1,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,1**
France	**2,8**	**2,4**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,8**	**2,1**
Greece	**NA**	**2,2**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**2,4**	**NA**
Hungary	**1,5**	**0,8**	**0,3**	0,3	0,0	*NAP*	*NA*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,3**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**6,9**	**4,4**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1,6**	**1,4**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**1,5**	**1,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,4**	**0,2**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,2**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**2,1**	**2,0**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,8**	**0,3**	**1,2**	1,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Poland	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	*-*	*-*	*-*	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**3,1**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,7**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,3**	**3,0**	**0,1**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**6,8**	**3,0**	**1,3**	1,2	0,1	*NAP*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NA	**0,3**	**2,2**
Slovenia	**9,3**	**2,2**	**5,7**	5,5	0,2	*0,2*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**1,3**
Spain	**3,1**	**2,0**	**0,8**	0,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,7**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,0**
Average	**3,8**	**1,7**	**1,6**	1,4	0,4	*0,4*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,4**	**0,8**
Median	**2,7**	**1,6**	**1,3**	1,1	0,1	*0,3*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,3**	**0,6**
Minimum	**0,7**	**0,2**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**9,3**	**4,4**	**5,7**	5,5	1,6	*1,3*	*0,2*	*0,0*	0,0	**2,4**	**2,2**
Nb of values	**26**	**26**	**26**	26	26	26	26	26	26	**26**	**26**
% of NA	**23%**	**12%**	**31%**	27%	15%	*12%*	*15%*	*12%*	27%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	8%	50%	*65%*	*54%*	*85%*	62%	**12%**	**46%**

Belgium: The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Table 3.1.1.1(2014): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2014

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**37 885**	**NA**	381 808	NA	*23 356*	*3 223*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**48 324**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**32 255**	NAP
Bulgaria	**76 155**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**8 642**	**NA**
Croatia	**391 722**	**217 927**	**161 792**	115 879	45 913	*42 811*	*3 102*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 003**	NAP
Cyprus	**49 655**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**8 130**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**375 783**	**248 246**	**42 997**	32 194	7 923	*NAP*	*7 923*	*NAP*	2 880	**8 543**	**75 997**
Denmark	**114 483**	**21 282**	**64 939**	57 523	7 416	*1 680*	*5 736*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**28 262**
Estonia	**24 107**	**6 803**	**16 282**	11 323	4 959	*3 843*	*1 116*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 022**	NAP
Finland	**137 261**	**9 321**	**102 233**	102 233	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 233**	**5 474**
France	**1 692 658**	**1 473 097**	**69 629**	69 629	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**149 932**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**785 606**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**664 067**	**1 851 995**
Greece	**NA**	**278 913**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**162 126**	**82 107**	**28 503**	27 373	962	*NAP*	*NA*	*962*	168	**5 320**	**46 196**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**NA**
Italy	**4 885 347**	**3 063 946**	**1 518 708**	1 518 708	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**302 693**	NAP
Latvia	**35 793**	**30 395**	**4 213**	4 213	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 510**	NAP
Lithuania	**41 985**	**27 197**	**1 941**	1 765	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	176	**9 332**	**3 515**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 218**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**NA**	NAP
Malta	**10 845**	**10 092**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**753**	NAP
Netherlands	**305 520**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**49 800**	NAP
Poland	**1 721 758**	**667 984**	**910 148**	667 530	242 618	*203 662*	*38 956*	*NA*	NA	**20 070**	**115 556**
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Romania	**918 286**	**793 683**	**14 940**	6 418	8 522	*5 601*	*2 921*	*NAP*	NAP	**109 663**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**407 586**	**186 707**	**74 501**	66 370	8 131	*NAP*	*8 131*	*NAP*	NA	**18 656**	**127 722**
Slovenia	**285 279**	**53 815**	**187 198**	177 648	9 550	*8 593*	*957*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 841**	**42 425**
Spain	**1 470 400**	**836 967**	**407 160**	407 160	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**226 273**	NAP
Sweden	**80 562**	**31 035**	**9 128**	9 128	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**37 003**	**3 396**
Average	**659 366**	**422 106**	**225 895**	215 112	37 333	41 364	8 007	962	1 075	**80 416**	**213 533**
Median	**223 703**	**82 107**	**67 284**	66 370	8 131	8 593	3 223	962	176	**18 656**	**46 196**
Minimum	**10 845**	**1 218**	**1 941**	1 765	962	1 680	957	962	168	**753**	**3 396**
Maximum	**4 885 347**	**3 063 946**	**1 518 708**	1 518 708	242 618	203 662	38 956	962	2 880	**664 067**	**1 851 995**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**26%**	**22%**	**37%**	30%	22%	15%	22%	22%	33%	**11%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	44%	59%	44%	74%	56%	**11%**	**44%**

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the number of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases in 2014 is comparable with General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases + Non-litigious enforcement cases in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.1.1.2a(2014): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2014

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**95 412**	**NA**	1 741 644	NA	*648 601*	*285 996*	*NA*	NA	**NAP**	**513 877**
Belgium	**NA**	**752 769**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**25 092**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**319 414**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**24 757**	**NA**
Croatia	**938 711**	**165 741**	**759 028**	197 352	561 676	*438 089*	*123 587*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 942**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**23 939**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 604**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**958 450**	**480 999**	**433 561**	150 192	238 876	*NAP*	*238 876*	*NAP*	44 493	**9 055**	**34 835**
Denmark	**2 288 883**	**41 717**	**2 115 501**	359 920	1 755 581	*1 744 916*	*10 665*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**131 665**
Estonia	**237 929**	**16 775**	**217 368**	46 864	170 504	*97 704*	*72 800*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 786**	**NAP**
Finland	**440 553**	**10 677**	**391 260**	391 260	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**28 254**	**10 362**
France	**2 285 876**	**1 747 989**	**342 262**	342 262	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**195 625**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 439 072**	**NA**	2 365 351	NA	*5 490 219*	*117 251*	*NA*	NA	**655 687**	**1 622 446**
Greece	**NA**	**241 418**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**848 998**	**180 382**	**613 158**	180 459	430 096	*NAP*	*427 114*	*2 982*	2 603	**18 008**	**37 450**
Ireland	**250 402**	**143 993**	**105 215**	105 215	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**1 194**
Italy	**3 999 586**	**1 585 740**	**2 350 123**	2 350 123	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**63 723**	**NAP**
Latvia	**71 939**	**45 127**	**28 691**	28 691	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 387**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**312 570**	**115 932**	**91 549**	82 707	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	8 842	**14 276**	**90 813**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**5 074**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**1 372**	**NAP**
Malta	**6 762**	**6 643**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**119**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 260 111**	**168 127**	**982 142**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**109 842**	**NAP**
Poland	**9 991 816**	**1 226 470**	**8 395 454**	4 408 257	3 987 197	*3 245 962*	*741 235*	*NA*	NA	**84 161**	**285 731**
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 632 597**	**1 526 483**	**27 733**	19 973	7 760	*6 821*	*939*	*NAP*	NAP	**78 381**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**614 273**	**151 315**	**225 116**	119 088	106 028	*NAP*	*106 028*	*NAP*	NA	**11 612**	**226 230**
Slovenia	**871 916**	**59 996**	**587 442**	228 724	358 718	*295 833*	*62 885*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 345**	**219 133**
Spain	**2 154 560**	**1 004 976**	**966 903**	966 903	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**182 681**	**NAP**
Sweden	**197 953**	**63 902**	**22 382**	22 382	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**106 085**	**5 584**
Average	**1 414 630**	**469 864**	**1 036 383**	742 493	846 271	1 496 018	198 852	2 982	18 646	**74 354**	**264 943**
Median	**848 998**	**158 528**	**412 411**	197 352	358 718	543 345	117 251	2 982	8 842	**21 383**	**111 239**
Minimum	**6 762**	**5 074**	**22 382**	19 973	7 760	6 821	939	2 982	2 603	**119**	**1 194**
Maximum	**9 991 816**	**1 747 989**	**8 395 454**	4 408 257	3 987 197	5 490 219	741 235	2 982	44 493	**655 687**	**1 622 446**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**11%**	**30%**	22%	22%	11%	15%	22%	33%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	44%	59%	44%	74%	56%	**11%**	**44%**

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the number of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases in 2014 is comparable with General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases + Non-litigious enforcement cases in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.1.1.2b(2014): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2014

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**1,1**	**NA**	20,3	NA	*7,6*	*3,3*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**6,0**
Belgium	**NA**	**6,7**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	NAP
Bulgaria	**4,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,3**	**NA**
Croatia	**22,2**	**3,9**	**18,0**	4,7	13,3	*10,4*	*2,9*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	NAP
Cyprus	**2,8**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,2**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**9,1**	**4,6**	**4,1**	1,4	2,3	*NAP*	*2,3*	*NAP*	0,4	**0,1**	**0,3**
Denmark	**40,4**	**0,7**	**37,4**	6,4	31,0	*30,8*	*0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**2,3**
Estonia	**18,1**	**1,3**	**16,6**	3,6	13,0	*7,4*	*5,5*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	NAP
Finland	**8,1**	**0,2**	**7,2**	7,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,5**	**0,2**
France	**3,4**	**2,6**	**0,5**	0,5	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**1,8**	**NA**	2,9	NA	*6,8*	*0,1*	*NA*	NA	**0,8**	**2,0**
Greece	**NA**	**2,2**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**8,6**	**1,8**	**6,2**	1,8	4,4	*NAP*	*4,3*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,2**	**0,4**
Ireland	**5,4**	**3,1**	**2,3**	2,3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,0**
Italy	**6,6**	**2,6**	**3,9**	3,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	NAP
Latvia	**3,6**	**2,3**	**1,4**	1,4	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	NAP
Lithuania	**10,7**	**4,0**	**3,1**	2,8	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,3	**0,5**	**3,1**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,9**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	NAP
Malta	**1,5**	**1,5**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	NAP
Netherlands	**7,5**	**1,0**	**5,8**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6**	NAP
Poland	**26,0**	**3,2**	**21,8**	11,5	10,4	*8,4*	*1,9*	*NA*	NA	**0,2**	**0,7**
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Romania	**7,3**	**6,9**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**11,3**	**2,8**	**4,2**	2,2	2,0	*NAP*	*2,0*	*NAP*	NA	**0,2**	**4,2**
Slovenia	**42,3**	**2,9**	**28,5**	11,1	17,4	*14,4*	*3,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**10,6**
Spain	**4,6**	**2,2**	**2,1**	2,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	NAP
Sweden	**2,0**	**0,7**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,1**	**0,1**
Average	**11,7**	**2,5**	**9,1**	4,5	10,4	*10,7*	*2,3*	*0,0*	0,3	**0,3**	**2,5**
Median	**7,5**	**2,2**	**4,1**	2,8	10,4	*8,0*	*2,3*	*0,0*	0,3	**0,3**	**1,4**
Minimum	**1,5**	**0,2**	**0,1**	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**42,3**	**6,9**	**37,4**	20,3	31,0	*30,8*	*5,5*	*0,0*	0,4	**1,1**	**10,6**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**11%**	**30%**	22%	22%	*11%*	*15%*	*22%*	33%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	44%	*59%*	*44%*	*74%*	56%	**11%**	**44%**

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the number of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases in 2014 is comparable with General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases + Non-litigious enforcement cases in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.1.1.3(2014): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2014

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**98 229**	**NA**	1 751 110	NA	*626 850*	*285 594*	*NA*	NA	**NAP**	**512 284**
Belgium	**NA**	**736 693**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**22 139**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**325 754**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**24 955**	**NA**
Croatia	**968 422**	**187 950**	**768 503**	210 569	557 934	*434 210*	*123 724*	*NAP*	NAP	**11 969**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**21 182**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 660**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**932 818**	**503 666**	**405 363**	126 708	234 227	*NAP*	*234 227*	*NAP*	44 428	**8 233**	**15 556**
Denmark	**2 288 504**	**42 638**	**2 114 440**	357 102	1 757 338	*1 745 063*	*12 275*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**131 426**
Estonia	**233 577**	**17 486**	**212 669**	42 969	169 700	*97 769*	*71 931*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 422**	**NAP**
Finland	**450 486**	**11 164**	**401 590**	401 590	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 429**	**10 303**
France	**2 169 237**	**1 649 648**	**331 294**	331 294	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**188 295**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**1 441 714**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*88 326*	*NA*	NA	**657 745**	**1 418 949**
Greece	**NA**	**273 048**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**872 260**	**188 199**	**626 526**	182 894	441 257	*NAP*	*438 389*	*2 868*	2 375	**16 594**	**40 941**
Ireland	**182 409**	**80 027**	**101 188**	101 188	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**1 194**
Italy	**4 373 441**	**1 891 595**	**2 382 677**	2 382 677	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99 169**	**NAP**
Latvia	**72 254**	**44 438**	**28 718**	28 718	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 436**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**308 820**	**112 980**	**92 449**	83 743	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	8 706	**12 763**	**90 628**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**4 910**	**NA**	1 044	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**1 283**	**NAP**
Malta	**6 909**	**6 732**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**177**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 248 701**	**166 639**	**973 447**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**108 615**	**NAP**
Poland	**10 177 708**	**1 217 579**	**8 598 250**	4 620 175	3 987 075	*3 248 343*	*729 732*	*NA*	NA	**81 240**	**280 639**
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Romania	**1 814 070**	**1 658 547**	**29 317**	22 016	7 301	*6 872*	*429*	*NAP*	NAP	**126 206**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**626 110**	**138 819**	**227 921**	120 392	107 529	*NAP*	*107 529*	*NAP*	NA	**14 496**	**244 874**
Slovenia	**904 958**	**65 432**	**603 557**	241 289	362 268	*299 060*	*63 208*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 504**	**230 465**
Spain	**2 178 205**	**984 896**	**987 761**	987 761	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**205 548**	**NAP**
Sweden	**204 109**	**66 421**	**22 726**	22 726	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**109 102**	**5 860**
Average	**1 445 711**	**482 894**	**1 050 466**	632 419	847 181	922 595	195 942	2 868	18 503	**78 635**	**248 593**
Median	**872 260**	**152 729**	**403 477**	182 894	362 268	434 210	107 529	2 868	8 706	**19 367**	**111 027**
Minimum	**6 909**	**4 910**	**22 726**	1 044	7 301	6 872	429	2 868	2 375	**177**	**1 194**
Maximum	**10 177 708**	**1 891 595**	**8 598 250**	4 620 175	3 987 075	3 248 343	729 732	2 868	44 428	**657 745**	**1 418 949**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**11%**	**30%**	26%	22%	15%	15%	22%	33%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	4%	44%	59%	44%	74%	56%	**11%**	**44%**

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the number of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases in 2014 is comparable with General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases + Non-litigious enforcement cases in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.1.1.4a(2014): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2014

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**35 068**	**NA**	372 342	NA	*21 827*	*3 625*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**49 917**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**37 880**	NAP
Bulgaria	**69 815**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**8 444**	**NA**
Croatia	**354 707**	**195 718**	**145 013**	102 786	42 227	*39 262*	*2 965*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 976**	NAP
Cyprus	**52 412**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**8 074**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**401 415**	**225 579**	**71 195**	55 678	12 572	*NAP*	*12 572*	*NAP*	2 945	**9 365**	**95 276**
Denmark	**118 484**	**20 705**	**69 113**	62 626	6 487	*1 533*	*4 954*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**28 666**
Estonia	**21 252**	**5 991**	**13 935**	9 147	4 788	*3 758*	*1 030*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 326**	NAP
Finland	**127 328**	**8 834**	**91 903**	91 903	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**21 058**	**5 533**
France	**1 809 297**	**1 571 438**	**80 597**	80 597	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**157 262**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**782 964**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**662 009**	**1 838 550**
Greece	**NA**	**246 839**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**150 089**	**74 290**	**26 410**	24 938	1 076	*NAP*	*NA*	*1 076*	396	**6 734**	**42 655**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**NA**
Italy	**4 511 492**	**2 758 091**	**1 486 154**	1 486 154	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**267 247**	NAP
Latvia	**35 478**	**31 084**	**4 186**	4 186	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 461**	NAP
Lithuania	**45 735**	**30 149**	**1 041**	729	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	312	**10 845**	**3 700**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 382**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**NA**	**3 700**
Malta	**10 568**	**9 885**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**683**	NAP
Netherlands	**310 170**	**60 160**	**198 990**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**51 020**	NAP
Poland	**1 533 930**	**676 875**	**707 352**	455 612	251 740	*201 281*	*50 459*	*NA*	NA	**30 991**	**118 712**
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Romania	**736 813**	**661 619**	**13 356**	4 375	8 981	*5 550*	*3 431*	*NAP*	NAP	**61 838**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**395 749**	**199 203**	**71 696**	65 066	6 630	*NAP*	*6 630*	*NAP*	NA	**15 772**	**109 078**
Slovenia	**251 814**	**48 389**	**170 653**	164 581	6 072	*5 438*	*634*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 682**	**31 090**
Spain	**1 446 755**	**857 047**	**384 727**	384 727	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**203 406**	NAP
Sweden	**74 406**	**28 516**	**8 784**	8 784	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**33 986**	**3 120**
Average	**622 885**	**387 719**	**208 536**	198 484	37 841	39 807	9 589	1 076	1 218	**76 431**	**194 166**
Median	**200 952**	**67 225**	**71 696**	65 066	6 630	5 550	3 625	1 076	396	**15 772**	**36 873**
Minimum	**10 568**	**1 382**	**1 041**	729	1 076	1 533	634	1 076	312	**683**	**3 120**
Maximum	**4 511 492**	**2 758 091**	**1 486 154**	1 486 154	251 740	201 281	50 459	1 076	2 945	**662 009**	**1 838 550**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**26%**	**19%**	**33%**	30%	22%	15%	22%	22%	33%	**11%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	44%	59%	44%	74%	56%	**11%**	**41%**

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the number of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases in 2014 is comparable with General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases + Non-litigious enforcement cases in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.1.1.4b(2014): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2014

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**0,4**	**NA**	4,3	NA	*0,3*	*0,0*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**0,6**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**0,3**	NAP
Bulgaria	**1,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**8,4**	**4,6**	**3,4**	2,4	1,0	*0,9*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	NAP
Cyprus	**6,1**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,9**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**3,8**	**2,1**	**0,7**	0,5	0,1	*NAP*	*0,1*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,9**
Denmark	**2,1**	**0,4**	**1,2**	1,1	0,1	*0,0*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,5**
Estonia	**1,6**	**0,5**	**1,1**	0,7	0,4	*0,3*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	NAP
Finland	**2,3**	**0,2**	**1,7**	1,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**0,1**
France	**2,7**	**2,4**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**1,0**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,8**	**2,3**
Greece	**NA**	**2,3**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**1,5**	**0,8**	**0,3**	0,3	0,0	*NAP*	*NA*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,4**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**NA**
Italy	**7,4**	**4,5**	**2,4**	2,4	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	NAP
Latvia	**1,8**	**1,6**	**0,2**	0,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	NAP
Lithuania	**1,6**	**1,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,0	**0,4**	**0,1**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,2**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**NA**	**0,7**
Malta	**2,4**	**2,2**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1,8**	**0,4**	**1,2**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Poland	**4,0**	**1,8**	**1,8**	1,2	0,7	*0,5*	*0,1*	*NA*	NA	**0,1**	**0,3**
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Romania	**3,3**	**3,0**	**0,1**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**7,3**	**3,7**	**1,3**	1,2	0,1	*NAP*	*0,1*	*NAP*	NA	**0,3**	**2,0**
Slovenia	**12,2**	**2,3**	**8,3**	8,0	0,3	*0,3*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**1,5**
Spain	**3,1**	**1,8**	**0,8**	0,8	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,8**	**0,3**	**0,1**	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,3**	**0,0**
Average	**3,8**	**1,7**	**1,5**	1,5	0,3	*0,3*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,3**	**0,8**
Median	**2,6**	**1,7**	**1,1**	0,8	0,1	*0,3*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,3**	**0,5**
Minimum	**0,8**	**0,2**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Maximum	**12,2**	**4,6**	**8,3**	8,0	1,0	*0,9*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,9**	**2,3**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**26%**	**19%**	**33%**	30%	22%	*15%*	*22%*	*22%*	33%	**11%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	44%	*59%*	*44%*	*74%*	56%	**11%**	**41%**

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the number of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases in 2014 is comparable with General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases + Non-litigious enforcement cases in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.1.1.1(2013): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2013

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	**517 264**	**38 918**	386 305	41 484	*0*	NAP	**50 557**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	**NA**	NAP
Bulgaria	**79 157**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	**10 909**	**68 248**
Croatia	**415 939**	**220 356**	131 065	54 928	*2 515*	**7 075**	NAP
Cyprus	**NA**	**44 285**	NA	NA	*NA*	**5 395**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**296 269**	**171 113**	97 177	NAP	*NAP*	NAP	**27 979**
Denmark	**117 611**	**23 845**	56 974	2 460	*6 841*	NAP	**27 491**
Estonia	**NA**	**8 412**	11 553	3 033	*2 777*	**891**	NAP
Finland	**137 004**	**9 600**	103 192	NAP	*NAP*	**18 849**	**5 363**
France	**1 643 188**	**1 428 811**	64 473	NAP	*NAP*	**149 904**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**736 340**	NA	NA	*NA*	**643 094**	**1 851 995**
Greece	**NA**	**478 241**	NA	NA	*NA*	**383 402**	**NA**
Hungary	**NA**	**78 381**	27 684	NAP	*NA*	**6 019**	**57 094**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**
Italy	**4 781 009**	**3 445 954**	1 335 055	NAP	*NAP*	**347 728**	NAP
Latvia	**41 425**	**33 818**	3 185	NAP	*NAP*	**4 422**	NAP
Lithuania	**33 908**	**26 005**	1 079	NA	*NA*	**3 128**	**3 696**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**5 007**	NA	NA	*NAP*	**NA**	NAP
Malta	**9 789**	**9 238**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	**551**	NAP
Netherlands	**287 474**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	**50 084**	NAP
Poland	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**362 099**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	**NA**	NAP
Romania	**777 991**	**578 043**	62 572	1 366	*2 526*	**133 484**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**339 930**	**150 579**	71 944	NAP	*6 510*	**17 815**	**93 082**
Slovenia	**303 220**	**55 486**	188 531	14 705	*477*	**1 936**	**42 085**
Spain	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Sweden	**81 916**	**31 686**	9 337	NAP	*NAP*	**37 724**	**3 169**
Average	**616 443**	**377 915**	170 008	19 663	3 092	**101 245**	**202 796**
Median	**291 872**	**55 486**	64 473	8 869	2 526	**14 362**	**42 085**
Minimum	**9 789**	**5 007**	1 079	1 366	0	**551**	**3 169**
Maximum	**4 781 009**	**3 445 954**	1 335 055	54 928	6 841	**643 094**	**1 851 995**
Nb of values	**25**	**25**	25	25	25	**25**	**25**
% of NA	**36%**	**16%**	28%	28%	24%	**12%**	**12%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	12%	48%	48%	**16%**	**44%**

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.2a(2013): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2013

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	**3 386 071**	**101 157**	1 777 887	643 064	*307 976*	NAP	**555 987**
Belgium	**NA**	**745 883**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	**NA**	NAP
Bulgaria	**353 415**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	**26 441**	**326 974**
Croatia	**1 086 228**	**203 831**	269 321	472 363	*126 900*	**13 813**	NAP
Cyprus	**NA**	**38 473**	NA	NA	*NA*	**6 653**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**1 734 290**	**469 054**	894 145	NAP	*NAP*	NAP	**371 091**
Denmark	**2 316 568**	**43 878**	370 649	1 762 764	*13 341*	NAP	**125 936**
Estonia	**NA**	**17 745**	51 112	92 832	*90 012*	**2 957**	NAP
Finland	**519 154**	**10 644**	470 137	NAP	*NAP*	**28 214**	**10 159**
France	**2 288 177**	**1 789 902**	322 513	NAP	*NAP*	**175 762**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**1 424 016**	NA	5 490 219	*NA*	**661 706**	**1 622 446**
Greece	**NA**	**688 859**	NA	NA	*NA*	**71 568**	**NA**
Hungary	**1 164 682**	**180 813**	201 578	NAP	*726 545*	**16 189**	**39 557**
Ireland	**NA**	**195 299**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**
Italy	**4 173 702**	**1 605 399**	2 568 303	NAP	*NAP*	**54 902**	NAP
Latvia	**76 869**	**40 747**	33 257	NAP	*NAP*	**2 865**	NAP
Lithuania	**296 795**	**106 890**	84 829	NA	*NA*	**17 932**	**87 144**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**4 643**	948	NA	*NAP*	**1 372**	NAP
Malta	**4 272**	**3 935**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	**337**	NAP
Netherlands	**1 237 427**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	**110 273**	NAP
Poland	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**322 689**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	**NA**	NAP
Romania	**1 599 815**	**829 193**	571 575	1 999	*869*	**196 179**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**690 648**	**163 200**	124 144	NAP	*111 931*	**11 296**	**280 077**
Slovenia	**921 342**	**63 636**	250 918	284 854	*58 288*	**5 234**	**258 412**
Spain	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Sweden	**200 644**	**65 467**	23 217	NAP	*NAP*	**106 094**	**5 866**
Average	**1 297 065**	396 320	500 908	1 249 728	179 483	79 462	334 877
Median	**1 086 228**	163 200	260 120	472 363	100 972	17 932	258 412
Minimum	**4 272**	3 935	948	1 999	869	337	5 866
Maximum	**4 173 702**	1 789 902	2 568 303	5 490 219	726 545	661 706	1 622 446
Nb of values	**25**	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	**32%**	8%	24%	24%	20%	8%	12%
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	12%	48%	48%	16%	44%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.2b(2013): First instance other than criminal cases - Incoming in 2013

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	39,9	1,2	21,0	7,6	3,6	NAP	6,6
Belgium	NA	6,7	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	4,9	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,4	4,5
Croatia	25,6	4,8	6,3	11,1	3,0	0,3	NAP
Cyprus	NA	4,5	NA	NA	NA	0,8	NA
Czech Republic	16,5	4,5	8,5	NAP	NAP	NAP	3,5
Denmark	41,2	0,8	6,6	31,3	0,2	NAP	2,2
Estonia	NA	1,3	3,9	7,1	6,8	0,2	NAP
Finland	9,5	0,2	8,6	NAP	NAP	0,5	0,2
France	3,5	2,7	0,5	NAP	NAP	0,3	NAP
Germany	NA	1,8	NA	6,8	NA	0,8	2,0
Greece	NA	6,2	NA	NA	NA	0,6	NA
Hungary	11,8	1,8	2,0	NAP	7,4	0,2	0,4
Ireland	NA	4,2	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	7,0	2,7	4,3	NAP	NAP	0,1	NAP
Latvia	3,8	2,0	1,6	NAP	NAP	0,1	NAP
Lithuania	10,1	3,6	2,9	NA	NA	0,6	3,0
Luxembourg	NA	0,8	0,2	NA	NAP	0,2	NAP
Malta	1,0	0,9	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,1	NAP
Netherlands	7,4	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	0,7	NAP
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	NA	3,1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP
Romania	8,0	4,2	2,9	0,0	0,0	1,0	NAP
Slovak Republic	12,8	3,0	2,3	NAP	2,1	0,2	5,2
Slovenia	44,7	3,1	12,2	13,8	2,8	0,3	12,5
Spain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	2,1	0,7	0,2	NAP	NAP	1,1	0,1
Average	14,7	2,8	5,3	11,1	3,2	0,4	3,7
Median	9,5	2,7	3,4	7,6	2,9	0,3	3,0
Minimum	1,0	0,2	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,1
Maximum	44,7	6,7	21,0	31,3	7,4	1,1	12,5
Nb of values	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	32%	8%	24%	24%	20%	8%	12%
% of NAP	0%	0%	12%	48%	48%	16%	44%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.3(2013): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2013

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	**3 411 960**	**102 190**	1 782 384	661 192	307 976	NAP	**558 218**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Bulgaria	**356 677**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	**28 727**	**327 950**
Croatia	**1 110 269**	**206 291**	284 153	484 480	126 460	**8 885**	NAP
Cyprus	**NA**	**30 125**	NA	NA	NA	**3 828**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**1 679 459**	**423 105**	915 562	NAP	NAP	NAP	**340 792**
Denmark	**2 323 265**	**47 009**	372 421	1 763 487	15 048	NAP	**125 300**
Estonia	**NA**	**19 096**	50 946	92 066	91 099	**2 687**	NAP
Finland	**518 725**	**11 319**	470 722	NAP	NAP	**26 745**	**9 939**
France	**2 246 155**	**1 745 616**	317 357	NAP	NAP	**183 182**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**1 415 623**	NA	NA	NA	**659 613**	**1 418 949**
Greece	**NA**	**551 755**	NA	NA	NA	**109 771**	**NA**
Hungary	**1 135 973**	**177 087**	200 004	NAP	691 613	**16 888**	**50 381**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	120 010	NAP	NAP	NAP	**35**
Italy	**4 450 604**	**1 895 576**	2 555 028	NAP	NAP	**104 409**	NAP
Latvia	**81 225**	**44 500**	32 046	NAP	NAP	**4 679**	NAP
Lithuania	**288 718**	**105 698**	83 967	NA	NA	**11 728**	**87 325**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**8 432**	948	NA	NAP	**1 283**	NAP
Malta	**4 447**	**4 312**	NAP	NAP	NAP	**135**	NAP
Netherlands	**1 219 381**	**158 722**	950 102	NAP	NAP	**110 557**	NAP
Poland	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**332 948**	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Romania	**1 760 885**	**929 973**	572 830	2 199	474	**255 409**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**626 660**	**131 609**	128 210	NAP	110 331	**9 560**	**246 950**
Slovenia	**938 955**	**65 194**	261 450	290 939	57 993	**5 329**	**258 050**
Spain	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Sweden	**201 996**	**66 112**	23 416	NAP	NAP	**106 832**	**5 636**
Average	**1 315 021**	385 104	506 753	549 061	175 124	86 855	285 794
Median	**1 110 269**	118 654	272 802	387 710	100 715	16 888	186 125
Minimum	**4 447**	4 312	948	2 199	474	135	35
Maximum	**4 450 604**	1 895 576	2 555 028	1 763 487	691 613	659 613	1 418 949
Nb of values	**25**	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	**32%**	12%	16%	28%	20%	8%	8%
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	12%	48%	48%	16%	44%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.4a(2013): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2013

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	**491 375**	**37 885**	381 808	23 356	0	NAP	**48 326**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Bulgaria	**75 895**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	**8 623**	**67 272**
Croatia	**391 898**	**217 896**	116 233	42 811	2 955	**12 003**	NAP
Cyprus	**NA**	**52 633**	NA	NA	NA	**8 130**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**351 100**	**217 062**	75 760	NAP	NAP	NAP	**58 278**
Denmark	**114 531**	**21 120**	57 559	1 737	5 751	NAP	**28 364**
Estonia	**NA**	**6 812**	11 765	3 799	1 634	**1 026**	NAP
Finland	**137 433**	**8 925**	102 607	NAP	NAP	**20 318**	**5 583**
France	**1 685 210**	**1 473 097**	69 629	NAP	NAP	**142 484**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**744 510**	NA	NA	NA	**645 014**	**1 838 550**
Greece	**NA**	**615 345**	NA	NA	NA	**345 199**	**NA**
Hungary	**NA**	**82 107**	29 258	NAP	NA	**5 320**	**46 270**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**
Italy	**4 504 107**	**3 155 777**	1 348 330	NAP	NAP	**298 221**	NAP
Latvia	**37 069**	**30 065**	4 396	NAP	NAP	**2 608**	NAP
Lithuania	**41 985**	**27 197**	1 941	NA	NA	**9 332**	**3 515**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 218**	0	NA	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Malta	**9 614**	**8 861**	NAP	NAP	NAP	**753**	NAP
Netherlands	**305 520**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	**49 800**	NAP
Poland	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**351 840**	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Romania	**616 921**	**477 263**	61 317	1 166	2 921	**74 254**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**403 918**	**182 170**	67 878	NAP	8 110	**19 551**	**126 209**
Slovenia	**285 117**	**53 813**	177 392	8 615	1 011	**1 841**	**42 445**
Spain	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Sweden	**80 564**	**31 041**	9 138	NAP	NAP	**36 986**	**3 399**
Average	**595 766**	371 268	157 188	13 581	3 197	93 415	206 201
Median	**295 319**	53 813	64 598	6 207	2 921	15 777	46 270
Minimum	**9 614**	1 218	0	1 166	0	753	3 399
Maximum	**4 504 107**	3 155 777	1 348 330	42 811	8 110	645 014	1 838 550
Nb of values	**25**	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	**36%**	16%	24%	28%	24%	12%	12%
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	12%	48%	48%	16%	44%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.4b(2013): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2013

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	5,8	0,4	4,5	0,3	0,0	NAP	0,6
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	1,0	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,1	0,9
Croatia	9,2	5,1	2,7	1,0	0,1	0,3	NAP
Cyprus	NA	6,1	NA	NA	NA	0,9	NA
Czech Republic	3,3	2,1	0,7	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,6
Denmark	2,0	0,4	1,0	0,0	0,1	NAP	0,5
Estonia	NA	0,5	0,9	0,3	0,1	0,1	NAP
Finland	2,5	0,2	1,9	NAP	NAP	0,4	0,1
France	2,6	2,2	0,1	NAP	NAP	0,2	NAP
Germany	NA	0,9	NA	NA	NA	0,8	2,3
Greece	NA	5,6	NA	NA	NA	3,1	NA
Hungary	NA	0,8	0,3	NAP	NA	0,1	0,5
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	7,5	5,3	2,3	NAP	NAP	0,5	NAP
Latvia	1,8	1,5	0,2	NAP	NAP	0,1	NAP
Lithuania	1,4	0,9	0,1	NA	NA	0,3	0,1
Luxembourg	NA	0,2	0,0	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Malta	2,2	2,1	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,2	NAP
Netherlands	1,8	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	0,3	NAP
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	NA	3,4	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP
Romania	3,1	2,4	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,4	NAP
Slovak Republic	7,5	3,4	1,3	NAP	0,1	0,4	2,3
Slovenia	13,8	2,6	8,6	0,4	0,0	0,1	2,1
Spain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	0,8	0,3	0,1	NAP	NAP	0,4	0,0
Average	4,2	2,2	1,6	0,3	0,1	0,5	0,9
Median	2,5	2,1	0,8	0,3	0,1	0,3	0,6
Minimum	0,8	0,2	0,0	0,01	0,0	0,1	0,0
Maximum	13,8	6,1	8,6	1,0	0,1	3,1	2,3
Nb of values	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	36%	16%	24%	28%	24%	12%	12%
% of NAP	0%	0%	12%	48%	48%	16%	44%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.1(2012): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2012

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	**504 481**	**39 530**	397 948	17 205	NA	NAP	**49 798**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Bulgaria	**74 505**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	**8 622**	**65 883**
Croatia	**430 500**	**208 520**	160 545	57 484	NA	**NA**	**3 951**
Cyprus	**42 179**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	**4 851**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**522 186**	**166 919**	43 819	NAP	NAP	NAP	**311 448**
Denmark	**143 328**	**26 505**	76 701	1 333	7 136	NAP	**28 748**
Estonia	**66 242**	**10 418**	13 554	3 782	37 335	**1 153**	NAP
Finland	**109 588**	**9 829**	75 446	NAP	NAP	**19 203**	**5 110**
France	**1 654 187**	**1 415 720**	69 108	NAP	NAP	**169 359**	NAP
Germany	**4 966 112**	**798 265**	NA	NA	NA	**689 031**	**1 957 181**
Greece	**616 391**	**205 198**	NA	NA	NA	**411 193**	**NA**
Hungary	**NA**	**142 113**	51 785	NAP	NA	**6 483**	**56 882**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**
Italy	**4 986 193**	**3 796 202**	1 189 991	NAP	NAP	**441 243**	NAP
Latvia	**48 647**	**42 051**	3 438	NAP	NAP	**5 496**	NAP
Lithuania	**35 363**	**26 545**	1 461	NA	NA	**2 974**	**4 383**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**5 072**	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Malta	**9 805**	**9 457**	NAP	NAP	NAP	**348**	NAP
Netherlands	**279 460**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	**48 010**	NAP
Poland	**1 431 356**	**382 664**	718 309	204 376	20 595	**21 837**	**83 575**
Portugal	**1 595 259**	**355 821**	NA	NAP	NAP	**NA**	**NA**
Romania	**698 506**	**566 796**	44 812	1 454	2 281	**83 163**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**289 064**	**128 073**	69 073	NAP	6 224	**7 883**	**77 811**
Slovenia	**356 071**	**56 651**	200 131	44 990	839	**2 430**	**51 030**
Spain	**NA**	**1 299 099**	59 995	NAP	NAP	**335 512**	NAP
Sweden	**85 228**	**30 917**	8 505	NAP	NAP	**42 654**	**3 152**
Average	**861 121**	441 926	187 331	47 232	12 402	121 129	207 612
Median	**322 568**	135 093	69 073	17 205	6 680	19 203	51 030
Minimum	**9 805**	5 072	1 461	1 333	839	348	3 152
Maximum	**4 986 193**	3 796 202	1 189 991	204 376	37 335	689 031	1 957 181
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**19%**	19%	30%	26%	30%	15%	15%
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	7%	48%	48%	15%	37%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.2a(2012): First instance other than criminal cases - incomingin 2012

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	**3 489 286**	**104 365**	1 775 035	689 005	335 857	NAP	**585 024**
Belgium	**NA**	**762 164**	NAP	NA	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Bulgaria	**392 320**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	**28 726**	**363 594**
Croatia	**1 097 909**	**182 693**	423 669	476 543	NA	**12 011**	**2 993**
Cyprus	**36 868**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	**2 094**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**1 046 760**	**363 080**	290 715	NAP	NAP	NAP	**392 965**
Denmark	**2 628 863**	**46 213**	371 900	2 071 492	14 694	NAP	**124 021**
Estonia	**265 301**	**16 336**	44 136	91 218	110 756	**2 855**	NAP
Finland	**524 352**	**10 320**	476 764	NAP	NAP	**27 579**	**9 689**
France	**2 185 753**	**1 688 929**	318 333	NAP	NAP	**178 491**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**1 573 220**	NA	5 604 653	118 560	**686 985**	**1 518 404**
Greece	**709 644**	**645 339**	NA	NA	NA	**64 305**	**NA**
Hungary	**1 129 126**	**432 443**	246 856	NAP	385 241	**12 595**	**51 991**
Ireland	**NA**	**180 287**	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	**NA**
Italy	**4 010 588**	**1 559 779**	2 450 809	NAP	NAP	**51 366**	NAP
Latvia	**72 547**	**44 106**	29 068	NAP	NAP	**3 989**	NAP
Lithuania	**280 708**	**107 559**	77 669	NA	NA	**8 068**	**87 412**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**4 718**	937	NA	NAP	**1 615**	NAP
Malta	**4 507**	**4 161**	NAP	NAP	NAP	**346**	NAP
Netherlands	**1 258 187**	**NA**	NA	NAP	NAP	**114 930**	NAP
Poland	**10 045 154**	**1 066 935**	4 800 084	3 194 947	610 397	**72 160**	**300 631**
Portugal	**718 369**	**369 178**	NA	NAP	NAP	**NA**	**NA**
Romania	**1 837 799**	**1 102 677**	502 594	2 099	810	**229 619**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**638 571**	**161 645**	139 784	NAP	96 186	**18 797**	**222 159**
Slovenia	**929 328**	**62 761**	250 169	306 951	50 144	**4 930**	**254 373**
Spain	**NA**	**1 761 051**	183 225	NAP	NAP	**196 995**	NAP
Sweden	**197 441**	**65 418**	22 800	NAP	NAP	**103 745**	**5 478**
Average	**1 522 699**	513 141	689 142	1 554 614	191 405	86 771	301 441
Median	**823 849**	181 490	270 442	582 774	110 756	27 579	222 159
Minimum	**4 507**	4 161	937	2 099	810	346	2 993
Maximum	**10 045 154**	1 761 051	4 800 084	5 604 653	610 397	686 985	1 518 404
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**19%**	11%	26%	22%	19%	7%	15%
% of NAP	**0%**	0%	7%	48%	48%	15%	37%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.2b(2012): First instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2012

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	41,3	1,2	21,0	8,2	4,0	NAP	6,9
Belgium	NA	6,8	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	5,4	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,4	5,0
Croatia	25,8	4,3	9,9	11,2	NA	0,3	0,1
Cyprus	4,3	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,2	NA
Czech Republic	10,0	3,5	2,8	NAP	NAP	NAP	3,7
Denmark	46,9	0,8	6,6	37,0	0,3	NAP	2,2
Estonia	20,6	1,3	3,4	7,1	8,6	0,2	NAP
Finland	9,7	0,2	8,8	NAP	NAP	0,5	0,2
France	3,3	2,6	0,5	NAP	NAP	0,3	NAP
Germany	NA	2,0	NA	7,0	0,1	0,9	1,9
Greece	6,4	5,8	NA	NA	NA	0,6	NA
Hungary	11,4	4,4	2,5	NAP	3,9	0,1	0,5
Ireland	NA	3,9	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	6,7	2,6	4,1	NAP	NAP	0,1	NAP
Latvia	3,5	2,2	1,4	NAP	NAP	0,2	NAP
Lithuania	9,3	3,6	2,6	NA	NA	0,3	2,9
Luxembourg	NA	0,9	0,2	NA	NAP	0,3	NAP
Malta	1,1	1,0	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,1	NAP
Netherlands	7,5	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	0,7	NAP
Poland	26,1	2,8	12,5	8,3	1,6	0,2	0,8
Portugal	6,8	3,5	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Romania	8,6	5,2	2,4	0,0	0,0	1,1	NAP
Slovak Republic	11,8	3,0	2,6	NAP	1,8	0,3	4,1
Slovenia	45,1	3,0	12,2	14,9	2,4	0,2	12,4
Spain	NA	3,8	0,4	NAP	NAP	0,4	NAP
Sweden	2,1	0,7	0,2	NAP	NAP	1,1	0,1
Average	14,3	2,9	5,2	11,7	2,5	0,4	3,1
Median	9,0	2,9	2,7	8,2	1,8	0,3	2,2
Minimum	1,1	0,2	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,1
Maximum	46,9	6,8	21,0	37,0	8,6	1,1	12,4
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	11%	26%	22%	19%	7%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	48%	48%	15%	37%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.3(2012): First instance other than criminal cases - resolved in 2012

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	3 476 472	104 977	1 786 647	664 726	335 857	NAP	584 265
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	387 832	NA	NA	NA	NA	26 462	361 370
Croatia	1 119 696	173 631	458 860	479 099	NA	4 936	4 170
Cyprus	32 092	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 550	NA
Czech Republic	1 190 182	358 886	298 084	NAP	NAP	NAP	533 212
Denmark	2 656 912	50 361	394 750	2 070 365	15 366	NAP	125 486
Estonia	295 674	18 370	46 041	92 043	136 207	3 013	NAP
Finland	497 063	10 653	449 101	NAP	NAP	27 852	9 457
France	2 189 186	1 675 838	322 968	NAP	NAP	190 380	NAP
Germany	3 888 915	1 578 891	NA	NA	NA	698 569	1 519 898
Greece	464 392	372 296	NA	NA	NA	92 096	NA
Hungary	1 176 429	454 369	262 314	NAP	394 348	13 599	51 799
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	4 346 215	2 047 289	2 298 926	NAP	NAP	143 713	NAP
Latvia	81 520	51 930	29 483	NAP	NAP	5 205	NAP
Lithuania	282 163	108 099	78 051	NA	NA	7 914	88 099
Luxembourg	NA	8 155	937	NA	NAP	1 127	NAP
Malta	4 875	4 736	NAP	NAP	NAP	139	NAP
Netherlands	1 243 457	159 165	972 185	NAP	NAP	112 107	NAP
Poland	10 100 564	944 559	4 944 396	3 240 327	603 887	71 865	295 530
Portugal	689 351	360 694	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Romania	1 758 314	1 091 430	484 834	2 187	565	179 298	NAP
Slovak Republic	580 653	131 856	137 139	NAP	95 900	8 865	206 893
Slovenia	981 418	63 689	261 325	337 182	50 506	5 424	263 292
Spain	NA	1 754 816	184 107	NAP	NAP	243 718	NAP
Sweden	200 774	64 651	21 937	NAP	NAP	108 724	5 462
Average	1 636 702	503 884	706 952	983 704	204 080	92 693	311 456
Median	981 418	159 165	298 084	479 099	116 054	26 462	206 893
Minimum	4 875	4 736	937	2 187	565	139	4 170
Maximum	10 100 564	2 047 289	4 944 396	3 240 327	603 887	698 569	1 519 898
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	15%	15%	22%	26%	22%	7%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	48%	48%	15%	37%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.4a(2012): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2012

Absolute values (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	517 295	38 918	386 336	41 484	NA	NAP	50 557
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	78 993	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 886	68 107
Croatia	408 713	217 582	126 354	54 928	NA	7 075	2 774
Cyprus	46 955	NA	NA	NA	NA	5 395	NA
Czech Republic	378 764	171 113	36 450	NAP	NAP	NAP	171 201
Denmark	120 108	22 804	57 548	2 460	6 852	NAP	27 580
Estonia	35 558	8 393	11 434	2 957	11 884	890	NAP
Finland	136 877	9 496	103 109	NAP	NAP	18 930	5 342
France	1 650 754	1 428 811	64 473	NAP	NAP	157 470	NAP
Germany	NA	792 594	NA	NA	NA	677 447	1 955 687
Greece	861 643	478 241	NA	NA	NA	383 402	NA
Hungary	NA	120 187	36 327	NAP	NA	5 479	57 074
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	4 650 566	3 308 692	1 341 874	NAP	NAP	348 896	NAP
Latvia	41 530	34 227	3 023	NAP	NAP	4 280	NAP
Lithuania	33 908	26 005	1 079	NA	NA	3 128	3 696
Luxembourg	NA	1 635	0	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Malta	9 437	8 882	NAP	NAP	NAP	555	NAP
Netherlands	285 340	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	50 010	NAP
Poland	1 375 396	505 040	573 450	158 992	27 106	22 132	88 676
Portugal	1 624 277	364 305	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Romania	777 991	578 043	62 572	1 366	2 526	133 484	NAP
Slovak Republic	346 982	157 862	71 718	NAP	6 510	17 815	93 077
Slovenia	303 220	55 486	188 531	14 705	477	1 936	42 085
Spain	NA	1 270 383	57 993	NAP	NAP	285 005	NAP
Sweden	81 895	31 684	9 368	NAP	NAP	37 675	3 168
Average	655 533	437 745	173 980	39 556	9 226	108 595	197 617
Median	303 220	139 025	60 283	14 705	6 681	18 373	50 557
Minimum	9 437	1 635	0	1 366	477	555	2 774
Maximum	4 650 566	3 308 692	1 341 874	158 992	27 106	677 447	1 955 687
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	19%	26%	26%	30%	11%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	48%	48%	15%	37%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.1.1.4b(2012): First instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2012

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	6,1	0,5	4,6	0,5	NA	NAP	0,6
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	1,1	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,1	0,9
Croatia	9,6	5,1	3,0	1,3	NA	0,2	0,1
Cyprus	5,4	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,6	NA
Czech Republic	3,6	1,6	0,3	NAP	NAP	NAP	1,6
Denmark	2,1	0,4	1,0	0,0	0,1	NAP	0,5
Estonia	2,8	0,7	0,9	0,2	0,9	0,1	NAP
Finland	2,5	0,2	1,9	NAP	NAP	0,3	0,1
France	2,5	2,2	0,1	NAP	NAP	0,2	NAP
Germany	NA	1,0	NA	NA	NA	0,8	2,4
Greece	7,8	4,3	NA	NA	NA	3,5	NA
Hungary	NA	1,2	0,4	NAP	NA	0,1	0,6
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	7,8	5,5	2,2	NAP	NAP	0,6	NAP
Latvia	2,0	1,7	0,1	NAP	NAP	0,2	NAP
Lithuania	1,1	0,9	0,0	NA	NA	0,1	0,1
Luxembourg	NA	0,3	0,0	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Malta	2,2	2,1	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,1	NAP
Netherlands	1,7	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	0,3	NAP
Poland	3,6	1,3	1,5	0,4	0,1	0,1	0,2
Portugal	15,5	3,5	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Romania	3,7	2,7	0,3	0,0	0,0	0,6	NAP
Slovak Republic	6,4	2,9	1,3	NAP	0,1	0,3	1,7
Slovenia	14,7	2,7	9,2	0,7	0,0	0,1	2,0
Spain	NA	2,8	0,1	NAP	NAP	0,6	NAP
Sweden	0,9	0,3	0,1	NAP	NAP	0,4	0,0
Average	4,9	2,0	1,5	0,5	0,2	0,5	0,8
Median	3,6	1,7	0,6	0,4	0,1	0,3	0,6
Minimum	0,9	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0
Maximum	15,5	5,5	9,2	1,3	0,9	3,5	2,4
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	19%	26%	26%	30%	11%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	48%	48%	15%	37%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Clearance Rate and Disposition Time for first instance other than criminal cases

Table 3.2.1.1(2021): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2021 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**99,8%**	**103,7%**	**98,1%**	96,8%	100,0%	*100,5%*	*98,9%*	NAP	NAP	**125,2%**	**104,4%**
Belgium	**104,5%**	**105,7%**	**100,0%**	NAP	100,0%	*NAP*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**131,1%**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**101,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**100,1%**	**NA**
Croatia	**97,3%**	**80,6%**	**100,4%**	96,6%	101,2%	*99,8%*	*107,5%*	*NAP*	NAP	**101,8%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**81,3%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**45,9%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**102,6%**	**103,5%**	**101,3%**	101,8%	99,5%	*NAP*	*99,5%*	*NAP*	92,2%	**118,9%**	**113,5%**
Denmark	**100,3%**	**97,6%**	**100,5%**	103,0%	100,2%	*100,1%*	*109,2%*	*NAP*	96,9%	**NAP**	**99,1%**
Estonia	**99,0%**	**100,0%**	**99,0%**	95,8%	99,9%	*99,9%*	*99,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**89,6%**	**NAP**
Finland	**102,3%**	**100,3%**	**102,5%**	102,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**101,7%**	**99,6%**
France	**105,3%**	**107,2%**	**104,7%**	104,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**96,6%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**105,1%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*56,8%*	*NA*	NA	**109,9%**	**104,0%**
Greece	**91,2%**	**82,4%**	**87,8%**	87,0%	102,3%	*111,9%*	*77,1%*	*100,0%*	85,0%	**129,7%**	**74,6%**
Hungary	**103,7%**	**105,5%**	**103,0%**	103,0%	103,0%	*NAP*	*103,1%*	*99,6%*	103,8%	**107,8%**	**104,7%**
Ireland	**75,4%**	**71,6%**	**90,3%**	90,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**106,8%**	**109,1%**	**104,7%**	104,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**124,6%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**100,2%**	**102,7%**	**100,0%**	99,9%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,5%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**101,1%**	**101,2%**	**100,1%**	100,1%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	100,5%	**98,0%**	**106,1%**
Luxembourg	**99,1%**	**99,0%**	**101,0%**	100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	101,2%	**92,3%**	**NAP**
Malta	**89,2%**	**78,1%**	**121,9%**	121,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**69,5%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**103,5%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**108,1%**	**NAP**
Poland	**101,7%**	**103,3%**	**101,6%**	101,0%	101,8%	*102,4%*	*97,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,8%**	**105,9%**
Portugal	**NA**	**102,2%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**106,8%**	**NAP**
Romania	**102,4%**	**102,4%**	**96,4%**	98,3%	89,4%	*93,9%*	*65,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**105,2%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**100,3%**	**104,2%**	**99,5%**	102,2%	105,5%	*NAP*	*106,0%*	*100,0%*	85,9%	**80,1%**	**100,5%**
Slovenia	**102,1%**	**107,2%**	**100,0%**	101,7%	99,2%	*99,1%*	*99,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**94,7%**	**108,6%**
Spain	**101,7%**	**102,4%**	**101,3%**	101,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**98,5%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**103,4%**	**102,7%**	**107,1%**	107,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**103,4%**	**100,2%**
Average	**99,0%**	**99,1%**	**101,0%**	100,9%	100,1%	*100,9%*	*93,9%*	*99,9%*	95,1%	**101,0%**	**101,8%**
Median	**101,2%**	**102,5%**	**100,5%**	101,3%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*99,8%*	*100,0%*	96,9%	**101,7%**	**104,2%**
Minimum	**75,4%**	**71,6%**	**87,8%**	87,0%	89,4%	*93,9%*	*56,8%*	*99,6%*	85,0%	**45,9%**	**74,6%**
Maximum	**106,8%**	**109,1%**	**121,9%**	121,9%	105,5%	*111,9%*	*109,2%*	*100,0%*	103,8%	**131,1%**	**113,5%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*7%*	*11%*	11%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Table 3.2.1.2(2021): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2021 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**61**	**135**	**58**	87	18	*9*	*36*	*NAP*	NAP	**312**	**39**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**235**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**91**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**125**	**NA**
Croatia	**120**	**559**	**53**	228	21	*25*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	**166**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**947**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**844**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**159**	**141**	**103**	125	14	*NAP*	*14*	*NAP*	115	**265**	**1309**
Denmark	**17**	**238**	**10**	75	2	*0*	*198*	*NAP*	238	**NAP**	**61**
Estonia	**27**	**146**	**19**	67	8	*9*	*7*	*NAP*	NAP	**162**	**NAP**
Finland	**88**	**305**	**72**	72	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**296**	**187**
France	**440**	**495**	**186**	186	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**299**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**231**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*7797*	*NA*	NA	**422**	**172**
Greece	**664**	**728**	**440**	521	286	*322*	*151*	*219*	228	**595**	**386**
Hungary	**65**	**145**	**34**	31	37	*NAP*	*35*	*130*	50	**103**	**284**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**381**	**560**	**232**	232	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**756**	**NAP**
Latvia	**30**	**216**	**11**	46	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**256**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**65**	**106**	**5**	3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	27	**106**	**13**
Luxembourg	**158**	**154**	**83**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	102	**524**	**NAP**
Malta	**350**	**529**	**0**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1356**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**76**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**265**	**NAP**
Poland	**107**	**330**	**80**	56	99	*106*	*55*	*NAP*	NAP	**151**	**161**
Portugal	**NA**	**253**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**792**	**NAP**
Romania	**160**	**150**	**212**	70	765	*452*	*3213*	*NAP*	NAP	**293**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**83**	**206**	**96**	75	19	*NAP*	*20*	*6*	289	**679**	**21**
Slovenia	**54**	**309**	**34**	95	5	*6*	*3*	*NAP*	NAP	**546**	**47**
Spain	**265**	**344**	**156**	156	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**352**	**NAP**
Sweden	**117**	**148**	**130**	130	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**102**	**181**
Average	**197**	**292**	**101**	119	106	*103*	*961*	*118*	150	**400**	**238**
Median	**107**	**234**	**76**	75	19	*9*	*36*	*130*	115	**296**	**166**
Minimum	**17**	**106**	**0**	0	0	*0*	*3*	*6*	27	**102**	**13**
Maximum	**947**	**728**	**440**	521	765	*452*	*7 797*	*219*	289	**1 356**	**1 309**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**19%**	**26%**	22%	11%	*7%*	*7%*	*7%*	11%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	44%	*59%*	*48%*	*81%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.2.1.1(2020): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2020 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**99,7%**	**99,8%**	**100,6%**	102,1%	98,7%	*100,0%*	*95,7%*	NAP	NAP	**126,0%**	**95,7%**
Belgium	**98,4%**	**98,8%**	**100,0%**	NAP	100,0%	*NAP*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**108,5%**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**100,9%**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**100,1%**	**NA**
Croatia	**103,6%**	**85,0%**	**106,3%**	133,5%	101,5%	*104,0%*	*93,7%*	NAP	NAP	**106,9%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**88,3%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**83,8%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**98,2%**	**98,0%**	**97,8%**	97,0%	101,1%	*NAP*	*101,1%*	*NAP*	114,2%	**112,6%**	**102,5%**
Denmark	**100,8%**	**111,1%**	**100,6%**	105,4%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*99,6%*	*NAP*	94,4%	**NAP**	**100,2%**
Estonia	**101,3%**	**99,8%**	**101,5%**	106,2%	100,3%	*100,2%*	*100,4%*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,5%**	**NAP**
Finland	**105,1%**	**93,6%**	**105,7%**	105,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**98,7%**	**107,6%**
France	**93,6%**	**92,9%**	**97,6%**	97,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**95,2%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**98,1%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*63,7%*	*NA*	NA	**110,0%**	**100,9%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**162,8%**	**NAP**
Hungary	**98,3%**	**100,2%**	**97,7%**	99,2%	96,9%	*NAP*	*96,9%*	*99,4%*	100,3%	**89,3%**	**112,5%**
Ireland	**62,0%**	**60,3%**	**68,2%**	68,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**102,6%**	**104,0%**	**100,6%**	100,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**136,4%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**99,0%**	**96,1%**	**99,2%**	95,5%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**107,0%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**96,7%**	**93,9%**	**100,1%**	100,1%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	100,1%	**97,5%**	**98,0%**
Luxembourg	**95,2%**	**92,5%**	**101,6%**	100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	102,0%	**87,4%**	**NAP**
Malta	**90,9%**	**90,5%**	**91,2%**	91,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**106,2%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**98,5%**	**99,7%**	**99,7%**	99,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**86,3%**	**NAP**
Poland	**104,3%**	**105,3%**	**104,3%**	103,2%	105,0%	*105,6%*	*100,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**95,0%**	**100,7%**
Portugal	**NA**	**97,8%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**126,1%**	**NAP**
Romania	**96,7%**	**100,1%**	**90,2%**	93,1%	79,8%	*82,0%*	*68,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**48,4%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**113,0%**	**99,7%**	**121,3%**	102,6%	149,1%	*NAP*	*152,9%*	*100,3%*	91,0%	**86,8%**	**104,8%**
Slovenia	**98,9%**	**100,5%**	**100,5%**	99,7%	100,9%	*101,1%*	*100,1%*	*NAP*	NAP	**106,7%**	**93,9%**
Spain	**89,8%**	**86,3%**	**92,7%**	92,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99,5%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**102,2%**	**102,8%**	**100,1%**	100,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**102,3%**	**100,7%**
Average	**97,4%**	**96,1%**	**99,0%**	99,7%	102,8%	*99,1%*	*97,8%*	*99,8%*	100,3%	**102,9%**	**101,6%**
Median	**98,7%**	**98,5%**	**100,1%**	100,0%	100,2%	*100,1%*	*99,8%*	*99,8%*	100,2%	**100,1%**	**100,7%**
Minimum	**62,0%**	**60,3%**	**68,2%**	68,2%	79,8%	*82,0%*	*63,7%*	*99,4%*	91,0%	**48,4%**	**93,9%**
Maximum	**113,0%**	**111,1%**	**121,3%**	133,5%	149,1%	*105,6%*	*152,9%*	*100,3%*	114,2%	**162,8%**	**112,5%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**19%**	15%	15%	*15%*	*11%*	*15%*	15%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Table 3.2.1.2(2020): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2020 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**63**	**156**	**59**	87	19	*11*	*38*	*NAP*	NAP	**388**	**42**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**399**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**107**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**124**	**NA**
Croatia	**120**	**655**	**57**	187	27	*27*	*30*	*NAP*	NAP	**179**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**1087**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**863**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**170**	**165**	**106**	129	13	*NAP*	*13*	*NAP*	83	**317**	**1317**
Denmark	**17**	**190**	**11**	71	2	*0*	*261*	*NAP*	234	**NAP**	**62**
Estonia	**25**	**135**	**17**	46	8	*13*	*4*	*NAP*	NAP	**142**	**NAP**
Finland	**97**	**300**	**82**	82	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**274**	**176**
France	**554**	**637**	**236**	236	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**333**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**237**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*7602*	*NA*	NA	**426**	**175**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**551**	**NAP**
Hungary	**80**	**165**	**48**	43	51	*NAP*	*49*	*135*	68	**110**	**226**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**471**	**674**	**297**	297	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**862**	**NAP**
Latvia	**28**	**239**	**9**	53	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**220**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**68**	**117**	**5**	3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	24	**112**	**28**
Luxembourg	**158**	**161**	**81**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	99	**513**	**NAP**
Malta	**414**	**550**	**89**	89	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**924**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**91**	**127**	**65**	65	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**304**	**NAP**
Poland	**110**	**317**	**86**	57	103	*111*	*50*	*NAP*	NAP	**150**	**203**
Portugal	**NA**	**280**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**847**	**NAP**
Romania	**186**	**168**	**219**	70	833	*506*	*2962*	*NAP*	NAP	**690**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**87**	**204**	**77**	80	25	*NAP*	*26*	*6*	262	**585**	**35**
Slovenia	**69**	**350**	**40**	108	3	*3*	*3*	*NAP*	NAP	**443**	**78**
Spain	**349**	**468**	**202**	202	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**406**	**NAP**
Sweden	**123**	**161**	**146**	146	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**107**	**170**
Average	**203**	**294**	**97**	108	99	*84*	*1 003*	*71*	128	**411**	**228**
Median	**109**	**221**	**79**	82	19	*12*	*38*	*71*	91	**388**	**170**
Minimum	**17**	**117**	**5**	3	0	*0*	*3*	*6*	24	**107**	**28**
Maximum	**1 087**	**674**	**297**	297	833	*506*	*7 602*	*135*	262	**924**	**1 317**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**19%**	**26%**	19%	15%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**4%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	11%	44%	*59%*	*48%*	*81%*	63%	**4%**	**48%**

Table 3.2.1.1(2019): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2019 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**100,4%**	**100,4%**	**100,3%**	100,6%	99,6%	*99,3%*	*100,4%*	*NAP*	NAP	**110,7%**	**100,0%**
Belgium	**100,8%**	**100,8%**	**100,0%**	NAP	100,0%	*NAP*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**111,8%**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**99,1%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**98,6%**	**NA**
Croatia	**92,8%**	**87,5%**	**93,3%**	75,7%	98,6%	*98,3%*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**108,8%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**97,9%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**169,8%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**100,8%**	**101,4%**	**100,1%**	99,9%	100,0%	*NAP*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	140,8%	**107,2%**	**104,0%**
Denmark	**100,6%**	**91,8%**	**100,8%**	104,1%	100,2%	*100,0%*	*134,1%*	*NAP*	98,9%	**NA**	**99,8%**
Estonia	**100,0%**	**94,2%**	**100,5%**	100,5%	100,5%	*100,5%*	*100,5%*	*NAP*	NAP	**94,3%**	**NAP**
Finland	**94,8%**	**99,9%**	**94,3%**	94,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99,8%**	**104,8%**
France	**99,4%**	**99,7%**	**101,1%**	101,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**96,5%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**98,9%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*68,2%*	*NA*	NA	**109,0%**	**100,0%**
Greece	**NA**	**86,2%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**100,7%**	**104,4%**	**99,0%**	100,1%	98,3%	*NAP*	*98,4%*	*96,1%*	95,5%	**102,5%**	**120,3%**
Ireland	**75,4%**	**63,0%**	**92,9%**	92,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**100,0%**
Italy	**103,3%**	**104,5%**	**101,7%**	101,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**131,1%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**100,0%**	**102,1%**	**99,8%**	98,2%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**105,3%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**101,2%**	**101,3%**	**100,3%**	100,3%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	100,4%	**104,6%**	**101,0%**
Luxembourg	**92,6%**	**88,0%**	**104,2%**	100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	105,3%	**75,2%**	**NAP**
Malta	**91,3%**	**91,8%**	**89,3%**	89,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**120,8%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**99,6%**	**100,2%**	**100,2%**	100,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**93,7%**	**NAP**
Poland	**90,2%**	**99,3%**	**89,1%**	99,4%	82,8%	*80,5%*	*100,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**98,6%**	**93,5%**
Portugal	**NA**	**105,0%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**106,2%**	**NAP**
Romania	**100,2%**	**100,4%**	**94,2%**	96,3%	86,8%	*91,8%*	*57,2%*	*NAP*	NAP	**100,3%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**91,1%**	**109,9%**	**80,4%**	100,2%	65,6%	*NAP*	*65,6%*	*NAP*	102,3%	**81,4%**	**104,0%**
Slovenia	**101,8%**	**109,4%**	**101,1%**	102,5%	100,2%	*100,2%*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**88,9%**	**102,2%**
Spain	**93,6%**	**94,0%**	**93,5%**	93,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,2%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**100,4%**	**97,5%**	**98,3%**	98,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**101,7%**	**101,9%**
Average	**97,0%**	**97,3%**	**97,0%**	97,6%	94,4%	*96,3%*	*93,7%*	*96,1%*	107,2%	**104,5%**	**102,6%**
Median	**99,8%**	**99,9%**	**99,9%**	100,0%	99,8%	*99,6%*	*100,0%*	*96,1%*	101,3%	**102,1%**	**101,5%**
Minimum	**75,4%**	**63,0%**	**80,4%**	75,7%	65,6%	*80,5%*	*57,2%*	*96,1%*	95,5%	**75,2%**	**93,5%**
Maximum	**103,3%**	**109,9%**	**104,2%**	104,1%	100,5%	*100,5%*	*134,1%*	*96,1%*	140,8%	**169,8%**	**120,3%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	*15%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*85%*	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Croatia: in 2019, new amedments to the Personal Bankruptcy Law caused a significant increase of incoming cases.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.2.1.2(2019): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2019 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**59**	**137**	**51**	72	14	*12*	*19*	*NAP*	NAP	**440**	**40**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**418**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**93**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**107**	**NA**
Croatia	**130**	**488**	**79**	281	33	*40*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	**187**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**882**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	**495**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**158**	**140**	**100**	123	15	*NAP*	*15*	*NAP*	92	**356**	**1201**
Denmark	**19**	**222**	**12**	71	2	*0*	*176*	*NAP*	181	**NA**	**65**
Estonia	**32**	**147**	**23**	83	10	*14*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	**136**	**NAP**
Finland	**105**	**280**	**92**	92	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**254**	**205**
France	**388**	**432**	**158**	158	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**284**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**217**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*7305*	*NA*	NA	**397**	**174**
Greece	**NA**	**637**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**69**	**152**	**36**	36	36	*NAP*	*34*	*128*	64	**103**	**285**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**367**	**532**	**222**	222	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**821**	**NAP**
Latvia	**25**	**213**	**6**	47	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**225**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**52**	**87**	**5**	3	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	21	**96**	**18**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**139**	**75**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	94	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**344**	**465**	**46**	46	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**839**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**80**	**110**	**62**	62	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**215**	**NAP**
Poland	**111**	**270**	**91**	55	118	*129*	*49*	*NAP*	NAP	**123**	**176**
Portugal	**NA**	**200**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**846**	**NAP**
Romania	**152**	**152**	**157**	38	629	*347*	*3301*	*NAP*	NAP	**138**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**135**	**170**	**172**	97	208	*NAP*	*208*	*NAP*	207	**518**	**46**
Slovenia	**56**	**281**	**36**	86	6	*7*	*3*	*NAP*	NAP	**516**	**44**
Spain	**274**	**353**	**162**	162	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**338**	**NAP**
Sweden	**138**	**167**	**151**	151	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**125**	**171**
Average	**175**	**261**	**87**	99	97	*68*	*1 011*	*128*	110	**347**	**220**
Median	**111**	**213**	**77**	83	15	*13*	*34*	*128*	93	**284**	**171**
Minimum	**19**	**87**	**5**	3	0	*0*	*3*	*128*	21	**96**	**18**
Maximum	**882**	**637**	**222**	281	629	*347*	*7 305*	*128*	207	**846**	**1 201**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	*15%*	*15%*	*11%*	15%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*85%*	63%	**4%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.2.1.1(2018): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2018 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**100,2%**	**100,8%**	**100,6%**	100,4%	101,0%	*100,2%*	*102,5%*	NAP	NAP	**89,7%**	**99,7%**
Belgium	**108,4%**	**112,5%**	**100,0%**	NAP	100,0%	*NAP*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**118,8%**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**97,6%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**99,7%**	**NA**
Croatia	**104,5%**	**112,5%**	**103,1%**	119,1%	100,1%	*100,0%*	*100,2%*	NAP	NAP	**115,9%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**124,9%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**219,2%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**102,3%**	**101,6%**	**101,7%**	101,4%	102,2%	*NAP*	*102,2%*	*NAP*	133,3%	**88,0%**	**134,3%**
Denmark	**99,6%**	**95,0%**	**99,7%**	100,1%	99,6%	*100,1%*	*70,5%*	*NAP*	94,8%	**NAP**	**99,2%**
Estonia	**100,5%**	**100,6%**	**100,5%**	95,6%	101,5%	*101,1%*	*102,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**100,0%**	**NAP**
Finland	**106,0%**	**102,2%**	**105,9%**	105,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**112,3%**	**95,9%**
France	**96,3%**	**95,8%**	**98,8%**	98,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**98,4%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**97,2%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*69,3%*	*NA*	NA	**97,1%**	**101,6%**
Greece	**NA**	**86,3%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**163,5%**	**NA**
Hungary	**106,0%**	**116,3%**	**102,7%**	101,2%	103,6%	*NAP*	*103,6%*	*96,6%*	111,4%	**101,7%**	**131,5%**
Ireland	**78,6%**	**63,1%**	**100,5%**	100,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**100,0%**
Italy	**102,9%**	**102,9%**	**102,0%**	102,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**136,3%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**100,2%**	**103,4%**	**99,9%**	99,3%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**105,2%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**101,0%**	**103,6%**	**100,8%**	100,9%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	100,0%	**87,6%**	**99,4%**
Luxembourg	**95,6%**	**93,5%**	**99,9%**	100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	99,9%	**86,0%**	**NAP**
Malta	**97,1%**	**93,4%**	**107,9%**	107,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**91,2%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**100,7%**	**101,2%**	**101,2%**	101,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**95,2%**	**NAP**
Poland	**99,0%**	**92,1%**	**100,4%**	102,6%	98,1%	*96,8%*	*103,1%*	*NAP*	NAP	**105,1%**	**86,9%**
Portugal	**NA**	**109,2%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**111,0%**	**NAP**
Romania	**103,5%**	**102,7%**	**99,6%**	99,2%	101,2%	*94,5%*	*144,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**118,0%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**111,4%**	**130,6%**	**100,8%**	98,0%	101,5%	*NAP*	*101,5%*	*100,0%*	103,1%	**96,1%**	**114,7%**
Slovenia	**102,0%**	**109,8%**	**102,7%**	107,4%	99,9%	*99,8%*	*100,2%*	*NAP*	NAP	**91,3%**	**98,4%**
Spain	**91,7%**	**86,7%**	**97,6%**	97,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99,6%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**97,1%**	**97,5%**	**99,8%**	99,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**96,8%**	**91,8%**
Average	**101,1%**	**100,4%**	**101,2%**	101,9%	100,7%	*99,1%*	*100,0%*	*98,3%*	107,1%	**108,9%**	**104,4%**
Median	**100,6%**	**101,2%**	**100,6%**	100,5%	100,5%	*100,0%*	*101,7%*	*98,3%*	101,5%	**99,7%**	**99,5%**
Minimum	**78,6%**	**63,1%**	**97,6%**	95,6%	98,1%	*94,5%*	*69,3%*	*96,6%*	94,8%	**86,0%**	**86,9%**
Maximum	**124,9%**	**130,6%**	**107,9%**	119,1%	103,6%	*101,1%*	*144,7%*	*100,0%*	133,3%	**219,2%**	**134,3%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	15%	11%	15%	15%	**0%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**7%**	**41%**

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.2.1.2(2018): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2018 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**57**	**138**	**49**	69	13	*9*	*20*	*NAP*	NAP	**449**	**39**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**370**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**91**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**112**	**NA**
Croatia	**102**	**374**	**54**	167	28	*34*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	**197**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**737**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**487**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**162**	**149**	**99**	120	16	*NAP*	*16*	*NAP*	240	**412**	**1252**
Denmark	**24**	**207**	**17**	85	2	*0*	*200*	*NAP*	200	**NAP**	**70**
Estonia	**30**	**143**	**23**	90	9	*12*	*7*	*NAP*	NAP	**119**	**NAP**
Finland	**86**	**273**	**71**	71	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**235**	**214**
France	**381**	**420**	**162**	162	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**285**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**220**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*7356*	*NA*	NA	**435**	**169**
Greece	**NA**	**559**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**601**	**NA**
Hungary	**63**	**151**	**28**	32	26	*NAP*	*24*	*134*	40	**109**	**273**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**373**	**527**	**231**	231	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**889**	**NAP**
Latvia	**28**	**236**	**6**	42	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**248**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**53**	**84**	**6**	4	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	18	**129**	**24**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**123**	**90**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	112	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**322**	**440**	**3**	3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1057**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**80**	**110**	**65**	65	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**200**	**NAP**
Poland	**82**	**273**	**54**	51	57	*60*	*46*	*NAP*	NAP	**118**	**168**
Portugal	**NA**	**229**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**928**	**NAP**
Romania	**154**	**157**	**133**	24	520	*317*	*1391*	*NAP*	NAP	**117**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**111**	**157**	**114**	131	25	*NAP*	*25*	*0*	223	**401**	**66**
Slovenia	**61**	**283**	**40**	92	7	*8*	*3*	*NAP*	NAP	**406**	**52**
Spain	**276**	**362**	**153**	153	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**331**	**NAP**
Sweden	**152**	**166**	**149**	149	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**146**	**200**
Average	**163**	**251**	**77**	91	64	*55*	*827*	*67*	139	**366**	**230**
Median	**91**	**220**	**59**	85	16	*10*	*24*	*67*	156	**308**	**168**
Minimum	**24**	**84**	**3**	3	0	*0*	*3*	*0*	18	**109**	**24**
Maximum	**737**	**559**	**231**	231	520	*317*	*7 356*	*134*	240	**1 057**	**1 252**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	15%	**4%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	63%	**7%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.2.1.1(2017): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2017 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**100,6%**	**98,9%**	**101,4%**	102,3%	99,7%	*100,3%*	*98,4%*	NAP	NAP	**79,5%**	**100,0%**
Belgium	**NA**	**112,3%**	**100,0%**	NAP	100,0%	*NAP*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**100,8%**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**97,4%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**94,7%**	**NA**
Croatia	**101,7%**	**108,7%**	**100,2%**	103,2%	99,4%	*99,3%*	*99,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**126,5%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**113,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**73,6%**	**103,3%**
Czech Republic	**101,0%**	**101,4%**	**99,6%**	100,2%	97,3%	*NAP*	*97,3%*	*NAP*	103,9%	**91,7%**	**139,2%**
Denmark	**99,7%**	**102,4%**	**99,7%**	99,3%	99,8%	*99,9%*	*88,7%*	*NAP*	105,0%	**NAP**	**99,3%**
Estonia	**104,0%**	**99,3%**	**104,4%**	100,0%	104,7%	*98,9%*	*110,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**99,4%**	**NAP**
Finland	**96,4%**	**110,8%**	**95,3%**	95,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**107,4%**	**101,7%**
France	**103,7%**	**102,5%**	**111,4%**	111,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**102,1%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**101,3%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*71,0%*	*NA*	NA	**84,0%**	**102,4%**
Greece	**NA**	**96,0%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**166,0%**	**NA**
Hungary	**99,2%**	**96,4%**	**99,5%**	102,4%	98,1%	*NAP*	*98,3%*	*82,9%*	99,5%	**102,1%**	**109,2%**
Ireland	**81,6%**	**72,8%**	**93,4%**	93,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**100,0%**
Italy	**102,9%**	**106,4%**	**98,8%**	98,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**156,2%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**101,1%**	**119,4%**	**99,3%**	96,4%	99,8%	*99,8%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99,7%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**102,0%**	**102,1%**	**100,1%**	99,5%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	102,0%	**113,0%**	**104,2%**
Luxembourg	**98,7%**	**96,3%**	**102,0%**	100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	102,5%	**94,3%**	**NAP**
Malta	**95,8%**	**97,0%**	**91,7%**	91,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**146,9%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**99,6%**	**99,1%**	**99,1%**	99,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**105,1%**	**NAP**
Poland	**100,6%**	**93,8%**	**101,3%**	105,0%	97,5%	*97,8%*	*96,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**107,1%**	**105,5%**
Portugal	**NA**	**113,0%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**105,0%**	**NAP**
Romania	**99,4%**	**99,2%**	**97,8%**	101,7%	84,8%	*97,6%*	*40,5%*	*NAP*	NAP	**102,2%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**108,6%**	**129,2%**	**98,5%**	98,1%	99,8%	*NAP*	*99,8%*	*NAP*	96,6%	**118,1%**	**105,5%**
Slovenia	**103,9%**	**108,0%**	**104,7%**	112,1%	100,3%	*100,5%*	*99,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**67,5%**	**101,4%**
Spain	**93,8%**	**87,9%**	**100,5%**	100,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**104,5%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**93,4%**	**99,7%**	**98,5%**	98,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**89,8%**	**105,3%**
Average	**99,9%**	**102,2%**	**99,9%**	100,4%	98,4%	*99,3%*	*91,8%*	*82,9%*	101,6%	**105,5%**	**105,9%**
Median	**100,6%**	**101,3%**	**99,6%**	100,0%	99,8%	*99,6%*	*98,3%*	*82,9%*	102,2%	**102,1%**	**103,3%**
Minimum	**81,6%**	**72,8%**	**91,7%**	91,7%	84,8%	*97,6%*	*40,5%*	*82,9%*	96,6%	**67,5%**	**99,3%**
Maximum	**113,2%**	**129,2%**	**111,4%**	112,1%	104,7%	*100,5%*	*110,9%*	*82,9%*	105,0%	**166,0%**	**139,2%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	*15%*	*11%*	*15%*	11%	**0%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*81%*	67%	**7%**	**41%**

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.2.1.2(2017): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2017 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**59**	**141**	**51**	70	17	*10*	*32*	*NAP*	NAP	**446**	**38**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**497**	**NA**
Bulgaria	**83**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**116**	**NA**
Croatia	**114**	**387**	**63**	195	27	*33*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	**258**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**1118**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**2162**	**296**
Czech Republic	**163**	**157**	**100**	121	21	*NAP*	*21*	*NAP*	370	**408**	**1377**
Denmark	**22**	**172**	**16**	80	2	*1*	*131*	*NAP*	179	**NAP**	**76**
Estonia	**24**	**140**	**16**	51	14	*14*	*14*	*NAP*	NAP	**108**	**NAP**
Finland	**118**	**258**	**103**	103	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**255**	**195**
France	**300**	**341**	**86**	86	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**290**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**204**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*7236*	*NA*	NA	**421**	**162**
Greece	**NA**	**479**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**735**	**NA**
Hungary	**63**	**181**	**17**	36	8	*NAP*	*NA*	*147*	57	**116**	**289**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**399**	**548**	**254**	254	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**887**	**NAP**
Latvia	**29**	**208**	**6**	40	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**249**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**44**	**85**	**6**	6	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	5	**76**	**16**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**108**	**97**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	120	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**331**	**435**	**33**	33	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1147**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**83**	**124**	**68**	68	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**165**	**NAP**
Poland	**73**	**232**	**51**	54	48	*48*	*48*	*NAP*	NAP	**121**	**120**
Portugal	**NA**	**250**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**988**	**NAP**
Romania	**161**	**167**	**134**	21	583	*300*	*2937*	*NAP*	NAP	**114**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**107**	**171**	**119**	176	26	*NAP*	*26*	*NAP*	231	**317**	**57**
Slovenia	**65**	**292**	**47**	108	6	*6*	*3*	*NAP*	NAP	**448**	**45**
Spain	**258**	**329**	**150**	150	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**322**	**NAP**
Sweden	**151**	**159**	**149**	149	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**147**	**171**
Average	**179**	**242**	**78**	95	75	*59*	*1 046*	*147*	161	**450**	**237**
Median	**107**	**204**	**65**	80	19	*14*	*29*	*147*	150	**303**	**141**
Minimum	**22**	**85**	**6**	6	2	*1*	*3*	*147*	5	**76**	**16**
Maximum	**1 118**	**548**	**254**	254	583	*300*	*7 236*	*147*	370	**2 162**	**1 377**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**22%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	11%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	48%	*59%*	*48%*	*81%*	67%	**7%**	**41%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.2.1.1(2016): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2016 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**100,4%**	**102,0%**	**100,6%**	100,3%	101,0%	*101,4%*	*100,1%*	NAP	NAP	**90,8%**	**100,3%**
Belgium	**102,2%**	**102,5%**	**100,0%**	NAP	100,0%	*NAP*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**120,9%**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**98,8%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**104,2%**	**NA**
Croatia	**101,8%**	**118,1%**	**98,9%**	101,0%	98,3%	*97,8%*	*100,2%*	*NAP*	NAP	**109,3%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**106,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**112,8%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**105,2%**	**110,0%**	**104,8%**	105,5%	103,0%	*NAP*	*103,0%*	*NAP*	79,3%	**80,2%**	**74,3%**
Denmark	**99,6%**	**101,2%**	**99,6%**	97,9%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*100,5%*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**99,7%**
Estonia	**97,7%**	**97,6%**	**97,7%**	100,7%	97,1%	*99,3%*	*95,6%*	*NAP*	NAP	**105,6%**	**NAP**
Finland	**98,1%**	**124,8%**	**99,1%**	99,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**79,4%**	**104,5%**
France	**98,5%**	**99,0%**	**95,5%**	95,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99,1%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**102,7%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*71,9%*	*NA*	NA	**92,3%**	**100,5%**
Greece	**NA**	**99,1%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**148,1%**	**NA**
Hungary	**102,1%**	**98,4%**	**102,2%**	102,8%	102,0%	*NAP*	*101,9%*	*104,3%*	97,3%	**99,7%**	**126,0%**
Ireland	**76,1%**	**59,2%**	**96,3%**	96,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**100,0%**
Italy	**104,5%**	**113,2%**	**96,6%**	96,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**153,5%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**101,0%**	**107,4%**	**100,2%**	100,2%	100,2%	*100,2%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**95,3%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**101,7%**	**98,4%**	**99,1%**	99,4%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	98,0%	**144,4%**	**102,3%**
Luxembourg	**101,6%**	**100,0%**	**104,0%**	100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	105,0%	**97,7%**	**NAP**
Malta	**107,4%**	**107,3%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**114,4%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**100,2%**	**100,7%**	**100,7%**	100,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**95,3%**	**NAP**
Poland	**92,9%**	**98,8%**	**91,7%**	86,3%	97,6%	*97,5%*	*98,2%*	*NAP*	NA	**103,0%**	**105,7%**
Portugal	**NA**	**112,3%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**111,5%**	**NAP**
Romania	**101,3%**	**102,0%**	**106,5%**	107,0%	105,2%	*110,1%*	*67,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**91,8%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**106,2%**	**132,0%**	**96,1%**	93,1%	98,7%	*NAP*	*98,7%*	*NAP*	94,7%	**112,0%**	**100,3%**
Slovenia	**106,1%**	**106,4%**	**107,4%**	119,8%	99,7%	*99,7%*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**87,1%**	**102,7%**
Spain	**104,6%**	**103,1%**	**104,9%**	104,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**111,6%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**95,9%**	**99,3%**	**100,0%**	100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**93,9%**	**95,2%**
Average	**100,4%**	**103,8%**	**100,1%**	100,4%	100,2%	*100,7%*	*94,8%*	*104,3%*	94,9%	**106,2%**	**101,0%**
Median	**101,5%**	**102,0%**	**100,0%**	100,1%	100,0%	*99,8%*	*100,0%*	*104,3%*	97,3%	**103,0%**	**100,4%**
Minimum	**76,1%**	**59,2%**	**91,7%**	86,3%	97,1%	*97,5%*	*67,7%*	*104,3%*	79,3%	**79,4%**	**74,3%**
Maximum	**107,4%**	**132,0%**	**107,4%**	119,8%	105,2%	*110,1%*	*103,0%*	*104,3%*	105,0%	**153,5%**	**126,0%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	19%	15%	*15%*	*11%*	*15%*	19%	**0%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	41%	*56%*	*44%*	*81%*	63%	**7%**	**44%**

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.2.1.2(2016): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2016 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**57**	**133**	**51**	76	8	*10*	*5*	*NAP*	NAP	**380**	**38**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**429**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**84**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**108**	**NA**
Croatia	**117**	**364**	**64**	189	26	*32*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	**319**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**862**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1582**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**155**	**153**	**92**	116	16	*NAP*	*16*	*NAP*	439	**421**	**1782**
Denmark	**21**	**176**	**14**	79	1	*0*	*106*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**78**
Estonia	**40**	**139**	**34**	61	30	*13*	*42*	*NAP*	NAP	**108**	**NAP**
Finland	**113**	**252**	**94**	94	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**279**	**184**
France	**312**	**353**	**111**	111	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**314**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**196**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*7030*	*NA*	NA	**375**	**394**
Greece	**NA**	**610**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1086**	**NA**
Hungary	**57**	**159**	**14**	47	1	*NAP*	*NA*	*56*	49	**109**	**277**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**387**	**514**	**250**	250	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**925**	**NAP**
Latvia	**33**	**217**	**4**	36	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**228**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**41**	**88**	**6**	4	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	14	**72**	**12**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**91**	**97**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	123	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**446**	**432**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1464**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**83**	**121**	**66**	66	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**178**	**NAP**
Poland	**85**	**225**	**64**	91	39	*41*	*31*	*NAP*	NA	**143**	**130**
Portugal	**NA**	**289**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**911**	**NAP**
Romania	**154**	**153**	**138**	33	434	*235*	*2900*	*NAP*	NAP	**170**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**98**	**130**	**121**	184	27	*NAP*	*27*	*NAP*	212	**203**	**66**
Slovenia	**72**	**280**	**58**	127	7	*8*	*3*	*NAP*	NAP	**282**	**45**
Spain	**227**	**282**	**143**	143	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**312**	**NAP**
Sweden	**133**	**164**	**144**	144	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**115**	**185**
Average	**170**	**240**	**82**	103	59	*48*	*1 016*	*56*	167	**438**	**290**
Median	**98**	**196**	**66**	92	21	*13*	*29*	*56*	123	**297**	**130**
Minimum	**21**	**88**	**4**	4	1	*0*	*3*	*56*	14	**72**	**12**
Maximum	**862**	**610**	**250**	250	434	*235*	*7 030*	*56*	439	**1 582**	**1 782**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**15%**	**26%**	22%	19%	*15%*	*19%*	*15%*	19%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	11%	44%	*59%*	*44%*	*81%*	63%	**7%**	**44%**

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.2.1.1(2015): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2015 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**100,2%**	**102,0%**	**100,3%**	100,9%	99,2%	*99,0%*	*99,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**99,2%**
Belgium	**NA**	**98,9%**	**NA**	NA	100,0%	*NAP*	*100,0%*	*NAP*	NA	**116,8%**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**99,0%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**99,0%**	**NA**
Croatia	**101,6%**	**107,1%**	**100,5%**	103,4%	99,7%	*99,5%*	*100,4%*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,7%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**90,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**119,8%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**102,3%**	**107,3%**	**102,0%**	103,8%	97,3%	*NAP*	*97,3%*	*NAP*	86,4%	**92,1%**	**56,4%**
Denmark	**100,0%**	**101,9%**	**99,9%**	99,5%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*90,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**100,8%**
Estonia	**139,7%**	**102,1%**	**142,8%**	103,8%	152,8%	*224,7%*	*100,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**104,5%**	**NAP**
Finland	**98,8%**	**94,2%**	**98,6%**	98,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**101,8%**	**101,1%**
France	**97,7%**	**97,7%**	**97,7%**	97,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**98,3%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**102,0%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**102,6%**	**101,8%**
Greece	**NA**	**101,7%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**183,4%**	**NA**
Hungary	**101,4%**	**99,0%**	**100,5%**	97,5%	101,9%	*NAP*	*101,9%*	*104,8%*	100,2%	**105,3%**	**132,4%**
Ireland	**76,6%**	**63,2%**	**93,9%**	93,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**100,0%**
Italy	**111,7%**	**120,1%**	**105,0%**	105,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**141,9%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**101,0%**	**108,6%**	**99,8%**	105,7%	99,1%	*99,1%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**106,0%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**100,5%**	**102,5%**	**100,2%**	100,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	98,8%	**99,7%**	**98,9%**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**105,4%**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**90,7%**	**NAP**
Malta	**110,5%**	**107,3%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**410,7%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**100,6%**	**100,4%**	**100,4%**	100,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**103,0%**	**NAP**
Poland	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**116,3%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**79,8%**	**NAP**
Romania	**106,1%**	**104,7%**	**106,1%**	106,9%	103,9%	*112,7%*	*55,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**132,7%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**105,1%**	**132,8%**	**99,8%**	100,6%	99,0%	*NAP*	*99,0%*	*NAP*	NA	**124,1%**	**93,8%**
Slovenia	**107,4%**	**104,9%**	**109,7%**	124,7%	100,4%	*100,4%*	*100,4%*	*NAP*	NAP	**101,0%**	**102,3%**
Spain	**99,7%**	**94,7%**	**102,1%**	102,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**117,3%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**103,5%**	**103,9%**	**101,5%**	101,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**103,7%**	**102,2%**
Average	**102,5%**	**103,3%**	**103,4%**	102,6%	104,9%	*119,3%*	*94,6%*	*104,8%*	95,1%	**122,9%**	**99,0%**
Median	**101,0%**	**102,3%**	**100,4%**	101,2%	100,0%	*100,0%*	*99,9%*	*104,8%*	98,8%	**103,7%**	**100,8%**
Minimum	**76,6%**	**63,2%**	**93,9%**	93,9%	97,3%	*99,0%*	*55,7%*	*104,8%*	86,4%	**79,8%**	**56,4%**
Maximum	**139,7%**	**132,8%**	**142,8%**	124,7%	152,8%	*224,7%*	*101,9%*	*104,8%*	100,2%	**410,7%**	**132,4%**
Nb of values	**26**	**26**	**26**	26	26	26	26	26	26	**26**	**26**
% of NA	**19%**	**8%**	**27%**	23%	12%	*12%*	*12%*	*12%*	27%	**0%**	**12%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	8%	46%	*62%*	*50%*	*85%*	62%	**12%**	**46%**

Belgium: The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Table 3.2.1.2(2015): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2015 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**53**	**131**	**53**	75	13	*15*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**39**
Belgium	**NA**	**87**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**444**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**78**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**122**	**NA**
Croatia	**132**	**391**	**66**	218	22	*27*	*8*	*NAP*	NAP	**413**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**839**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1391**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**164**	**159**	**107**	133	29	*NAP*	*29*	*NAP*	326	**437**	**2011**
Denmark	**17**	**174**	**11**	69	1	*0*	*178*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**77**
Estonia	**39**	**136**	**33**	61	28	*39*	*11*	*NAP*	NAP	**117**	**NAP**
Finland	**111**	**332**	**91**	91	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**271**	**196**
France	**304**	**346**	**93**	93	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**313**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**190**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**349**	**515**
Greece	**NA**	**378**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**964**	**NA**
Hungary	**59**	**159**	**17**	54	1	*NAP*	*NA*	*82*	47	**110**	**306**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NA**
Italy	**393**	**527**	**227**	227	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1008**	**NAP**
Latvia	**38**	**238**	**4**	36	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**200**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**50**	**96**	**3**	2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	13	**236**	**18**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**86**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**NA**	**NAP**
Malta	**447**	**445**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**495**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**87**	**115**	**74**	74	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**168**	**NAP**
Poland	**-**	**-**	**-**	-	-	*-*	*-*	*-*	-	**-**	**-**
Portugal	**NA**	**315**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**989**	**NAP**
Romania	**154**	**154**	**154**	54	431	*258*	*2357*	*NAP*	NAP	**170**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**240**	**401**	**118**	202	26	*NAP*	*26*	*NAP*	NA	**374**	**246**
Slovenia	**82**	**277**	**74**	162	5	*6*	*2*	*NAP*	NAP	**122**	**46**
Spain	**238**	**325**	**134**	134	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**317**	**NAP**
Sweden	**126**	**152**	**141**	141	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**105**	**185**
Average	**182**	**244**	**82**	107	62	*58*	*327*	*82*	129	**414**	**364**
Median	**119**	**190**	**74**	91	22	*21*	*19*	*82*	47	**315**	**191**
Minimum	**17**	**86**	**3**	2	1	*0*	*2*	*82*	13	**105**	**18**
Maximum	**839**	**527**	**227**	227	431	*258*	*2 357*	*82*	326	**1 391**	**2 011**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**11%**	**30%**	26%	15%	*11%*	*15%*	*11%*	26%	**4%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**4%**	7%	48%	*63%*	*52%*	*81%*	59%	**11%**	**44%**

Belgium: The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Greece: Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.2.1.1 (2014): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2014 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases**
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	NA	103,0%	NA	100,5%	NA	*96,6%*	*99,9%*	*NA*	NA	NAP	99,7%
Belgium	NA	97,9%	NA	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	88,2%	NAP
Bulgaria	102,0%	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	100,8%	NA
Croatia	103,2%	113,4%	101,2%	106,7%	99,3%	*99,1%*	*100,1%*	*NAP*	NAP	85,8%	NAP
Cyprus	88,5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	103,5%	NA
Czech Republic	97,3%	104,7%	93,5%	84,4%	98,1%	*NAP*	*98,1%*	*NAP*	99,9%	90,9%	44,7%
Denmark	100,0%	102,2%	99,9%	99,2%	100,1%	*100,0%*	*115,1%*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	99,8%
Estonia	98,2%	104,2%	97,8%	91,7%	99,5%	*100,1%*	*98,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	90,4%	NAP
Finland	102,3%	104,6%	102,6%	102,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	97,1%	99,4%
France	94,9%	94,4%	96,8%	96,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	96,3%	NAP
Germany	NA	100,2%	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*75,3%*	*NA*	NA	100,3%	87,5%
Greece	NA	113,1%	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	102,7%	104,3%	102,2%	101,3%	102,6%	*NAP*	*102,6%*	*96,2%*	91,2%	92,1%	109,3%
Ireland	72,8%	55,6%	96,2%	96,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	100,0%
Italy	109,3%	119,3%	101,4%	101,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	155,6%	NAP
Latvia	100,4%	98,5%	100,1%	100,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	143,9%	NAP
Lithuania	98,8%	97,5%	101,0%	101,3%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	98,5%	89,4%	99,8%
Luxembourg	NA	96,8%	NA	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	93,5%	NAP
Malta	102,2%	101,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	148,7%	NAP
Netherlands	99,1%	99,1%	99,1%	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	98,9%	NAP
Poland	101,9%	99,3%	102,4%	104,8%	100,0%	*100,1%*	*98,4%*	*NA*	NA	96,5%	98,2%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Romania	111,1%	108,7%	105,7%	110,2%	94,1%	*100,7%*	*45,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	161,0%	NAP
Slovak Republic	101,9%	91,7%	101,2%	101,1%	101,4%	*NAP*	*101,4%*	*NAP*	NA	124,8%	108,2%
Slovenia	103,8%	109,1%	102,7%	105,5%	101,0%	*101,1%*	*100,5%*	*NAP*	NAP	103,0%	105,2%
Spain	101,1%	98,0%	102,2%	102,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	112,5%	NAP
Sweden	103,1%	103,9%	101,5%	101,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	102,8%	104,9%
Average	99,7%	100,9%	100,4%	100,4%	99,6%	*99,7%*	*94,2%*	*96,2%*	96,5%	108,0%	96,4%
Median	101,9%	101,8%	101,2%	101,3%	100,0%	*100,1%*	*99,9%*	*96,2%*	98,5%	99,6%	99,8%
Minimum	72,8%	55,6%	93,5%	84,4%	94,1%	*96,6%*	*45,7%*	*96,2%*	91,2%	85,8%	44,7%
Maximum	111,1%	119,3%	105,7%	110,2%	102,6%	*101,1%*	*115,1%*	*96,2%*	99,9%	161,0%	109,3%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	11%	30%	26%	22%	*15%*	*15%*	*22%*	33%	7%	11%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	7%	44%	*59%*	*44%*	*74%*	56%	11%	44%

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the number of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases in 2014 is comparable with General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases + Non-litigious enforcement cases in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.
Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.2.1.2 (2014): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2014 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases**
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	NA	130	NA	78	NA	*13*	*5*	*NA*	NA	NAP	36
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NA	625	NAP
Bulgaria	78	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	124	NA
Croatia	134	380	69	178	28	*33*	*9*	*NAP*	NAP	426	NAP
Cyprus	903	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	1775	NA
Czech Republic	157	163	64	160	20	*NAP*	*20*	*NAP*	24	415	2236
Denmark	19	177	12	64	1	*0*	*147*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	80
Estonia	33	125	24	78	10	*14*	*5*	*NAP*	NAP	141	NAP
Finland	103	289	84	84	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	280	196
France	304	348	89	89	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	305	NAP
Germany	NA	198	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	367	473
Greece	NA	330	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	63	144	15	50	1	*NAP*	*NA*	*137*	61	148	380
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	377	532	228	228	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	984	NAP
Latvia	179	255	53	53	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	155	NAP
Lithuania	54	97	4	3	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	13	310	15
Luxembourg	NA	103	NA	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	558	536	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	1408	NAP
Netherlands	91	132	75	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	171	NAP
Poland	55	203	30	36	23	*23*	*25*	*NA*	NA	139	154
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Romania	148	146	166	73	449	*295*	*2919*	*NAP*	NAP	179	NAP
Slovak Republic	231	524	115	197	23	*NAP*	*23*	*NAP*	NA	397	163
Slovenia	102	270	103	249	6	*7*	*4*	*NAP*	NAP	112	49
Spain	242	318	142	142	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	361	NAP
Sweden	133	157	141	141	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	114	194
Average	198	253	83	112	62	*55*	*351*	*137*	33	426	361
Median	133	201	75	84	20	*14*	*20*	*137*	24	305	163
Minimum	19	97	4	3	1	*0*	*4*	*137*	13	112	15
Maximum	903	536	228	249	449	*295*	*2 919*	*137*	61	1 775	2 236
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	27	27
% of NA	26%	19%	33%	30%	22%	*15%*	*22%*	*22%*	33%	11%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	7%	44%	*59%*	*44%*	*74%*	56%	11%	44%

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the number of General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases in 2014 is comparable with General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases + Non-litigious enforcement cases in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: for civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office. As far as the category “other”, there are the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and involve information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. Some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding question 91. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable with the 2013 data.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.2.1.1(2013): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 2013 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	100,8%	101,0%	100,3%	102,8%	100,0%	NAP	100,4%
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	100,9%	NA	NA	NA	NA	108,6%	100,3%
Croatia	102,2%	101,2%	105,5%	102,6%	99,7%	64,3%	NAP
Cyprus	NA	78,3%	NA	NA	NA	57,5%	NA
Czech Republic	96,8%	90,2%	102,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP	91,8%
Denmark	100,3%	107,1%	100,5%	100,0%	112,8%	NAP	99,5%
Estonia	NA	107,6%	99,7%	99,2%	101,2%	90,9%	NAP
Finland	99,9%	106,3%	100,1%	NAP	NAP	94,8%	97,8%
France	98,2%	97,5%	98,4%	NAP	NAP	104,2%	NAP
Germany	NA	99,4%	NA	NA	NA	99,7%	87,5%
Greece	NA	80,1%	NA	NA	NA	153,4%	NA
Hungary	97,5%	97,9%	99,2%	NAP	95,2%	104,3%	127,4%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	106,6%	118,1%	99,5%	NAP	NAP	190,2%	NAP
Latvia	105,7%	109,2%	96,4%	NAP	NAP	163,3%	NAP
Lithuania	97,3%	98,9%	99,0%	NA	NA	65,4%	100,2%
Luxembourg	NA	181,6%	100,0%	NA	NAP	93,5%	NAP
Malta	104,1%	109,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP	40,1%	NAP
Netherlands	98,5%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	100,3%	NAP
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	NA	103,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP
Romania	110,1%	112,2%	100,2%	110,0%	54,5%	130,2%	NAP
Slovak Republic	90,7%	80,6%	103,3%	NAP	98,6%	84,6%	88,2%
Slovenia	101,9%	102,4%	104,2%	102,1%	99,5%	101,8%	99,9%
Spain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	100,7%	101,0%	100,9%	NAP	NAP	100,7%	96,1%
Average	100,7%	104,0%	100,6%	102,8%	95,2%	102,5%	99,0%
Median	100,7%	101,2%	100,2%	102,4%	99,6%	100,3%	99,5%
Minimum	90,7%	78,3%	96,4%	99,2%	54,5%	40,1%	87,5%
Maximum	110,1%	181,6%	105,5%	110,0%	112,8%	190,2%	127,4%
Nb of values	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	32%	16%	24%	28%	20%	8%	12%
% of NAP	0%	0%	12%	48%	48%	16%	44%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.2.1.2(2013): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2013 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious land registry cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	53	135	78	13	0	NAP	32
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	78	NA	NA	NA	NA	110	75
Croatia	129	386	149	32	9	493	NAP
Cyprus	NA	638	NA	NA	NA	775	NA
Czech Republic	76	187	30	NAP	NAP	NAP	62
Denmark	18	164	56	0	139	NAP	83
Estonia	NA	130	84	15	7	139	NAP
Finland	97	288	80	NAP	NAP	277	205
France	274	308	80	NAP	NAP	284	NAP
Germany	NA	192	NA	NA	NA	357	473
Greece	NA	407	NA	NA	NA	1148	NA
Hungary	NA	169	53	NAP	NA	115	335
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	369	608	193	NAP	NAP	1043	NAP
Latvia	167	247	50	NAP	NAP	203	NAP
Lithuania	53	94	8	NA	NA	290	15
Luxembourg	NA	53	0	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Malta	789	750	NAP	NAP	NAP	2036	NAP
Netherlands	91	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	164	NAP
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	NA	386	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP
Romania	128	187	39	194	2249	106	NAP
Slovak Republic	235	505	193	NAP	27	746	187
Slovenia	111	301	248	11	6	126	60
Spain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	146	171	142	NAP	NAP	126	220
Average	176	300	93	44	348	474	159
Median	119	247	79	14	9	281	83
Minimum	18	53	0	0,4	0	106	15
Maximum	789	750	248	194	2 249	2 036	473
Nb of values	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	36%	16%	24%	28%	24%	12%	12%
% of NAP	0%	0%	12%	48%	48%	16%	44%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.2.1.1(2012): Clearance rate for first instance other than criminal cases in 20212 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	99,6%	100,6%	100,7%	96,5%	100,0%	NAP	99,9%
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	98,9%	NA	NA	NA	NA	92,1%	99,4%
Croatia	102,0%	95,0%	108,3%	100,5%	NA	41,1%	139,3%
Cyprus	87,0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	74,0%	NA
Czech Republic	113,7%	98,8%	102,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP	135,7%
Denmark	101,1%	109,0%	106,1%	99,9%	104,6%	NAP	101,2%
Estonia	111,4%	112,5%	104,3%	100,9%	123,0%	105,5%	NAP
Finland	94,8%	103,2%	94,2%	NAP	NAP	101,0%	97,6%
France	100,2%	99,2%	101,5%	NAP	NAP	106,7%	NAP
Germany	NA	100,4%	NA	NA	NA	101,7%	100,1%
Greece	65,4%	57,7%	NA	NA	NA	143,2%	NA
Hungary	104,2%	105,1%	106,3%	NAP	102,4%	108,0%	99,6%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	108,4%	131,3%	93,8%	NAP	NAP	279,8%	NAP
Latvia	112,4%	117,7%	101,4%	NAP	NAP	130,5%	NAP
Lithuania	100,5%	100,5%	100,5%	NA	NA	98,1%	100,8%
Luxembourg	NA	172,8%	100,0%	NA	NAP	69,8%	NAP
Malta	108,2%	113,8%	NAP	NAP	NAP	40,2%	NAP
Netherlands	98,8%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	97,5%	NAP
Poland	100,6%	88,5%	103,0%	101,4%	98,9%	99,6%	98,3%
Portugal	96,0%	97,7%	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Romania	95,7%	99,0%	96,5%	104,2%	69,8%	78,1%	NAP
Slovak Republic	90,9%	81,6%	98,1%	NAP	99,7%	47,2%	93,1%
Slovenia	105,6%	101,5%	104,5%	109,8%	100,7%	110,0%	103,5%
Spain	NA	99,6%	100,5%	NAP	NAP	123,7%	NAP
Sweden	101,7%	98,8%	96,2%	NAP	NAP	104,8%	99,7%
Average	99,9%	103,8%	101,0%	101,9%	99,9%	102,5%	105,2%
Median	100,5%	100,4%	101,0%	100,9%	100,4%	101,0%	99,9%
Minimum	65,4%	57,7%	93,8%	96,5%	69,8%	40,2%	93,1%
Maximum	113,7%	172,8%	108,3%	109,8%	123,0%	279,8%	139,3%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	19%	26%	26%	22%	7%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	48%	48%	15%	37%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.2.1.2(2012): Disposition time for first instance other than criminal cases in 2012 (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Non-litigious business registry cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases*
Austria	54	135	79	23	NA	NAP	32
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	74	NA	NA	NA	NA	150	69
Croatia	133	457	101	42	NA	523	243
Cyprus	534	NA	NA	NA	NA	1270	NA
Czech Republic	116	174	45	NAP	NAP	NAP	117
Denmark	17	165	53	0	163	NAP	80
Estonia	44	167	91	12	32	108	NAP
Finland	101	325	84	NAP	NAP	248	206
France	275	311	73	NAP	NAP	302	NAP
Germany	NA	183	NA	NA	NA	354	470
Greece	677	469	NA	NA	NA	1520	NA
Hungary	NA	97	51	NAP	NA	147	402
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA
Italy	391	590	213	NAP	NAP	886	NAP
Latvia	186	241	37	NAP	NAP	300	NAP
Lithuania	44	88	5	NA	NA	144	15
Luxembourg	NA	73	0	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Malta	707	685	NAP	NAP	NAP	1457	NAP
Netherlands	84	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	163	NAP
Poland	50	195	42	18	16	112	110
Portugal	860	369	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Romania	161	193	47	228	1632	272	NAP
Slovak Republic	218	437	191	NAP	25	733	164
Slovenia	113	318	263	16	3	130	58
Spain	NA	264	115	NAP	NAP	427	NAP
Sweden	149	179	156	NAP	NAP	126	212
Average	237	278	91	48	312	469	168
Median	133	218	76	18	28	286	117
Minimum	17	73	0	0	3	108	15
Maximum	860	685	263	228	1 632	1 520	470
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	19%	26%	26%	30%	11%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	48%	48%	15%	37%

*** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable before and after 2014.**

Germany: With regard to the number of incoming non-litigious enforcement cases, the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Variations of first instance other than criminal cases by case categories

Table 3.3.1: First instance courts, variation of incoming other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**-0,7%**	**1,0%**	**9,3%**	10,9%	7,1%	*3,8%*	*14,4%*	NAP	NAP	**0,5%**	**-28,9%**
Belgium	**-1,9%**	**-3,2%**	**4,8%**	NAP	4,8%	*NAP*	*4,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-0,5%**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**13,0%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-0,3%**	**NA**
Croatia	**21,3%**	**53,5%**	**16,8%**	26,4%	15,1%	*24,1%*	*-12,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**14,1%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**30,6%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**278,0%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**-1,4%**	**3,7%**	**-3,5%**	-4,9%	2,1%	*NAP*	*2,1%*	*NAP*	25,3%	**-5,5%**	**-10,5%**
Denmark	**-2,9%**	**5,9%**	**-3,9%**	-12,9%	-2,7%	*-2,8%*	*3,9%*	*NAP*	4,0%	**NAP**	**9,2%**
Estonia	**4,0%**	**-7,6%**	**4,7%**	0,2%	5,8%	*11,1%*	*1,1%*	*NAP*	NAP	**13,9%**	**NAP**
Finland	**4,4%**	**-6,1%**	**5,6%**	5,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-12,2%**	**3,0%**
France	**6,9%**	**6,0%**	**2,7%**	2,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**14,3%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**-11,2%**	**NA**	-9,0%	NA	*2,1%*	*13,2%*	*NA*	NA	**-6,1%**	**-8,9%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3,9%**	**NAP**
Hungary	**-0,4%**	**-2,6%**	**2,7%**	2,0%	3,1%	*NAP*	*3,0%*	*7,2%*	6,8%	**-28,2%**	**-17,4%**
Ireland	**-35,5%**	**-35,7%**	**-35,0%**	-35,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**13,6%**	**10,8%**	**15,7%**	15,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**15,0%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**-5,3%**	**-0,6%**	**-5,8%**	29,5%	-13,4%	*-13,4%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13,3%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**-5,8%**	**-1,8%**	**-9,0%**	-8,1%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	-17,2%	**12,4%**	**-24,4%**
Luxembourg	**-3,6%**	**-1,3%**	**-7,4%**	-5,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-7,9%	**-3,3%**	**NAP**
Malta	**21,4%**	**30,4%**	**1,7%**	1,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**16,7%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**-4,0%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-12,9%**	**NAP**
Poland	**-0,2%**	**-3,8%**	**-2,1%**	-2,3%	1,1%	*0,0%*	*8,5%*	*NAP*	NAP	**26,5%**	**6,2%**
Portugal	**NA**	**1,9%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**21,9%**	**NAP**
Romania	**4,4%**	**4,5%**	**4,1%**	4,1%	4,1%	*4,2%*	*3,6%*	*NAP*	NAP	**2,9%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**17,1%**	**-9,5%**	**-0,5%**	-2,4%	-8,9%	*NAP*	*-9,9%*	*2,7%*	21,7%	**8,4%**	**67,2%**
Slovenia	**9,1%**	**-1,7%**	**16,9%**	4,9%	23,4%	*27,2%*	*5,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-4,8%**	**-10,3%**
Spain	**14,4%**	**11,7%**	**17,0%**	17,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**18,9%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**-6,1%**	**1,8%**	**-12,8%**	-12,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-7,9%**	**-6,8%**
Average	**3,8%**	**2,0%**	**1,0%**	1,3%	3,5%	*6,3%*	*3,1%*	*4,9%*	5,4%	**15,2%**	**-2,0%**
Median	**1,9%**	**-0,6%**	**2,7%**	1,7%	3,6%	*3,8%*	*3,8%*	*4,9%*	5,4%	**3,9%**	**-8,9%**
Minimum	**-35,5%**	**-35,7%**	**-35,0%**	-35,0%	-13,4%	*-13,4%*	*-12,9%*	*2,7%*	-17,2%	**-28,2%**	**-28,9%**
Maximum	**30,6%**	**53,5%**	**17,0%**	29,5%	23,4%	*27,2%*	*14,4%*	*7,2%*	25,3%	**278,0%**	**67,2%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**22%**	19%	15%	11%	11%	15%	15%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**4%**	**52%**

Croatia: In 2021 there was an increase of civil and commercial cases in first instance due to an increase of labour disputes following a collective agreement in the first quarter of 2021, and to an increase of enforcement cases following a legislative change in September 2021.

Table 3.3.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**-0,7%**	**4,9%**	**6,6%**	5,2%	8,5%	*4,3%*	*18,2%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-0,1%**	**-22,4%**
Belgium	**4,2%**	**3,6%**	**4,8%**	NAP	4,8%	*NAP*	*4,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**20,3%**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**13,4%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-0,4%**	**NA**
Croatia	**13,9%**	**45,4%**	**10,4%**	-8,6%	14,7%	*19,0%*	*-0,2%*	*NAP*	NAP	**8,6%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**20,3%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**107,1%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**3,1%**	**9,5%**	**0,0%**	-0,2%	0,6%	*NAP*	*0,6%*	*NAP*	1,2%	**-0,1%**	**-0,9%**
Denmark	**-3,3%**	**-6,9%**	**-4,1%**	-14,8%	-2,6%	*-2,7%*	*13,9%*	*NAP*	6,7%	**NAP**	**8,0%**
Estonia	**1,6%**	**-7,4%**	**2,1%**	-9,7%	5,4%	*10,8%*	*0,4%*	*NAP*	NAP	**10,4%**	**NAP**
Finland	**1,6%**	**0,7%**	**2,4%**	2,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-9,5%**	**-4,6%**
France	**20,3%**	**22,3%**	**10,2%**	10,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**16,0%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**-4,9%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*0,9%*	*NA*	NA	**-6,3%**	**-6,0%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-17,2%**	**NAP**
Hungary	**5,1%**	**2,6%**	**8,2%**	5,9%	9,6%	*NAP*	*9,6%*	*7,4%*	10,5%	**-13,3%**	**-23,2%**
Ireland	**-21,6%**	**-23,6%**	**-13,9%**	-13,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**18,3%**	**16,2%**	**20,4%**	20,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5,0%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**-4,2%**	**6,3%**	**-5,0%**	35,5%	-13,4%	*-13,4%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-2,0%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**-1,6%**	**5,9%**	**-9,0%**	-8,1%	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	-16,8%	**13,0%**	**-18,1%**
Luxembourg	**0,4%**	**5,6%**	**-8,0%**	-5,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-8,6%	**2,1%**	**NAP**
Malta	**19,2%**	**12,4%**	**35,9%**	35,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-23,6%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**0,9%**	**1,4%**	**0,0%**	0,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9,1%**	**NAP**
Poland	**-2,6%**	**-5,6%**	**-4,6%**	-4,4%	-1,9%	*-3,0%*	*5,3%*	*NAP*	NAP	**23,5%**	**11,6%**
Portugal	**NA**	**6,4%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3,2%**	**NAP**
Romania	**10,6%**	**6,9%**	**11,2%**	9,9%	16,5%	*19,2%*	*-1,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**123,7%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3,9%**	**-5,4%**	**-18,4%**	-2,7%	-35,6%	*NAP*	*-37,6%*	*2,4%*	14,8%	**0,0%**	**60,3%**
Slovenia	**12,5%**	**4,9%**	**16,3%**	6,9%	21,3%	*24,7%*	*4,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-15,6%**	**3,7%**
Spain	**29,4%**	**32,5%**	**27,9%**	27,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**17,7%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**-5,0%**	**1,7%**	**-6,7%**	-6,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-6,9%**	**-7,2%**
Average	**5,8%**	**5,6%**	**3,9%**	4,1%	2,3%	*7,4%*	*1,6%*	*4,9%*	1,3%	**10,6%**	**0,1%**
Median	**3,5%**	**4,9%**	**2,2%**	0,0%	5,1%	*7,6%*	*2,8%*	*4,9%*	3,9%	**2,1%**	**-4,6%**
Minimum	**-21,6%**	**-23,6%**	**-18,4%**	-14,8%	-35,6%	*-13,4%*	*-37,6%*	*2,4%*	-16,8%	**-23,6%**	**-23,2%**
Maximum	**29,4%**	**45,4%**	**35,9%**	35,9%	21,3%	*24,7%*	*18,2%*	*7,4%*	14,8%	**123,7%**	**60,3%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	15%	15%	11%	15%	15%	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	41%	56%	44%	78%	63%	**4%**	**52%**

Croatia: In 2021 there was an increase of civil and commercial cases in first instance due to an increase of labour disputes following a collective agreement in the first quarter of 2021, and to an increase of enforcement cases following a legislative change in September 2021.

Table 3.3.3: First instance courts, variation of pending on 31 Dec. other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**-4,1%**	**-9,2%**	**5,2%**	5,9%	0,2%	*-16,8%*	*12,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-19,5%**	**-29,1%**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**-29,0%**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**-3,7%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,6%**	**NA**
Croatia	**14,3%**	**24,1%**	**2,2%**	11,6%	-12,4%	*9,5%*	*-80,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,4%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**4,9%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**102,5%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**-3,8%**	**-6,4%**	**-2,7%**	-3,2%	15,2%	*NAP*	*15,2%*	*NAP*	41,4%	**-16,6%**	**-1,5%**
Denmark	**-3,5%**	**16,4%**	**-12,7%**	-10,2%	-27,7%	*-89,0%*	*-13,7%*	*NAP*	8,2%	**NAP**	**4,8%**
Estonia	**12,5%**	**-0,1%**	**18,1%**	30,6%	-1,1%	*-25,1%*	*74,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	**25,4%**	**NAP**
Finland	**-8,5%**	**2,3%**	**-10,8%**	-10,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-2,4%**	**1,3%**
France	**-4,5%**	**-5,0%**	**-13,0%**	-13,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4,2%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**-7,3%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*3,5%*	*NA*	NA	**-7,3%**	**-7,5%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-10,6%**	**NAP**
Hungary	**-14,9%**	**-9,8%**	**-21,9%**	-24,0%	-21,0%	*NAP*	*-22,1%*	*3,2%*	-19,6%	**-18,8%**	**-3,5%**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**-4,4%**	**-3,5%**	**-5,7%**	-5,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-7,9%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**3,1%**	**-3,8%**	**16,7%**	16,7%	-	-	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**14,0%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**-6,0%**	**-4,4%**	**-9,9%**	-12,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-6,9%	**7,0%**	**-61,2%**
Luxembourg	**0,4%**	**0,7%**	**-5,7%**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-5,7%	**4,4%**	**NAP**
Malta	**0,9%**	**7,9%**	**-100,0%**	-100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12,1%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**-16,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-4,9%**	**NAP**
Poland	**-5,0%**	**-1,9%**	**-11,2%**	-7,0%	-5,8%	*-7,3%*	*16,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**23,8%**	**-11,5%**
Portugal	**NA**	**-4,0%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-3,5%**	**NAP**
Romania	**-4,4%**	**-4,7%**	**7,8%**	10,4%	6,9%	*6,4%*	*7,4%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-5,1%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**-0,4%**	**-4,4%**	**2,2%**	-9,3%	-49,2%	*NAP*	*-49,8%*	*0,5%*	26,7%	**16,0%**	**-7,0%**
Slovenia	**-12,0%**	**-7,4%**	**-0,1%**	-6,1%	113,7%	*131,2%*	*17,1%*	*NAP*	NAP	**4,0%**	**-38,2%**
Spain	**-1,8%**	**-2,5%**	**-1,4%**	-1,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2,1%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**-9,9%**	**-6,7%**	**-16,5%**	-16,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-10,9%**	**-1,2%**
Average	**-3,1%**	**-1,4%**	**-8,4%**	-8,0%	1,9%	1,3%	-1,9%	1,8%	7,4%	**3,2%**	**-14,1%**
Median	**-4,0%**	**-4,0%**	**-5,7%**	-6,6%	-3,4%	-7,3%	7,4%	1,8%	1,3%	**0,4%**	**-7,0%**
Minimum	**-16,2%**	**-9,8%**	**-100,0%**	-100,0%	-49,2%	-89,0%	-80,8%	0,5%	-19,6%	**-29,0%**	**-61,2%**
Maximum	**14,3%**	**24,1%**	**18,1%**	30,6%	113,7%	131,2%	74,0%	3,2%	41,4%	**102,5%**	**4,8%**
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	22%	30%	26%	15%	11%	11%	11%	15%	4%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	7%	44%	59%	48%	81%	63%	4%	52%

Table 3.3.4: First instance courts, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal law cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage points (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**+0,1**	**+3,9**	**-2,5**	-5,3	+1,3	*+0,5*	*+3,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**-0,7**	**+8,7**
Belgium	**+6,2**	**+6,9**	**0**	NAP	0	*NAP*	*0*	*NAP*	NAP	**+22,7**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**+0,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**-6,3**	**-4,5**	**-5,8**	-37,0	-0,4	*-4,3*	*+13,7*	*NAP*	NAP	**-5,1**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**-7,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-37,9**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**+4,5**	**+5,5**	**+3,5**	+4,8	-1,5	*NAP*	*-1,5*	*NAP*	-22,0	**+6,3**	**+10,9**
Denmark	**-0,4**	**-13,4**	**-0,2**	-2,4	+0,2	*+0,1*	*+9,6*	*NAP*	+2,4	**NAP**	**-1,1**
Estonia	**-2,3**	**+0,2**	**-2,5**	-10,4	-0,4	*-0,2*	*-0,6*	*NAP*	NAP	**-2,9**	**NAP**
Finland	**-2,8**	**+6,7**	**-3,2**	-3,2	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**+3,0**	**-8,0**
France	**+11,7**	**+14,4**	**+7,1**	+7,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**+1,4**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**+6,9**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*-6,9*	*NA*	NA	**-0,2**	**+3,2**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-33,1**	**NAP**
Hungary	**+5,4**	**+5,3**	**+5,2**	+3,8	+6,1	*NAP*	*+6,2*	*+0,2*	+3,5	**+18,5**	**-7,8**
Ireland	**+13,4**	**+11,3**	**+22,1**	+22,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**+4,2**	**+5,1**	**+4,1**	+4,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-11,8**	**NAP**
Latvia	**+1,2**	**+6,6**	**+0,8**	+4,4	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-14,4**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**+4,4**	**+7,3**	**+0,0**	-0,0	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	+0,5	**+0,5**	**+8,1**
Luxembourg	**+3,9**	**+6,5**	**-0,6**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-0,8	**+4,9**	**NAP**
Malta	**-1,7**	**-12,5**	**+30,7**	+30,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-36,7**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**+5,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**+21,8**	**NAP**
Poland	**-2,5**	**-2,0**	**-2,7**	-2,2	-3,2	*-3,2*	*-3,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**-2,2**	**+5,2**
Portugal	**NA**	**+4,4**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-19,3**	**NAP**
Romania	**+5,8**	**+2,3**	**+6,2**	+5,2	+9,5	*+11,8*	*-3,1*	*NAP*	NAP	**+56,8**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**-12,7**	**+4,5**	**-21,8**	-0,3	-43,6	*NAP*	*-47,0*	*-0,3*	-5,1	**-6,7**	**-4,3**
Slovenia	**+3,1**	**+6,7**	**-0,5**	+1,9	-1,7	*-2,0*	*-0,2*	*NAP*	NAP	**-12,1**	**+14,7**
Spain	**+11,8**	**+16,1**	**+8,6**	+8,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-1,0**	**NAP**
Sweden	**+1,2**	**-0,2**	**+7,0**	+7,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**+1,1**	**-0,5**
Average	**+1,9**	**+3,8**	**+2,6**	+2,0	*-2,8*	*+0,3*	*-2,5*	*-0,0*	*-3,6*	**-1,9**	**+2,6**
Median	**+2,2**	**+5,3**	**+0,0**	+2,9	*-0,2*	*-0,1*	*-0,4*	*-0,0*	*-0,2*	**-0,7**	**+3,2**
Minimum	**-12,7**	**-13,4**	**-21,8**	-37,0	*-43,6*	*-4,3*	*-47,0*	*-0,3*	*-22,0*	**-37,9**	**-8,0**
Maximum	**+13,4**	**+16,1**	**+30,7**	+30,7	*+9,5*	*+11,8*	*+13,7*	*+0,2*	*+3,5*	**+56,8**	**+14,7**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**22%**	22%	*15%*	*15%*	*11%*	*15%*	*15%*	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	4%	*41%*	*56%*	*44%*	*78%*	*63%*	**4%**	**52%**

Table 3.3.5: First instance courts, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal law cases between 2012 and 2021

in percentage points (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	+0,2	+3,1	CATEGORY NON EXISTING BEFORE 2014	-3,9	CATEGORY NON EXISTING BEFORE 2014	*+4,0*	*-1,1*	CATEGORY NON EXISTING BEFORE 2014	CATEGORY NON EXISTING BEFORE 2014	NAP	NOT COMPARABLE**
Belgium	NA	NA		NAP		*NA*	*NAP*			NA	
Bulgaria	+2,4	NA		NA		*NAP*	*NAP*			+8,0	
Croatia	-4,6	-14,5		-11,7		*-0,8*	*NA*			+60,7	
Cyprus	-5,7	NA		NA		*NA*	*NA*			-28,1	
Czech Republic	-11,1	+4,7		-0,7		*NAP*	*NAP*			NAP	
Denmark	-0,7	-11,4		-3,1		*+0,2*	*+4,7*			NAP	
Estonia	-12,4	-12,4		-8,6		*-1,0*	*-23,2*			-15,9	
Finland	+7,5	-2,9		+8,3		*NAP*	*NAP*			+0,8	
France	+5,1	+8,0		+3,2		*NAP*	*NAP*			-10,0	
Germany	NA	+4,7		NA		*NA*	*NA*			+8,2	
Greece	+25,7	+24,7		NA		*NA*	*NA*			-13,5	
Hungary	-0,5	+0,5		-3,3		*NAP*	*+0,7*			-0,1	
Ireland	NA	NA		NA		*NAP*	*NAP*			NAP	
Italy	-1,5	-22,2		+10,9		*NAP*	*NAP*			-155,2	
Latvia	-12,2	-15,0		-1,5		*NAP*	*NAP*			-37,9	
Lithuania	+0,6	+0,7		-0,4		*NA*	*NA*			-0,1	
Luxembourg	NA	-73,8		0		*NAP*	*NAP*			+22,5	
Malta	-18,9	-35,8		NAP		*NAP*	*NAP*			+29,4	
Netherlands	+4,7	NA		NA		*NAP*	*NAP*			+10,6	
Poland	+1,2	+14,8		-2,0		*+1,0*	*-1,0*			-6,8	
Portugal	NA	+4,5		NA		*NAP*	*NAP*			NAP	
Romania	+6,8	+3,4		+1,9		*-10,3*	*-4,8*			+27,1	
Slovak Republic	+9,4	+22,6		+4,1		*NAP*	*+6,3*			+32,9	
Slovenia	-3,5	+5,8		-2,8		*-10,7*	*-0,8*			-15,4	
Spain	NA	+2,7		+0,9		*NAP*	*NAP*			-25,2	
Sweden	+1,7	+3,9		+10,9		*NAP*	*NAP*			-1,4	
Average	**-0,3**	**-3,8**		+0,1		*-2,5*	*-2,4*			**-5,2**	
Median	**+0,2**	**+2,9**		-0,6		*-0,8*	*-0,9*			**-0,1**	
Minimum	**-18,9**	**-73,8**		-11,7		*-10,7*	*-23,2*			**-155,2**	
Maximum	**+25,7**	**+24,7**		+10,9		*+4,0*	*+6,3*			**+60,7**	
Nb of values	**27**	**27**		27		*27*	*27*			**27**	
% of NA	**22%**	**19%**		26%		*19%*	*19%*			**4%**	
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**		7%		*56%*	*52%*			**19%**	

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the 2014 column "General civil (and commercial) non litigious cases" is comparable with the addition of the columns "General civil (and commercial) non litigious cases" and "Non-litigious enforcement cases" in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable between 2012, 2013 and 2014, 2015.**

Italy: A different classification of civil cases was introduced in 2013. Therefore comparison between different years might lead to erroneous conclusion.

Table 3.3.6: First instance variation of Disposition time of other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**-3,4%**	**-13,5%**	**-1,3%**	0,7%	-7,7%	*-20,3%*	*-5,3%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-19,4%**	**-8,7%**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**-40,9%**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**-15,1%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**1,0%**	**NA**
Croatia	**0,4%**	**-14,7%**	**-7,4%**	22,1%	-23,6%	*-8,0%*	*-80,8%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-7,6%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**-12,8%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-2,2%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**-6,7%**	**-14,5%**	**-2,7%**	-3,1%	14,5%	*NAP*	*14,5%*	*NAP*	39,7%	**-16,4%**	**-0,6%**
Denmark	**-0,2%**	**25,1%**	**-9,0%**	5,5%	-25,8%	*-88,7%*	*-24,3%*	*NAP*	1,4%	**NAP**	**-3,0%**
Estonia	**10,7%**	**7,9%**	**15,7%**	44,6%	-6,1%	*-32,4%*	*73,2%*	*NAP*	NAP	**13,7%**	**NAP**
Finland	**-10,0%**	**1,6%**	**-12,9%**	-12,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7,9%**	**6,2%**
France	**-20,6%**	**-22,4%**	**-21,1%**	-21,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-10,2%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**-2,5%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*2,6%*	*NA*	NA	**-1,1%**	**-1,6%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**8,1%**	**NAP**
Hungary	**-19,0%**	**-12,1%**	**-27,9%**	-28,2%	-27,9%	*NAP*	*-29,0%*	*-3,9%*	-27,2%	**-6,3%**	**25,7%**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**-19,2%**	**-17,0%**	**-21,7%**	-21,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-12,3%**	**NAP**
Latvia	**7,5%**	**-9,5%**	**22,9%**	-13,8%	-	-	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**16,3%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**-4,5%**	**-9,7%**	**-1,0%**	-4,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	11,8%	**-5,3%**	**-52,7%**
Luxembourg	**0,1%**	**-4,6%**	**2,5%**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	3,3%	**2,2%**	**NAP**
Malta	**-15,3%**	**-4,0%**	**-100,0%**	-100,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**46,6%**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**-17,0%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-12,8%**	**NAP**
Poland	**-2,4%**	**3,9%**	**-6,9%**	-2,7%	-3,9%	*-4,4%*	*10,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,2%**	**-20,7%**
Portugal	**NA**	**-9,8%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-6,5%**	**NAP**
Romania	**-13,5%**	**-10,8%**	**-3,1%**	0,4%	-8,3%	*-10,7%*	*8,5%*	*NAP*	NAP	**-57,6%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**-4,2%**	**1,0%**	**25,3%**	-6,8%	-21,1%	*NAP*	*-19,6%*	*-1,9%*	10,4%	**16,0%**	**-42,0%**
Slovenia	**-21,8%**	**-11,8%**	**-14,1%**	-12,2%	76,1%	*85,4%*	*11,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	**23,2%**	**-40,4%**
Spain	**-24,1%**	**-26,4%**	**-22,9%**	-22,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-13,3%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**-5,2%**	**-8,2%**	**-10,5%**	-10,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-4,4%**	**6,5%**
Average	**-8,9%**	**-7,2%**	**-10,3%**	-10,4%	*-3,4%*	*-11,3%*	*-3,4%*	*-2,9%*	*+6,6%*	**-3,2%**	**-11,9%**
Median	**-8,3%**	**-9,7%**	**-7,4%**	-8,6%	*-8,0%*	*-10,7%*	*+2,6%*	*-2,9%*	*+6,8%*	**-4,4%**	**-3,0%**
Minimum	**-24,1%**	**-26,4%**	**-100,0%**	-100,0%	*-27,9%*	*-88,7%*	*-80,8%*	*-3,9%*	*-27,2%*	**-57,6%**	**-52,7%**
Maximum	**+10,7%**	**+25,1%**	**+25,3%**	+44,6%	*+76,1%*	*+85,4%*	*+73,2%*	*-1,9%*	*+39,7%*	**+46,6%**	**+25,7%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	26	*26*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**22%**	**30%**	26%	*15%*	*12%*	*11%*	*11%*	*15%*	**4%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	7%	*46%*	*62%*	*48%*	*81%*	*63%*	**4%**	**52%**

Table 3.3.7: First instance variation of Disposition time of other than criminal cases between 2012 and 2021 (Q91)

in percentage (Q91)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	12,3%	0,1%		10,8%		*-60,2%*	*NA*			NAP	
Belgium	NA	NA		NAP		*NAP*	*NA*			NA	
Bulgaria	22,8%	NA		NA		*NAP*	*NAP*			-16,8%	
Croatia	-10,0%	22,3%		127,1%		*-41,3%*	*NA*			-68,3%	
Cyprus	77,4%	NA		NA		*NA*	*NA*			-33,6%	
Czech Republic	36,8%	-18,9%		180,0%		*NAP*	*NAP*			NAP	
Denmark	4,8%	43,8%		41,3%		*-88,4%*	*21,6%*			NAP	
Estonia	-37,5%	-12,7%		-26,1%		*-22,4%*	*-78,9%*			50,2%	
Finland	-12,7%	-6,3%		-14,4%		*NAP*	*NAP*			19,1%	
France	60,0%	58,9%		155,4%		*NAP*	*NAP*			-1,0%	
Germany	NA	26,0%		NA		*NA*	*NA*			19,1%	
Greece	-2,0%	55,2%		NA		*NA*	*NA*			-60,8%	
Hungary	NA	50,2%		-39,5%		*NAP*	*NA*			-29,8%	
Ireland	NA	NA		NA		*NAP*	*NAP*			NA	
Italy	-2,5%	-5,1%		9,0%		*NAP*	*NAP*			-14,7%	
Latvia	-83,9%	-10,2%		22,6%		*NAP*	*NAP*			-14,7%	
Lithuania	47,6%	20,8%		-42,1%		*NAP*	*NAP*			-26,3%	
Luxembourg	NA	110,2%		NAP		*NAP*	*NAP*			NA	
Malta	-50,4%	-22,8%		NAP		*NAP*	*NAP*			-7,0%	
Netherlands	-9,8%	NA		NA		*NAP*	*NAP*			62,9%	
Poland	115,8%	69,1%		31,6%		*492,6%*	*237,8%*			34,0%	
Portugal	NA	-31,5%		NA		*NAP*	*NAP*			NA	
Romania	-0,7%	-22,3%		49,1%		*98,3%*	*96,9%*			7,7%	
Slovak Republic	-61,9%	-52,8%		-61,0%		*NAP*	*-17,3%*			-7,5%	
Slovenia	-51,9%	-2,8%		-63,9%		*-63,5%*	*-9,6%*			319,4%	
Spain	NA	30,2%		35,3%		*NAP*	*NAP*			-17,5%	
Sweden	-21,4%	-17,3%		-16,3%		*NAP*	*NAP*			-19,4%	
Average	+1,7%	+12,9%		+23,5%		*+45,0%*	*+41,7%*			+9,8%	
Median	-2,2%	-1,4%		+10,8%		*-41,3%*	*+6,0%*			-11,1%	
Minimum	-83,9%	-52,8%		-63,9%		*-88,4%*	*-78,9%*			-68,3%	
Maximum	+115,8%	+110,2%		+180,0%		*+492,6%*	*+237,8%*			+319,4%	
Nb of values	27	27		27		*27*	*27*			27	
% of NA	26%	19%		26%		*11%*	*26%*			15%	
% of NAP	0%	0%		11%		*63%*	*52%*			11%	

CATEGORY NON EXISTING BEFORE 2014

NON EXISTING CATEGORY BEFORE 2014

NON EXISTING CATEGORY BEFORE 2014

NON EXISTING CATEGORY BEFORE 2014

NOT COMPARABLE**

*** Starting from 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases have been included in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases. Hence the 2014 column "General civil (and commercial) non litigious cases" is comparable with the addition of the columns "General civil (and commercial) non litigious cases" and "Non-litigious enforcement cases" in the 2010, 2012 and 2013 tables.**

**** Due to the creation in 2014 of a category "other" in non-litigious cases, "other cases" category is not fully comparable between 2012, 2013 and 2014, 2015.**

Czech Republic, Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Italy: A different classification of civil cases was introduced in 2013. Therefore comparison between different years might lead to erroneous conclusion.

Specific categories of first instance cases

litigious divorce

employment dismissal and

insolvency cases

Table 3.4.1(2021): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2021 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 668	4 824	5 083	2 409	NA	NA	NA	NA	7 002	16 604	15 535	8 071
Belgium	NA	10 009	10 013	NA	11 834	4 346	5 532	10 648	NA	46 141	76 733	NA
Bulgaria	2 566	4 984	5 144	2 406	920	951	1 136	735	894	1 252	1 341	805
Croatia	1 856	2 455	2 442	1 870	1 471	862	802	1 538	6 105	8 816	8 443	6 780
Cyprus	3 513	6 185	6 676	3 022	1 874	447	373	1 948	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	8 613	22 266	23 611	7 268	NA	NA	NA	NA	110 263	23 632	26 679	107 216
Denmark	1 967	8 255	7 409	2 813	NA	NA	NA	NA	8 087	9 661	8 678	9 070
Estonia	174	750	759	165	256	289	308	230	236	1 443	1 448	197
Finland	11 428	15 230	16 397	10 261	479	413	450	442	1 556	2 724	2 457	1 823
France	NA	41 561	98 060	NA	NA	72 685	92 992	NA	NA	24 557	40 176	NA
Germany	NA	NA	161 375	NA	NA	NA	165 851	NA	NA	146 198	NA	264 907
Greece	2 605	3 639	2 975	3 269	385	334	230	489	1 341	613	632	1 322
Hungary	10 495	24 354	26 843	8 006	950	1 460	1 613	797	2	68	53	17
Ireland	NA	5 856	4 286	NA	NA	5	4	NA	NA	5 337	5 741	NA
Italy	44 924	29 179	32 930	41 173	15 618	10 448	14 629	11 437	9 068	23 203	25 510	6 761
Latvia	973	1 324	1 269	1 028	199	334	327	206	3 003	1 222	1 646	2 579
Lithuania	403	7 678	7 599	482	68	163	164	67	2 245	1 500	1 773	1 972
Luxembourg	715	859	830	744	NA	1 511	1 578	NA	NA	1 309	1 309	NA
Malta	70	15	14	71	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	43	21	1	63
Netherlands	NA	NA	4 588	NA	NA	NA	1 872	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	58 172	80 659	82 708	56 326	5 622	4 863	5 775	4 710	6 858	24 723	25 856	5 725
Portugal	3 568	7 403	7 430	3 541	1 800	3 298	3 451	1 647	1 580	9 544	9 769	1 355
Romania	16 628	28 426	31 385	13 669	1 775	1 791	1 959	1 607	24 498	20 525	24 520	20 503
Slovak Republic	4 256	10 034	10 314	3 976	1 435	1 020	970	1 485	1 215	10 586	10 098	1 703
Slovenia	805	1 123	1 211	717	583	592	778	397	6 758	2 471	3 619	5 610
Spain	35 728	36 337	39 695	30 886	82 732	117 293	135 369	62 254	35 275	18 892	15 575	38 904
Sweden	5 205	8 564	9 132	4 637	NA	NA	NA	NA	9 546	9 316	9 649	9 213
Average	9 879	14 479	22 229	9 034	7 529	11 155	19 826	5 920	11 779	16 414	13 218	23 552
Median	3 091	7 678	7 430	3 146	1 435	986	1 357	1 485	4 554	9 316	8 561	5 610
Minimum	70	15	14	71	68	5	4	67	2	21	1	17
Maximum	58 172	80 659	161 375	56 326	82 732	117 293	165 851	62 254	110 263	146 198	76 733	264 907
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	7%	0%	19%	33%	22%	15%	33%	26%	7%	11%	22%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3.4.1(2020): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2020 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 648	4 906	4 886	2 668	NA	NA	NA	NA	9 905	14 236	17 140	7 001
Belgium	NA	11 006	8 566	NA	NA	5 460	5 839	NA	NA	53 706	65 484	NA
Bulgaria	2 371	4 830	4 629	2 572	749	1 301	1 121	929	750	1 293	1 154	889
Croatia	1 747	2 389	2 282	1 856	1 144	1 067	743	1 471	7 114	4 798	6 787	6 105
Cyprus	3 347	6 322	6 190	3 479	1 965	414	505	1 874	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	9 036	23 601	24 054	8 583	NA	NA	NA	NA	111 104	26 712	27 567	110 249
Denmark	1 734	7 239	7 013	1 960	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 184	7 707	9 873	8 018
Estonia	194	841	860	174	180	337	255	250	230	1 614	1 571	232
Finland	12 069	17 058	17 593	11 534	480	452	463	469	2 031	2 321	2 823	1 529
France	NA	75 733	79 589	NA	NA	71 501	68 734	NA	NA	30 931	45 621	NA
Germany	NA	NA	163 435	NA	NA	NA	198 766	NA	NA	92 999	NA	250 154
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	10 579	25 579	25 663	10 495	842	2 896	2 793	949	32	63	93	2
Ireland	NA	5 266	3 183	NA	NA	5	9	NA	NA	3 002	3 153	NA
Italy	44 792	25 607	25 212	45 187	15 207	14 380	14 038	15 549	9 401	22 985	23 256	9 130
Latvia	1 046	1 254	1 327	973	211	341	353	199	3 643	1 542	2 182	3 003
Lithuania	582	7 378	7 557	403	51	178	161	68	3 178	2 282	3 215	2 245
Luxembourg	764	923	972	715	NA	1 287	1 434	NA	NA	1 158	1 158	NA
Malta	170	10	7	173	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	48	14	6	56
Netherlands	NA	NA	4 147	NA	NA	NA	2 060	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	53 276	76 369	71 595	58 173	4 177	6 968	5 523	5 622	6 610	24 105	23 857	6 858
Portugal	3 427	7 081	6 931	3 577	1 286	3 710	3 203	1 793	1 537	10 163	10 077	1 623
Romania	15 599	27 892	26 863	16 628	1 339	2 074	1 638	1 775	27 048	19 859	22 409	24 498
Slovak Republic	4 515	10 395	10 654	4 256	1 184	1 404	1 153	1 435	1 621	11 944	12 350	1 215
Slovenia	638	1 143	975	806	361	837	615	583	7 916	3 033	4 190	6 759
Spain	34 092	36 090	33 185	35 731	62 273	129 287	106 654	82 573	32 530	13 741	10 843	35 275
Sweden	5 490	9 163	9 458	5 195	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 559	10 414	11 429	9 544
Average	9 910	16 170	21 032	10 245	6 097	12 837	19 812	7 703	12 918	15 026	13 315	24 219
Median	3 347	7 309	7 285	3 479	1 144	1 301	1 434	1 435	6 610	8 935	9 873	6 432
Minimum	170	10	7	173	51	5	9	68	32	14	6	2
Maximum	53 276	76 369	163 435	58 173	62 273	129 287	198 766	82 573	111 104	92 999	65 484	250 154
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	11%	4%	22%	41%	26%	19%	41%	30%	11%	15%	26%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3.4.1(2019): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2019 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 511	5 531	5 394	2 648	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 033	24 900	25 028	9 905
Belgium	NA	14 338	14 839	NA	14 926	5 886	6 015	14 797	NA	57 613	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2 396	5 600	5 621	2 375	710	1 075	1 036	749	762	1 169	1 171	760
Croatia	1 728	2 661	2 640	1 747	1 137	1 073	1 072	1 144	8 660	7 175	9 416	7 114
Cyprus	3 293	7 075	6 951	3 417	1 845	632	512	1 965	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	9 014	27 251	27 241	9 024	NA	NA	NA	NA	116 843	33 763	35 110	115 496
Denmark	1 533	4 840	4 637	1 736	NA	NA	NA	NA	9 895	10 504	10 489	9 910
Estonia	194	855	860	189	191	291	290	178	440	1 635	1 613	425
Finland	11 999	17 553	19 042	10 510	NA	NA	505	NA	1 946	2 894	2 857	1 983
France	NA	89 026	90 569	NA	NA	80 566	96 580	NA	NA	46 375	48 969	NA
Germany	NA	NA	168 629	NA	NA	NA	178 797	NA	NA	135 212	NA	292 436
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	11 425	26 735	27 581	10 579	909	1 630	1 697	842	13	123	104	32
Ireland	NA	4 073	3 573	NA	NA	13	22	NA	NA	1 496	1 258	NA
Italy	46 872	32 847	34 929	44 790	17 414	16 583	18 971	15 026	9 754	30 332	30 767	9 319
Latvia	1 099	1 534	1 589	1 044	203	330	322	211	4 041	1 908	2 314	3 635
Lithuania	709	7 705	7 832	582	70	145	164	51	3 931	3 674	4 427	3 178
Luxembourg	737	1 070	1 043	764	NA	1 367	1 625	NA	NAP	1 227	1 227	NAP
Malta	151	372	353	170	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	47	14	17	48
Netherlands	NA	NA	4 648	NA	NA	NA	1 801	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	53 202	85 975	86 108	53 275	4 090	5 595	5 508	4 177	5 549	19 596	18 535	6 610
Portugal	3 560	9 014	9 128	3 446	1 327	3 179	3 239	1 267	1 726	12 236	12 381	1 581
Romania	16 816	32 562	33 779	15 599	1 399	1 621	1 681	1 339	30 928	25 921	29 801	27 048
Slovak Republic	4 922	11 622	12 029	4 515	1 310	1 094	1 220	1 184	1 898	17 682	17 959	1 621
Slovenia	721	1 326	1 409	638	370	650	658	362	9 449	3 766	5 298	7 917
Spain	35 116	42 826	42 281	34 092	54 258	120 049	108 715	62 273	31 123	12 031	10 364	32 530
Sweden	5 692	9 545	9 745	5 492	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	10 176	18 414	23 940	9 840	6 677	13 432	20 497	7 038	13 724	19 619	12 815	27 976
Median	3 293	8 360	8 480	3 417	1 310	1 231	1 625	1 184	4 795	10 504	9 416	6 610
Minimum	151	372	353	170	70	13	22	51	13	14	17	32
Maximum	53 202	89 026	168 629	53 275	54 258	120 049	178 797	62 273	116 843	135 212	48 969	292 436
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	11%	4%	22%	41%	30%	19%	41%	30%	15%	22%	26%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%

Table 3.4.1(2018): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2018 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 700	5 497	5 686	2 511	NA	NA	NA	NA	9 922	24 910	24 799	10 033
Belgium	NA	13 483	14 926	NA	14 641	6 549	6 381	14 839	NA	53 796	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2 272	5 554	5 421	2 405	775	1 168	1 230	713	977	931	1 154	754
Croatia	1 756	2 798	2 826	1 728	1 459	1 119	1 441	1 137	10 624	9 213	11 179	8 660
Cyprus	3 322	6 695	6 724	3 293	2 196	364	715	1 845	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	9 419	26 894	27 337	8 976	NA	NA	NA	NA	117 766	21 211	28 436	110 541
Denmark	1 534	3 911	3 905	1 540	NA	NA	NA	NA	8 593	9 381	7 438	10 536
Estonia	168	805	778	194	193	282	277	187	193	1 522	1 444	250
Finland	11 444	18 001	17 579	11 866	NA	NA	529	NA	1 745	2 801	2 654	1 892
France	NA	92 802	86 771	NA	NA	90 504	97 053	NA	NA	49 083	50 039	NA
Germany	NA	NA	167 836	NA	NA	NA	173 096	NA	NA	139 752	NA	280 659
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	13 123	24 452	26 150	11 425	1 306	1 552	1 949	909	12	64	63	13
Ireland	NA	3 888	3 252	NA	NA	18	31	NA	NA	1 526	1 549	NA
Italy	47 638	34 968	35 701	46 905	18 661	19 323	20 716	17 268	11 140	30 772	31 996	9 916
Latvia	1 178	1 569	1 648	1 099	276	355	427	204	4 718	1 990	2 666	4 042
Lithuania	765	7 787	7 843	709	53	195	178	70	4 936	3 609	4 614	3 931
Luxembourg	663	668	594	737	NA	1 434	1 698	NA	NAP	1 086	1 086	NAP
Malta	126	395	370	151	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	20	15	47
Netherlands	NA	NA	4 539	NA	NA	NA	2 117	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	49 485	89 156	85 568	53 202	4 124	5 479	5 513	4 090	4 660	16 309	15 420	5 549
Portugal	3 871	8 256	8 560	3 567	1 462	3 312	3 559	1 215	2 175	12 437	12 748	1 864
Romania	16 646	34 609	34 439	16 816	1 498	1 661	1 760	1 399	33 373	27 374	29 819	30 928
Slovak Republic	5 188	11 819	12 085	4 922	1 645	1 282	1 617	1 310	2 529	15 599	15 561	2 567
Slovenia	727	1 607	1 614	720	412	642	683	371	11 661	4 158	6 370	9 449
Spain	36 185	44 433	43 893	35 116	51 797	107 294	101 243	54 274	30 239	9 115	8 728	31 123
Sweden	5 536	9 457	9 329	5 664	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	10 178	18 729	23 668	10 169	6 700	13 474	20 105	6 655	15 015	18 985	12 275	27 513
Median	3 322	8 022	8 202	3 293	1 462	1 358	1 698	1 215	4 936	9 213	7 438	5 549
Minimum	126	395	370	151	53	18	31	70	12	20	15	13
Maximum	49 485	92 802	167 836	53 202	51 797	107 294	173 096	54 274	117 766	139 752	50 039	280 659
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	11%	4%	22%	41%	30%	19%	41%	33%	15%	22%	26%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%

Belgium: Starting from 2018, incoming insolvency cases do not include cases dealt with by the new Regsol platform since mid 2017.

Table 3.4.1(2017): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2017 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 617	5 767	5 684	2 700	NA	NA	NA	NA	9 548	22 406	22 032	9 922
Belgium	NA	9 727	11 947	NA	14 984	6 769	7 100	14 653	NA	60 207	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2 346	5 393	5 343	2 396	737	1 202	1 281	658	1 087	1 135	1 251	971
Croatia	1 873	2 867	2 984	1 756	1 902	1 199	1 645	1 459	14 621	9 967	13 964	10 624
Cyprus	3 581	6 601	6 660	3 522	2 292	489	585	2 196	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	10 313	28 033	28 934	9 412	NA	NA	NA	NA	119 923	16 895	25 782	111 036
Denmark	1 640	4 124	4 212	1 552	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 406	8 454	7 708	4 459
Estonia	163	829	823	169	222	356	364	192	226	1 314	1 281	236
Finland	11 255	17 648	17 458	11 445	NA	NA	557	NA	1 936	2 384	2 593	1 727
France	NA	94 560	82 562	NA	NA	94 099	122 120	NA	NA	49 626	54 768	NA
Germany	NA	NA	174 149	NA	NA	NA	180 886	NA	NA	149 526	NA	293 027
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	11 371	28 326	26 574	13 123	1 332	2 258	2 265	1 325	39	109	136	12
Ireland	NA	3 995	3 434	NA	NA	48	73	NA	NA	3 060	1 736	NA
Italy	46 446	37 702	35 369	48 779	23 281	23 416	25 812	20 885	12 461	34 324	35 407	11 378
Latvia	1 304	1 616	1 741	1 179	308	409	441	276	5 247	2 266	2 792	4 721
Lithuania	584	7 711	7 530	765	84	267	298	53	5 108	4 836	5 008	4 936
Luxembourg	631	617	586	663	NA	1 308	1 743	NA	NAP	988	988	NAP
Malta	121	334	329	126	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	5 018	NA	NA	NA	2 720	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	47 334	88 361	86 405	49 290	5 087	6 082	7 045	4 124	3 563	14 468	13 371	4 660
Portugal	4 408	9 351	9 855	3 904	1 733	3 469	3 853	1 349	2 562	13 986	14 282	2 266
Romania	15 753	35 709	34 816	16 646	1 802	1 732	2 036	1 498	35 215	28 623	30 465	33 373
Slovak Republic	5 598	11 440	11 707	5 331	1 770	1 539	1 797	1 732	2 324	6 880	6 593	2 783
Slovenia	815	1 644	1 732	727	570	722	881	411	12 995	4 306	5 642	11 659
Spain	37 148	45 019	45 188	36 189	48 738	104 824	97 673	51 798	30 335	7 594	7 874	30 241
Sweden	5 435	9 402	9 304	5 533	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	10 035	19 032	23 859	10 248	6 989	13 899	21 961	6 841	15 388	20 152	12 684	29 891
Median	3 581	8 531	8 417	3 522	1 770	1 424	1 797	1 459	5 108	8 024	7 151	4 829
Minimum	121	334	329	126	84	48	73	53	39	109	136	12
Maximum	47 334	94 560	174 149	49 290	48 738	104 824	180 886	51 798	119 923	149 526	54 768	293 027
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	11%	4%	22%	41%	30%	19%	41%	33%	19%	26%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%

Belgium: The category “litigious divorce cases”, the variations in the numbers of incoming and resolved cases are due to the fact that, unlike previous cycles (2014, 2015), the 2016 and 2017 data does not include divorces by mutual consent.

Hungary: Litigious divorce cases in 2017 and 2016 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed due to an amendment of the code of civil procedure these cases were included in a new statistical category.

Table 3.4.1(2016): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2016 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 765	5 782	5 930	2 617	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 150	23 556	24 158	9 548
Belgium	NA	14 332	15 111	NA	14 905	7 535	7 497	14 943	NA	68 681	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2 332	5 663	5 622	2 373	661	1 604	1 527	738	967	1 281	1 219	1 029
Croatia	3 104	2 566	3 797	1 873	2 403	1 517	2 018	1 902	19 087	19 021	23 510	14 621
Cyprus	3 389	6 663	6 471	3 581	2 105	1 014	827	2 292	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	11 675	28 500	29 907	10 268	NA	NA	NA	NA	111 050	29 871	20 998	119 923
Denmark	1 557	4 375	4 314	1 618	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 182	8 499	7 248	4 377
Estonia	240	828	900	166	218	446	389	222	230	1 194	1 212	201
Finland	12 384	17 023	18 145	11 262	NA	NA	662	NA	2 050	2 725	2 852	1 923
France	NA	84 579	85 560	NA	NA	108 193	131 063	NA	NA	53 072	56 300	NA
Germany	NA	NA	184 025	NA	NA	NA	192 161	NA	NA	159 395	NA	293 924
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	10 682	27 677	26 988	11 371	1 762	2 452	2 882	1 332	54	120	130	44
Ireland	NA	4 179	3 277	NA	NA	121	105	NA	NA	2 909	1 989	NA
Italy	40 593	39 304	33 283	46 614	26 665	25 411	29 012	23 064	14 653	36 968	38 884	12 737
Latvia	1 426	1 805	1 927	1 304	397	462	551	308	5 812	2 323	2 888	5 247
Lithuania	784	7 457	7 657	584	84	264	264	84	4 775	5 058	4 725	5 108
Luxembourg	782	498	649	631	NA	1 455	1 735	NA	NAP	915	915	NAP
Malta	130	358	367	121	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	5 332	NA	NA	NA	3 752	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	46 315	89 135	88 303	47 334	5 607	8 266	8 786	5 087	3 167	11 797	11 401	3 563
Portugal	5 294	9 131	9 966	4 459	2 493	3 663	4 598	1 558	3 482	14 746	15 625	2 603
Romania	15 912	36 041	36 200	15 753	2 257	2 030	2 485	1 802	41 701	29 883	36 369	35 215
Slovak Republic	3 063	12 335	9 800	5 598	1 965	1 632	1 827	1 770	1 926	2 134	1 736	2 324
Slovenia	896	1 748	1 829	815	551	887	868	570	11 999	5 517	4 519	12 997
Spain	37 354	46 830	45 469	37 148	55 514	94 877	101 480	48 738	30 928	7 040	7 709	30 335
Sweden	5 292	9 174	9 056	5 410	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	9 808	18 999	24 611	10 043	7 839	14 546	23 547	6 961	15 660	22 123	13 219	30 873
Median	3 104	8 294	8 357	3 581	2 105	1 618	2 018	1 770	4 775	7 770	5 987	5 178
Minimum	130	358	367	121	84	121	105	84	54	120	130	44
Maximum	46 315	89 135	184 025	47 334	55 514	108 193	192 161	48 738	111 050	159 395	56 300	293 924
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	11%	4%	22%	41%	30%	19%	41%	33%	19%	26%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%

Belgium: The category “litigious divorce cases”, the variations in the numbers of incoming and resolved cases are due to the fact that, unlike previous cycles (2014, 2015), the 2016 and 2017 data does not include divorces by mutual consent.

Hungary: Litigious divorce cases in 2017 and 2016 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed due to an amendment of the code of civil procedure these cases were included in a new statistical category.

Table 3.4.1(2015): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2015 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 872	5 992	6 099	2 765	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 179	24 365	24 394	10 150
Belgium	NA	29 656	33 317	NA	15 039	7 756	8 052	14 743	74 483	10 881	12 021	76 381
Bulgaria	2 252	5 729	5 795	2 186	731	1 364	1 483	612	1 087	1 143	1 258	972
Croatia	2 946	4 384	4 233	3 105	2 773	1 603	1 980	2 396	5 014	20 217	6 151	19 080
Cyprus	3 282	6 605	6 498	3 389	2 219	637	751	2 105	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	12 448	28 941	29 777	11 612	NA	NA	NA	NA	95 282	32 801	17 047	111 036
Denmark	1 816	4 005	4 286	1 546	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 226	5 815	6 399	4 176
Estonia	300	814	876	238	232	386	390	213	237	1 145	1 146	209
Finland	12 326	18 579	18 545	12 360	NA	NA	666	NA	2 326	2 882	3 168	2 040
France	NA	86 926	84 602	NA	NA	128 489	136 021	NA	NA	57 902	59 686	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	27 446	16 764	10 682	2 198	3 231	3 667	1 762	37	77	78	36
Ireland	NA	4 314	3 291	NA	NA	135	102	NA	NA	2 368	1 805	NA
Italy	37 027	31 420	27 959	40 488	28 981	27 440	29 933	26 488	22 772	41 036	49 233	14 575
Latvia	1 565	1 815	1 954	1 426	570	442	615	397	6 643	2 557	3 388	5 812
Lithuania	560	8 164	7 940	784	85	273	274	84	4 960	4 114	4 299	4 775
Luxembourg	NA	NA	794	NA	NA	1 670	1 826	NA	NAP	912	NAP	NAP
Malta	162	299	331	130	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	5 827	NA	NA	NA	3 289	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	7 801	9 167	11 387	5 581	3 533	4 498	5 529	2 502	4 527	17 325	18 206	3 556
Romania	16 814	36 435	37 337	15 912	3 212	2 413	3 372	2 253	50 739	34 981	45 121	40 599
Slovak Republic	7 338	12 562	12 583	7 317	2 331	1 725	1 415	2 641	740	1 977	1 705	1 012
Slovenia	1 033	1 709	1 842	900	598	905	952	551	9 169	6 224	3 398	11 995
Spain	39 093	49 941	48 799	40 235	78 820	104 457	110 098	55 514	32 356	6 288	7 155	31 489
Sweden	5 411	8 939	9 070	5 280	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	8 614	17 447	15 829	8 733	10 094	16 907	16 338	8 019	19 105	13 751	13 982	19 876
Median	3 114	8 552	7 219	3 389	2 275	1 670	1 826	2 179	5 014	6 020	6 151	5 812
Minimum	162	299	331	130	85	135	102	84	37	77	78	36
Maximum	39 093	86 926	84 602	40 488	78 820	128 489	136 021	55 514	95 282	57 902	59 686	111 036
Nb of values	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
% of NA	31%	15%	8%	27%	42%	31%	23%	42%	31%	23%	23%	31%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	4%	4%

Hungary: Litigious divorce cases in 2015 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed due to an amendment of the code of civil procedure these cases were included in a new statistical category.

Slovak Republic: In evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.4.1(2014): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2014 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	3 004	6 214	6 346	2 872	NA	NA	NA	NA	10 841	23 944	24 606	10 179
Belgium	NA	33 396	32 173	NA	15 744	7 762	8 523	14 983	82 398	15 023	10 530	86 891
Bulgaria	2 280	5 822	5 848	2 254	871	1 551	1 693	729	1 227	1 146	1 294	1 079
Croatia	6 276	7 283	8 964	4 595	2 591	2 378	2 196	2 773	5 664	2 378	4 538	5 014
Cyprus	3 335	6 686	6 737	3 284	2 173	984	938	2 219	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	13 636	29 474	30 719	12 391	NA	NA	NA	NA	75 256	34 835	15 556	95 276
Denmark	1 892	4 852	4 946	1 817	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 952	5 808	7 283	4 223
Estonia	280	912	873	319	277	375	382	228	235	1 331	1 290	258
Finland	12 127	18 542	18 325	12 344	NA	NA	658	NA	2 439	3 372	3 489	2 322
France	NA	91 882	88 220	NA	NA	134 837	130 574	NA	NA	56 820	51 577	NA
Germany	NA	NA	167 014	NA	40 175	152 391	152 919	39 647	NA	143 662	NA	303 654
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	12 878	28 512	28 641	12 749	2 492	3 872	4 166	2 198	85	100	148	37
Ireland	NA	3 831	2 638	NA	NA	69	89	NA	NA	1 615	1 055	NA
Italy	36 304	26 639	26 037	36 906	29 014	22 216	22 512	28 718	22 427	42 967	45 092	20 302
Latvia	1 454	2 035	1 968	1 521	599	557	622	534	6 328	2 832	2 364	6 796
Lithuania	698	8 034	8 172	560	132	308	355	85	4 615	4 656	4 311	4 960
Luxembourg	NA	NA	589	NA	NA	1 726	1 901	NA	NAP	NAP	869	NAP
Malta	142	285	265	162	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	5 757	NA	NA	NA	3 897	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	47 162	89 791	88 752	48 539	7 201	9 727	11 024	5 904	1 166	4 469	4 546	1 089
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	16 334	34 125	33 645	16 814	3 277	3 075	3 140	3 212	60 239	45 896	55 396	50 739
Slovak Republic	7 403	13 529	13 594	7 338	NA	1 600	1 254	NA	544	1 819	1 623	740
Slovenia	1 048	1 839	1 851	1 036	743	932	1 075	600	5 288	6 596	2 717	9 167
Spain	36 349	50 604	47 860	39 093	78 832	118 213	118 225	78 820	30 530	8 132	6 306	32 356
Sweden	5 738	9 254	9 601	5 391	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	10 965	21 525	25 581	11 052	13 152	25 699	23 307	12 904	18 484	20 370	12 230	35 282
Median	5 738	8 644	8 964	4 595	2 542	2 052	2 049	2 496	5 288	5 232	4 425	5 905
Minimum	142	285	265	162	132	69	89	85	85	100	148	37
Maximum	47 162	91 882	167 014	48 539	78 832	152 391	152 919	78 820	82 398	143 662	55 396	303 654
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	30%	19%	7%	30%	44%	30%	22%	44%	33%	22%	26%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	4%

Slovak Republic: In evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.4.1(2013): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2013 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 830	6 237	6 063	3 004	NA	NA	NA	NA	11 365	24 861	25 385	10 841
Belgium	NA	34 588	33 355	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2 463	6 032	6 210	2 285	1 032	1 741	1 908	865	1 173	1 523	1 520	1 176
Croatia	6 561	8 553	8 493	6 621	2 722	1 972	2 103	2 591	2 774	7 628	4 738	5 664
Cyprus	3 378	6 846	6 889	3 335	1 749	1 038	614	2 173	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	12 965	32 804	32 559	13 210	NA	NA	NA	NA	52 032	37 637	14 920	74 749
Denmark	1 994	5 124	5 237	1 890	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	5 817	7 291	8 472	4 958
Estonia	172	691	585	275	306	451	432	277	267	1 306	1 286	242
Finland	12 203	18 185	18 262	12 126	509	638	601	546	2 251	3 553	3 379	2 425
France	NA	90 694	89 956	NA	NA	145 779	128 657	NA	NA	57 743	49 024	NA
Germany	NA	NA	167 014	NA	40 175	152 391	152 919	39 686	NA	143 662	NA	303 654
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	13 134	28 392	28 648	12 878	3 144	4 170	4 822	2 492	51	154	120	85
Ireland	NA	3 609	2 949	NA	NA	358	120	NA	NA	314	236	NA
Italy	34 738	20 580	18 936	36 382	NA	NA	NA	NA	86 501	14 792	13 261	88 032
Latvia	1 649	2 098	2 293	1 454	779	575	755	599	5 402	2 961	2 035	6 328
Lithuania	867	8 192	8 361	698	122	429	419	132	4 352	4 051	3 788	4 615
Luxembourg	NA	NA	434	NA	NA	NA	1 606	NA	NA	NA	1 058	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	6 200	NA	NA	NA	4 689	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	7 195	9 281	9 590	6 886	5 721	5 951	7 662	4 010	4 316	20 068	20 065	4 319
Romania	19 247	35 422	37 508	17 161	2 734	3 789	3 246	3 277	50 774	60 536	54 184	57 126
Slovak Republic	7 283	14 096	13 977	7 402	NA	1 684	1 127	NA	456	1 668	1 581	543
Slovenia	1 022	1 917	1 891	1 048	657	1 085	999	743	4 558	2 819	2 089	5 288
Spain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	5 677	9 503	9 444	5 736	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	7 846	17 142	22 385	7 788	4 971	21 470	18 393	4 783	15 473	21 809	11 508	35 628
Median	5 677	8 917	8 493	5 736	1 391	1 684	1 606	1 519	4 352	5 671	3 584	5 123
Minimum	172	691	434	275	122	358	120	132	51	154	120	85
Maximum	34 738	90 694	167 014	36 382	40 175	152 391	152 919	39 686	86 501	143 662	54 184	303 654
Nb of values	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	32%	20%	8%	32%	44%	32%	24%	44%	40%	28%	28%	36%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	8%	8%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Germany: With regard to the category "employment dismissal cases", the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Table 3.4.1(2012): First instance courts, number of cases for specific case categories (litigious divorce, employment dismissal and insolvency cases) in 2012 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases				Employment dismissal cases				Insolvency cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	2 920	6 354	6 444	2 830	NA	NA	NA	NA	11 557	26 152	26 344	11 365
Belgium	NA	37 497	37 635	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2 378	6 239	6 151	2 466	936	2 331	2 242	1 025	887	1 583	1 311	1 159
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	3 450	7 195	7 267	3 378	1 382	1 005	638	1 749	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	13 150	30 025	30 557	12 965	NA	NA	NA	NA	30 331	33 083	11 382	52 032
Denmark	2 257	5 219	5 497	2 000	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	6 300	8 199	9 024	5 820
Estonia	263	652	598	316	283	331	320	277	289	1 152	1 099	312
Finland	11 706	17 075	17 696	11 085	559	577	647	489	2 135	3 359	3 261	2 233
France	NA	92 864	92 659	NA	NA	124 434	130 478	NA	NA	55 561	47 942	NA
Germany	NA	NA	190 258	NA	26 968	101 369	144 293	25 360	NA		NA	
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	16 416	27 394	30 676	13 134	3 389	5 119	5 364	3 144	62	124	135	51
Ireland	NA	3 482	2 892	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	486	380	275	524
Italy	34 114	19 287	18 174	35 227	NA	NA	NA	NA	85 736	12 577	11 909	86 404
Latvia	1 905	2 389	2 645	1 649	994	549	764	779	4 825	2 626	2 049	5 402
Lithuania	946	8 196	8 275	867	146	453	477	122	4 253	3 717	3 618	4 352
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2 343	1 824	NA	NA	NA	1 029	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	6 118	NA	NA	NA	4 676	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	42 786	90 933	89 217	44 750	11 102	22 070	20 924	12 249	794	4 589	4 390	993
Portugal	7 627	9 638	9 975	7 290	6 448	7 897	8 659	5 686	3 568	20 776	19 969	4 375
Romania	20 926	42 582	44 261	19 247	3 041	3 274	3 581	2 734	48 643	57 956	55 825	50 774
Slovak Republic	7 181	13 749	13 647	7 283	NA	1 616	1 317	NA	341	1 505	1 395	451
Slovenia	1 068	1 954	2 000	1 022	622	1 038	1 003	657	3 667	2 669	1 778	4 558
Spain	37 586	49 330	47 572	37 472	38 417	147 404	108 570	64 705	20 306	10 290	4 763	25 647
Sweden	5 535	8 972	8 824	5 683	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	11 790	27 507	33 308	11 578	7 185	27 673	26 620	9 098	13 109	15 534	10 890	15 001
Median	6 358	11 694	11 811	6 483	1 382	2 343	2 912	1 749	3 568	4 589	3 618	4 352
Minimum	263	652	598	316	108	152	185	75	62	124	135	51
Maximum	42 786	124 449	190 258	44 750	38 417	147 404	144 293	64 705	85 736	57 956	55 825	86 404
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	26	27	26
% of NA	33%	22%	15%	33%	44%	33%	30%	44%	37%	31%	30%	35%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	7%	7%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Slovak Republic: In evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Germany: With regard to the category "employment dismissal cases", the number of Lander taken into consideration within the reply is different for the 2012 and 2013 exercises. Consequently, data are not comparable.

Clearance rate and Disposition time for specific categories of first instance cases

litigious divorce

employment dismissal and

insolvency cases

Table 3.5.1(2021): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2021 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	105,4%	173	NA	NA	93,6%	190
Belgium	100,0%	NA	127,3%	703	166,3%	NA
Bulgaria	103,2%	171	119,5%	236	107,1%	219
Croatia	99,5%	280	93,0%	700	95,8%	293
Cyprus	107,9%	165	83,4%	1906	NA	NA
Czech Republic	106,0%	112	NA	NA	112,9%	1467
Denmark	89,8%	139	NA	NA	89,8%	381
Estonia	101,2%	79	106,6%	273	100,3%	50
Finland	107,7%	228	109,0%	359	90,2%	271
France	235,9%	NA	127,9%	NA	163,6%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	81,8%	401	68,9%	776	103,1%	763
Hungary	110,2%	109	110,5%	180	77,9%	117
Ireland	73,2%	NA	80,0%	NA	107,6%	NA
Italy	112,9%	456	140,0%	285	109,9%	97
Latvia	95,8%	296	97,9%	230	134,7%	572
Lithuania	99,0%	23	100,6%	149	118,2%	406
Luxembourg	96,6%	327	104,4%	NA	100,0%	NA
Malta	93,3%	1851	NAP	NAP	4,8%	22995
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	102,5%	249	118,8%	298	104,6%	81
Portugal	100,4%	174	104,6%	174	102,4%	51
Romania	110,4%	159	109,4%	299	119,5%	305
Slovak Republic	102,8%	141	95,1%	559	95,4%	62
Slovenia	107,8%	216	131,4%	186	146,5%	566
Spain	109,2%	284	115,4%	168	82,4%	912
Sweden	106,6%	185	NA	NA	103,6%	349
Average	106,4%	283	107,2%	440	105,4%	1 507
Median	102,8%	180	107,8%	285	103,3%	299
Minimum	73,2%	23	68,9%	149	4,8%	50
Maximum	235,9%	1 851	140,0%	1 906	166,3%	22 995
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	7%	19%	22%	33%	11%	26%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%

The bars for Dispostion Time are not set to maximum value but they exclude the outlier to enhance visibility and comparability.

Belgium: Starting from 2018, incoming insolvency cases do not include cases dealt with by the new Regsol platform since mid 2017**.**

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Malta: The Disposition Time is very high And Clearence Rate is very low, due to the low absolute number of resolved cases in 2021.

Table 3.5.1(2020): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2020 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	99,6%	199	NA	NA	120,4%	149
Belgium	77,8%	NA	106,9%	NA	121,9%	NA
Bulgaria	95,8%	203	86,2%	302	89,2%	281
Croatia	95,5%	297	69,6%	723	141,5%	328
Cyprus	97,9%	205	122,0%	1354	NA	NA
Czech Republic	101,9%	130	NA	NA	103,2%	1460
Denmark	96,9%	102	NA	NA	128,1%	296
Estonia	102,3%	74	75,7%	358	97,3%	54
Finland	103,1%	239	102,4%	370	121,6%	198
France	105,1%	NA	96,1%	NA	147,5%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	100,3%	149	96,4%	124	147,6%	8
Ireland	60,4%	NA	180,0%	NA	105,0%	NA
Italy	98,5%	654	97,6%	404	101,2%	143
Latvia	105,8%	268	103,5%	206	141,5%	502
Lithuania	102,4%	19	90,4%	154	140,9%	255
Luxembourg	105,3%	268	111,4%	NA	100,0%	NA
Malta	70,0%	9021	NAP	NAP	42,9%	3407
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	93,7%	297	79,3%	372	99,0%	105
Portugal	97,9%	188	86,3%	204	99,2%	59
Romania	96,3%	226	79,0%	396	112,8%	399
Slovak Republic	102,5%	146	82,1%	454	103,4%	36
Slovenia	85,3%	302	73,5%	346	138,1%	589
Spain	92,0%	393	82,5%	283	78,9%	1187
Sweden	103,2%	200	NA	NA	109,7%	305
Average	95,4%	647	95,8%	403	112,7%	514
Median	98,2%	205	90,4%	358	109,7%	281
Minimum	60,4%	19	69,6%	124	42,9%	8
Maximum	105,8%	9 021	180,0%	1 354	147,6%	3 407
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	22%	26%	41%	15%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%

The bars for Dispostion Time are not set to maximum value but they exclude the outlier to enhance visibility and comparability.

Belgium: Starting from 2018, incoming insolvency cases do not include cases dealt with by the new Regsol platform since mid 2017**.**

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Malta: The Disposition Time is very high due to the low absolute number of resolved cases in 2020.

Table 3.5.1(2019): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2019 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	97,5%	179	NA	NA	100,5%	144
Belgium	103,5%	NA	102,2%	898	NA	NA
Bulgaria	100,4%	154	96,4%	264	100,2%	237
Croatia	99,2%	242	99,9%	390	131,2%	276
Cyprus	98,2%	179	81,0%	1401	NA	NA
Czech Republic	100,0%	121	NA	NA	104,0%	1201
Denmark	95,8%	137	NA	NA	99,9%	345
Estonia	100,6%	80	99,7%	224	98,7%	96
Finland	108,5%	201	NA	NA	98,7%	253
France	101,7%	NA	119,9%	NA	105,6%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	103,2%	140	104,1%	181	84,6%	112
Ireland	87,7%	NA	169,2%	NA	84,1%	NA
Italy	106,3%	468	114,4%	289	101,4%	111
Latvia	103,6%	240	97,6%	239	121,3%	573
Lithuania	101,6%	27	113,1%	114	120,5%	262
Luxembourg	97,5%	267	118,9%	NA	100,0%	NAP
Malta	94,9%	176	NAP	NAP	121,4%	1031
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	100,2%	226	98,4%	277	94,6%	130
Portugal	101,3%	138	101,9%	143	101,2%	47
Romania	103,7%	169	103,7%	291	115,0%	331
Slovak Republic	103,5%	137	111,5%	354	101,6%	33
Slovenia	106,3%	165	101,2%	201	140,7%	545
Spain	98,7%	294	90,6%	209	86,1%	1146
Sweden	102,1%	206	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	100,7%	188	106,9%	365	105,3%	382
Median	100,9%	176	102,0%	264	101,2%	258
Minimum	87,7%	27	81,0%	114	84,1%	33
Maximum	108,5%	468	169,2%	1 401	140,7%	1 201
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	22%	30%	41%	22%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%

Belgium: Starting from 2018, incoming insolvency cases do not include cases dealt with by the new Regsol platform since mid 2017.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.5.1(2018): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2018 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	103,4%	161	NA	NA	99,6%	148
Belgium	110,7%	NA	97,4%	849	NA	NA
Bulgaria	97,6%	162	105,3%	212	124,0%	238
Croatia	101,0%	223	128,8%	288	121,3%	283
Cyprus	100,4%	179	196,4%	942	NA	NA
Czech Republic	101,6%	120	NA	NA	134,1%	1419
Denmark	99,8%	144	NA	NA	79,3%	517
Estonia	96,6%	91	98,2%	246	94,9%	63
Finland	97,7%	246	NA	NA	94,8%	260
France	93,5%	NA	107,2%	NA	101,9%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	106,9%	159	125,6%	170	98,4%	75
Ireland	83,6%	NA	172,2%	NA	101,5%	NA
Italy	102,1%	480	107,2%	304	104,0%	113
Latvia	105,0%	243	120,3%	174	134,0%	553
Lithuania	100,7%	33	91,3%	144	127,8%	311
Luxembourg	88,9%	453	118,4%	NA	100,0%	NAP
Malta	93,7%	149	NAP	NAP	75,0%	1144
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	96,0%	227	100,6%	271	94,5%	131
Portugal	103,7%	152	107,5%	125	102,5%	53
Romania	99,5%	178	106,0%	290	108,9%	379
Slovak Republic	102,3%	149	126,1%	296	99,8%	60
Slovenia	100,4%	163	106,4%	198	153,2%	541
Spain	98,8%	292	94,4%	196	95,8%	1302
Sweden	98,6%	222	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	99,3%	201	117,2%	314	106,9%	422
Median	100,1%	163	107,2%	246	101,5%	271
Minimum	83,6%	33	91,3%	125	75,0%	53
Maximum	110,7%	480	196,4%	942	153,2%	1 419
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	22%	30%	41%	22%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.5.1(2017): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2017 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	98,6%	173	NA	NA	98,3%	164
Belgium	122,8%	NA	104,9%	753	NA	NA
Bulgaria	99,1%	164	106,6%	187	110,2%	283
Croatia	104,1%	215	137,2%	324	140,1%	278
Cyprus	100,9%	193	119,6%	1370	NA	NA
Czech Republic	103,2%	119	NA	NA	152,6%	1572
Denmark	102,1%	134	NA	NA	91,2%	211
Estonia	99,3%	75	102,2%	193	97,5%	67
Finland	98,9%	239	NA	NA	108,8%	243
France	87,3%	NA	129,8%	NA	110,4%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	93,8%	180	100,3%	214	124,8%	32
Ireland	86,0%	NA	152,1%	NA	56,7%	NA
Italy	93,8%	503	110,2%	295	103,2%	117
Latvia	107,7%	247	107,8%	228	123,2%	617
Lithuania	97,7%	37	111,6%	65	103,6%	360
Luxembourg	95,0%	413	133,3%	NA	100,0%	NAP
Malta	98,5%	140	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	97,8%	208	115,8%	214	92,4%	127
Portugal	105,4%	145	111,1%	128	102,1%	58
Romania	97,5%	175	117,6%	269	106,4%	400
Slovak Republic	102,3%	166	116,8%	352	95,8%	154
Slovenia	105,4%	153	122,0%	170	131,0%	754
Spain	100,4%	292	93,2%	194	103,7%	1402
Sweden	99,0%	217	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	99,9%	199	116,2%	330	107,6%	402
Median	99,0%	175	113,7%	214	103,6%	243
Minimum	86,0%	37	93,2%	65	56,7%	32
Maximum	122,8%	503	152,1%	1 370	152,6%	1 572
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	22%	30%	41%	26%	33%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%

Hungary: Litigious divorce cases in 2017 and 2016 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed due to an amendment of the code of civil procedure these cases were included in a new statistical category.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.5.1(2016): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2016 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	102,6%	161	NA	NA	102,6%	144
Belgium	105,4%	NA	99,5%	728	NA	NA
Bulgaria	99,3%	154	95,2%	176	95,2%	308
Croatia	148,0%	180	133,0%	344	123,6%	227
Cyprus	97,1%	202	81,6%	1012	NA	NA
Czech Republic	104,9%	125	NA	NA	70,3%	2085
Denmark	98,6%	137	NA	NA	85,3%	220
Estonia	108,7%	67	87,2%	208	101,5%	61
Finland	106,6%	227	NA	NA	104,7%	246
France	101,2%	NA	121,1%	NA	106,1%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	97,5%	154	117,5%	169	108,3%	124
Ireland	78,4%	NA	86,8%	NA	68,4%	NA
Italy	84,7%	511	114,2%	290	105,2%	120
Latvia	106,8%	247	119,3%	204	124,3%	663
Lithuania	102,7%	28	100,0%	116	93,4%	395
Luxembourg	130,3%	355	119,2%	NA	100,0%	NAP
Malta	102,5%	120	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	99,1%	196	106,3%	211	96,6%	114
Portugal	109,1%	163	125,5%	124	106,0%	61
Romania	100,4%	159	122,4%	265	121,7%	353
Slovak Republic	79,4%	208	111,9%	354	81,3%	489
Slovenia	104,6%	163	97,9%	240	81,9%	1050
Spain	97,1%	298	107,0%	175	109,5%	1436
Sweden	98,7%	218	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	102,7%	194	108,1%	308	99,3%	476
Median	101,8%	163	109,5%	211	102,0%	246
Minimum	78,4%	28	81,6%	116	68,4%	61
Maximum	148,0%	511	133,0%	1 012	124,3%	2 085
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	22%	30%	41%	26%	33%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%

Hungary: Litigious divorce cases in 2017 and 2016 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed due to an amendment of the code of civil procedure these cases were included in a new statistical category.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.5.1(2015): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2015 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	101,8%	165	NA	NA	100,1%	152
Belgium	112,3%	NA	103,8%	668	110,5%	2319
Bulgaria	101,2%	138	108,7%	151	110,1%	282
Croatia	96,6%	268	123,5%	442	30,4%	1132
Cyprus	98,4%	190	117,9%	1023	NA	NA
Czech Republic	102,9%	142	NA	NA	52,0%	2377
Denmark	107,0%	132	NA	NA	110,0%	238
Estonia	107,6%	99	101,0%	199	100,1%	67
Finland	99,8%	243	NA	NA	109,9%	235
France	97,3%	NA	105,9%	NA	103,1%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	61,1%	233	113,5%	175	101,3%	168
Ireland	76,3%	NA	75,6%	NA	76,2%	NA
Italy	89,0%	529	109,1%	323	120,0%	108
Latvia	107,7%	266	139,1%	236	132,5%	626
Lithuania	97,3%	36	100,4%	112	104,5%	405
Luxembourg	NA	NA	109,3%	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	110,7%	143	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	124,2%	179	122,9%	165	105,1%	71
Romania	102,5%	156	139,7%	244	129,0%	328
Slovak Republic	100,2%	212	82,0%	681	86,2%	217
Slovenia	107,8%	178	105,2%	211	54,6%	1288
Spain	97,7%	301	105,4%	184	113,8%	1606
Sweden	101,5%	212	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	100,0%	201	109,6%	344	97,3%	684
Median	101,3%	179	108,7%	223	104,5%	282
Minimum	61,1%	36	75,6%	112	30,4%	67
Maximum	124,2%	529	139,7%	1 023	132,5%	2 377
Nb of values	26	26	26	26	26	26
% of NA	15%	27%	31%	42%	23%	31%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%

Croatia: The increase of incoming insolvency cases is due to the new Act for shortened insolvency proceedings and more than 20.000 legal persons for which the preconditions were met initiated these proceedings. Consequently there is an increase of pending cases at the end of the period as well as decreased Clearance Rate.

Hungary: Litigious divorce cases since 2015 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed due to an amendment of the code of civil procedure these cases were included in a new statistical category.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: In evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.5.1(2014): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2014 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	102,1%	165	NA	NA	102,8%	151
Belgium	96,3%	NA	109,8%	642	70,1%	3012
Bulgaria	100,4%	141	109,2%	157	112,9%	304
Croatia	123,1%	187	92,3%	461	190,8%	403
Cyprus	100,8%	178	95,3%	863	NA	NA
Czech Republic	104,2%	147	NA	NA	44,7%	2236
Denmark	101,9%	134	NA	NA	125,4%	212
Estonia	95,7%	133	101,9%	218	96,9%	73
Finland	98,8%	246	NA	NA	103,5%	243
France	96,0%	NA	96,8%	NA	90,8%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	100,3%	95	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	100,5%	162	107,6%	193	148,0%	91
Ireland	68,9%	NA	129,0%	NA	65,3%	NA
Italy	97,7%	517	101,3%	466	104,9%	164
Latvia	96,7%	282	111,7%	313	83,5%	1049
Lithuania	101,7%	25	115,3%	87	92,6%	420
Luxembourg	NA	NA	110,1%	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	93,0%	223	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	98,8%	200	113,3%	195	101,7%	87
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	98,6%	182	102,1%	373	120,7%	334
Slovak Republic	100,5%	197	78,4%	NA	89,2%	166
Slovenia	100,7%	204	115,3%	204	41,2%	1231
Spain	94,6%	298	100,0%	243	77,5%	1873
Sweden	103,7%	205	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	98,9%	201	105,0%	322	98,0%	709
Median	99,6%	187	104,9%	231	96,9%	304
Minimum	68,9%	25	78,4%	87	41,2%	73
Maximum	123,1%	517	129,0%	863	190,8%	3 012
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	30%	30%	44%	26%	33%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: In evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.5.1(2013): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2013 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	97,2%	181	NA	NA	102,1%	156
Belgium	96,4%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	103,0%	134	109,6%	165	99,8%	282
Croatia	99,3%	285	106,6%	450	62,1%	436
Cyprus	100,6%	177	59,2%	1292	NA	NA
Czech Republic	99,3%	148	NA	NA	39,6%	1829
Denmark	102,2%	132	NAP	NAP	116,2%	214
Estonia	84,7%	172	95,8%	234	98,5%	69
Finland	100,4%	242	94,2%	332	95,1%	262
France	99,2%	NA	88,3%	NA	84,9%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	100,3%	95	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	100,9%	164	115,6%	189	77,9%	259
Ireland	81,7%	NA	33,5%	NA	75,2%	NA
Italy	92,0%	701	NA	NA	89,6%	2423
Latvia	109,3%	231	131,3%	290	68,7%	1135
Lithuania	102,1%	30	97,7%	115	93,5%	445
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	103,3%	262	128,8%	191	100,0%	79
Romania	105,9%	167	85,7%	368	89,5%	385
Slovak Republic	99,2%	193	66,9%	NA	94,8%	125
Slovenia	98,6%	202	92,1%	271	74,1%	924
Spain	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	99,4%	222	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	98,7%	214	93,7%	333	86,0%	601
Median	99,3%	181	95,8%	253	89,6%	282
Minimum	81,7%	30	33,5%	95	39,6%	69
Maximum	109,3%	701	131,3%	1 292	116,2%	2 423
Nb of values	25	25	25	25	25	25
% of NA	20%	32%	32%	44%	32%	40%
% of NAP	0%	0%	8%	8%	0%	0%

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: In evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Table 3.5.1(2012): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific case categories in 2012 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	101,4%	160	NA	NA	100,7%	157
Belgium	100,4%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	98,6%	146	96,2%	167	82,8%	323
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	101,0%	170	63,5%	1001	NA	NA
Czech Republic	101,8%	155	NA	NA	34,4%	1669
Denmark	105,3%	133	NAP	NAP	110,1%	235
Estonia	91,7%	193	96,7%	316	95,4%	104
Finland	103,6%	229	112,1%	276	97,1%	250
France	99,8%	NA	104,9%	NA	86,3%	NA
Germany	NA	NA	142,3%	64	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	112,0%	156	104,8%	214	108,9%	138
Ireland	83,1%	NA	NA	NA	72,4%	695
Italy	94,2%	707	NA	NA	94,7%	2648
Latvia	110,7%	228	139,2%	372	78,0%	962
Lithuania	101,0%	38	105,3%	93	97,3%	439
Luxembourg	NA	NA	77,8%	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	98,1%	183	94,8%	214	95,7%	83
Portugal	103,5%	267	109,6%	240	96,1%	80
Romania	103,9%	159	109,4%	279	96,3%	332
Slovak Republic	99,3%	195	81,5%	NA	92,7%	118
Slovenia	102,4%	187	96,6%	239	66,6%	936
Spain	96,4%	288	73,7%	218	46,3%	1965
Sweden	98,4%	235	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	100,3%	213	100,5%	284	86,2%	655
Median	101,0%	185	100,7%	239	95,0%	323
Minimum	83,1%	38	63,5%	64	34,4%	80
Maximum	112,0%	707	142,3%	1 001	110,1%	2 648
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	33%	33%	44%	33%	37%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	7%	0%	0%

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Republic: In evaluation cycles 2015 and before, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Variations of CR and DT for specific categories of first instance cases

litigious divorce

employment dismissal and

insolvency cases

Table 3.6.1: First instance courts variation of Clearance rate (in percent points) and Disposition time (in percent) for specific case categories between 2020 and 2021 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate (p.points)	Disposition Time (%)	Clearance Rate (p.points)	Disposition Time (%)	Clearance Rate (p.points)	Disposition Time (%)
Austria	5,8	13,2%	NA	NA	-26,8	27,2%
Belgium	22,2	NA	20,3	NA	44,4	NA
Bulgaria	7,4	15,8%	33,3	21,9%	17,9	22,1%
Croatia	3,9	-5,8%	23,4	-3,1%	-45,7	10,7%
Cyprus	10,0	19,5%	-38,5	40,7%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	4,1	13,7%	NA	NA	9,7	0,5%
Denmark	-7,1	35,8%	NA	NA	-38,3	28,7%
Estonia	-1,1	7,4%	30,9	23,8%	3,0	-7,9%
Finland	4,5	-4,5%	6,5	-3,0%	-31,4	37,0%
France	130,9	NA	31,8	NA	16,1	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	9,9	27,1%	14,0	45,4%	-69,7	1391,5%
Ireland	12,7	NA	-100,0	NA	2,5	NA
Italy	14,4	30,2%	42,4	29,4%	8,8	32,5%
Latvia	-10,0	10,5%	-5,6	11,7%	-6,8	13,8%
Lithuania	-3,5	18,9%	10,2	-3,3%	-22,7	59,3%
Luxembourg	-8,7	21,9%	-7,0	NA	0,0	NA
Malta	23,3	79,5%	NAP	NAP	-38,1	575,0%
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	8,8	16,2%	39,5	19,9%	5,6	23,0%
Portugal	2,5	-7,7%	18,3	14,7%	3,2	13,9%
Romania	14,1	29,6%	30,4	24,3%	6,6	23,5%
Slovak Republic	0,3	-3,5%	13,0	23,0%	-8,0	71,4%
Slovenia	22,5	28,4%	57,9	46,2%	8,3	-3,9%
Spain	17,3	27,7%	32,9	40,6%	3,5	23,2%
Sweden	3,4	-7,6%	NA	NA	-6,2	14,3%
Average	+12,0	-11,2%	+13,4	-7,3%	-7,1	+108,3%
Median	+6,6	-13,2%	+20,3	-14,7%	+2,5	+0,5%
Minimum	-10,0	-79,5%	-100,0	-46,2%	-69,7	-32,5%
Maximum	+130,9	+35,8%	+57,9	+45,4%	+44,4	+1391,5%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	22%	26%	41%	15%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%

The bars for Dispostion Time are not set to maximum value but they exclude the outlier to enhance visibility and comparability.

Belgium: In 2018 and 2019 incoming insolvency cases do not include cases dealt by the new Regsol platform since mid 2017.

Malta: The variation of the Disposition Time is very high due to the low absolute number of resolved cases in 2020.

Table 3.6.2: First instance courts variation of Clearance rate (in percent points) and Disposition time (in percent) for specific case categories between 2012 and 2021 (Q101)

States	Litigious divorce cases		Employment dismissal cases		Insolvency cases	
	Clearance Rate (p.points)	Disposition Time (%)	Clearance Rate (p.points)	Disposition Time (%)	Clearance Rate (p.points)	Disposition Time (%)
Austria	4,0	7,9%	NA	NA	-7,2	20,4%
Belgium	-0,3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	4,6	16,7%	23,3	41,5%	24,3	32,1%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	6,9	-2,6%	20,0	90,5%	NA	NA
Czech Republic	4,3	27,4%	NA	NA	78,5	12,1%
Denmark	-15,6	4,4%	NA	NA	-20,2	62,1%
Estonia	9,5	58,9%	9,9	13,7%	4,9	52,1%
Finland	4,0	-0,1%	-3,2	30,0%	-6,9	8,4%
France	136,2	NA	23,1	NA	77,3	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	-1,8	30,3%	5,7	15,7%	-30,9	15,1%
Ireland	-9,9	NA	NA	NA	35,2	NA
Italy	18,6	35,5%	NA	NA	15,3	96,3%
Latvia	-14,9	29,9%	-41,3	38,2%	56,7	40,6%
Lithuania	-2,0	39,5%	-4,7	59,7%	20,9	-7,5%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	26,6	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	4,4	35,8%	23,9	39,3%	8,9	-2,1%
Portugal	-3,1	34,8%	-5,0	27,3%	6,2	36,7%
Romania	6,5	0,2%	0,0	7,4%	23,1	-8,1%
Slovak Republic	3,5	27,8%	13,6	NA	2,7	47,8%
Slovenia	5,5	15,9%	34,8	22,1%	79,8	39,5%
Spain	12,8	-1,2%	41,8	22,8%	36,2	53,6%
Sweden	8,3	21,2%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	+8,6	-9,4%	+11,2	+10,7%	22,49	-22,1%
Median	+4,3	-1,9%	+13,6	-3,1%	18,06	-23,6%
Minimum	-15,6	-58,9%	-41,3	-38,2%	-30,93	-96,3%
Maximum	+136,2	+35,8%	+41,8	+90,5%	79,84	+62,1%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	33%	41%	52%	33%	41%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%

Belgium: In 2018 and 2019 incoming insolvency cases do not include cases dealt by the new Regsol platform since mid 2017.

Czech Republic, Slovak Republic: In all evaluation cycles, it was not possible to distinguish number of pending cases solely on 1st instance since each case is considered pending until the moment a final decision is enacted and no further proceeding is possible.

Hungary: Litigious divorce cases in 2015 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed due to an amendment of the code of civil procedure these cases were included in a new statistical category.

Second instance other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.7.1(2021): Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. 2021

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**4 276**	**2 772**	**1 504**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**18 713**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**2 244**	**NA**
Croatia	**29 411**	**19 194**	**7 370**	6 540	782	*775*	*7*	*NAP*	48	**2 847**	NAP
Cyprus	**4 828**	**3 753**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 075**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**11 401**	**10 688**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**713**
Denmark	**2 516**	**2 516**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 150**	**585**	**221**	221	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**344**	NAP
Finland	**1 285**	**1 102**	**132**	132	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**51**
France	**289 510**	**240 497**	**18 505**	18 505	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 508**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**81 192**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**55 186**	**19 827**
Greece	**48 320**	**16 026**	**305**	221	84	*84*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**31 930**	**59**
Hungary	**6 823**	**3 099**	**3 271**	3 176	69	*NAP*	*51*	*18*	26	**14**	**439**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**294 808**	**289 280**	**5 528**	5 528	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**1 434**	**992**	**27**	27	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**415**	NAP
Lithuania	**5 405**	**2 152**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**3 104**	**149**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 591**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**240**	**NA**
Malta	**1 760**	**1 760**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Poland	**123 044**	**60 884**	**5 518**	5 302	216	*NAP*	*216*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 714**	**29 928**
Portugal	**13 997**	**4 605**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 392**	NAP
Romania	**78 204**	**77 067**	**1 137**	424	713	*713*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**11 550**	**8 798**	**2 752**	2 752	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	NAP
Slovenia	**1 182**	**805**	**377**	361	16	*12*	*4*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**142 351**	**106 068**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**36 283**	NAP
Sweden	**12 028**	**990**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 437**	**2 601**
Average	**50 182**	**40 714**	**3 588**	3 599	313	*396*	*70*	*18*	37	**13 046**	**6 721**
Median	**11 476**	**3 753**	**1 504**	1 588	150	*399*	*29*	*18*	37	**2 976**	**576**
Minimum	**1 150**	**585**	**27**	27	16	*12*	*4*	*18*	26	**0**	**51**
Maximum	**294 808**	**289 280**	**18 505**	18 505	782	*775*	*216*	*18*	48	**55 186**	**29 928**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**15%**	**26%**	30%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**11%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.7.2a(2021): Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**24 932**	**14 462**	**10 470**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**23 735**	**23 735**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**55 193**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**13 419**	**NA**
Croatia	**61 558**	**36 163**	**19 940**	17 622	2 164	*1 979*	*185*	*NAP*	154	**5 455**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**1 148**	**920**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**228**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**50 849**	**46 924**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**3 925**
Denmark	**4 862**	**4 862**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**4 566**	**1 899**	**1 179**	1 179	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 488**	**NAP**
Finland	**2 652**	**2 078**	**518**	518	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**56**
France	**243 630**	**171 390**	**38 228**	38 228	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**34 012**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**117 550**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**42 476**	**39 225**
Greece	**28 724**	**9 278**	**374**	277	97	*97*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**18 237**	**835**
Hungary	**33 710**	**10 187**	**21 720**	20 898	572	*NAP*	*477*	*95*	250	**29**	**1 774**
Ireland	**1 416**	**1 416**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**105 081**	**96 668**	**8 413**	8 413	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**4 500**	**3 336**	**200**	200	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**964**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**16 448**	**10 171**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**4 207**	**2 070**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 204**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**237**	**NA**
Malta	**831**	**831**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**23 172**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**11 261**	**NAP**
Poland	**208 708**	**129 127**	**16 210**	15 875	335	*NAP*	*335*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 873**	**36 498**
Portugal	**22 414**	**17 575**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 839**	**NAP**
Romania	**198 661**	**195 682**	**2 979**	1 176	1 803	*1 803*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**23 480**	**12 963**	**10 517**	10 517	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**11 190**	**6 571**	**4 619**	4 262	357	*296*	*61*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**235 331**	**203 675**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**31 656**	**NAP**
Sweden	**60 998**	**3 153**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**38 779**	**19 066**
Average	**57 912**	**44 873**	**10 413**	9 930	888	*1 044*	*265*	*95*	202	**13 774**	**12 931**
Median	**23 735**	**10 187**	**8 413**	6 338	465	*1 050*	*260*	*95*	202	**5 455**	**2 998**
Minimum	**831**	**831**	**200**	200	97	*97*	*61*	*95*	154	**0**	**56**
Maximum	**243 630**	**203 675**	**38 228**	38 228	2 164	*1 979*	*477*	*95*	250	**42 476**	**39 225**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**26%**	30%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.7.2b(2021): Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming cases in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,28**	**0,16**	**0,12**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**0,21**	**0,21**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,81**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,20**	**NA**
Croatia	**1,59**	**0,93**	**0,52**	0,46	0,06	*0,05*	*0,00*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,14**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,13**	**0,10**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**0,48**	**0,45**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,04**
Denmark	**0,08**	**0,08**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,34**	**0,14**	**0,09**	0,09	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,11**	NAP
Finland	**0,05**	**0,04**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
France	**0,36**	**0,25**	**0,06**	0,06	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,05**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**0,14**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,05**	**0,05**
Greece	**0,27**	**0,09**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,17**	**0,01**
Hungary	**0,35**	**0,11**	**0,22**	0,22	0,01	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,02**
Ireland	**0,03**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,18**	**0,16**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**0,24**	**0,18**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,05**	NAP
Lithuania	**0,59**	**0,36**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,15**	**0,07**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,19**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,04**	**NA**
Malta	**0,16**	**0,16**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,13**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,06**	NAP
Poland	**0,55**	**0,34**	**0,04**	0,04	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,10**
Portugal	**0,22**	**0,17**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,05**	NAP
Romania	**1,04**	**1,03**	**0,02**	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,43**	**0,24**	**0,19**	0,19	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,53**	**0,31**	**0,22**	0,20	0,02	*0,01*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**0,50**	**0,43**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,07**	NAP
Sweden	**0,58**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,37**	**0,18**
Average	**0,40**	**0,25**	**0,12**	0,11	0,01	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,09**	**0,06**
Median	**0,34**	**0,17**	**0,06**	0,05	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,06**	**0,04**
Minimum	**0,03**	**0,03**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**1,59**	**1,03**	**0,52**	0,46	0,06	*0,05*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,37**	**0,18**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**26%**	30%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Table 3.7.3a(2021): Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved cases in 2021

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**24 003**	**13 659**	**10 344**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**24 932**	**24 932**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**54 821**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**13 430**	**NA**
Croatia	**63 679**	**35 441**	**21 908**	19 392	2 381	*2 198*	*183*	*NAP*	135	**6 330**	NAP
Cyprus	**1 060**	**924**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**136**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**52 609**	**48 767**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**3 842**
Denmark	**4 978**	**4 978**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**4 196**	**1 707**	**1 117**	1 117	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 372**	NAP
Finland	**2 547**	**1 979**	**506**	506	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**62**
France	**254 669**	**180 858**	**39 805**	39 805	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**34 006**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**99 768**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**43 410**	**38 887**
Greece	**25 576**	**9 475**	**253**	186	67	*67*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**15 186**	**662**
Hungary	**34 181**	**10 079**	**22 193**	21 389	560	*NAP*	*462*	*98*	244	**38**	**1 871**
Ireland	**1 096**	**1 096**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**127 813**	**119 208**	**8 605**	8 605	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**4 537**	**3 438**	**206**	206	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**893**	NAP
Lithuania	**16 785**	**10 330**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**4 413**	**2 042**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 178**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**295**	**NA**
Malta	**1 014**	**1 014**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**22 315**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 435**	NAP
Poland	**197 690**	**125 668**	**16 679**	16 288	391	*NAP*	*391*	*NAP*	NAP	**17 111**	**38 232**
Portugal	**22 169**	**17 845**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 324**	NAP
Romania	**191 190**	**188 260**	**2 930**	1 245	1 685	*1 685*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**25 333**	**14 574**	**10 759**	10 759	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	NAP
Slovenia	**10 918**	**6 347**	**4 571**	4 224	347	*285*	*62*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**206 239**	**175 725**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**30 514**	NAP
Sweden	**59 816**	**3 174**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**37 672**	**18 970**
Average	**57 367**	**44 017**	**10 760**	10 310	905	*1 059*	*275*	*98*	190	**12 916**	**13 071**
Median	**24 932**	**10 330**	**8 605**	6 415	476	*985*	*287*	*98*	190	**6 330**	**2 942**
Minimum	**1 014**	**924**	**206**	186	67	*67*	*62*	*98*	135	**0**	**62**
Maximum	**254 669**	**188 260**	**39 805**	39 805	2 381	*2 198*	*462*	*98*	244	**43 410**	**38 887**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**26%**	30%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.7.3b(2021): Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved cases per 100 inhabitants in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,27**	**0,15**	**0,12**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**0,22**	**0,22**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,80**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,20**	**NA**
Croatia	**1,64**	**0,92**	**0,57**	0,50	0,06	*0,06*	*0,00*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,16**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,12**	**0,10**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,02**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**0,50**	**0,46**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,04**
Denmark	**0,08**	**0,08**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,32**	**0,13**	**0,08**	0,08	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,10**	NAP
Finland	**0,05**	**0,04**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
France	**0,38**	**0,27**	**0,06**	0,06	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,05**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**0,12**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,05**	**0,05**
Greece	**0,24**	**0,09**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,14**	**0,01**
Hungary	**0,35**	**0,10**	**0,23**	0,22	0,01	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,02**
Ireland	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,22**	**0,20**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**0,24**	**0,18**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,05**	NAP
Lithuania	**0,60**	**0,37**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,16**	**0,07**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,18**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,05**	**NA**
Malta	**0,20**	**0,20**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,13**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,06**	NAP
Poland	**0,52**	**0,33**	**0,04**	0,04	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,10**
Portugal	**0,21**	**0,17**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Romania	**1,00**	**0,99**	**0,02**	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,47**	**0,27**	**0,20**	0,20	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,52**	**0,30**	**0,22**	0,20	0,02	*0,01*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**0,43**	**0,37**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,06**	NAP
Sweden	**0,57**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,36**	**0,18**
Average	**0,40**	**0,25**	**0,12**	0,11	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,09**	**0,06**
Median	**0,32**	**0,18**	**0,06**	0,05	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,05**	**0,04**
Minimum	**0,02**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**1,64**	**0,99**	**0,57**	0,50	0,06	*0,06*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,36**	**0,18**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**26%**	30%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Table 3.7.4a(2021): Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2021

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**5 205**	**3 575**	**1 630**	NA	NA	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**19 085**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**2 233**	**NA**
Croatia	**27 434**	**19 931**	**5 392**	4 761	565	*556*	*9*	*NAP*	66	**2 111**	NAP
Cyprus	**4 916**	**3 749**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 167**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**9 641**	**8 845**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**796**
Denmark	**2 400**	**2 400**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 516**	**775**	**283**	283	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**458**	NAP
Finland	**1 390**	**1 201**	**144**	144	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**45**
France	**278 471**	**231 029**	**16 928**	16 928	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 514**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**98 939**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**54 267**	**20 173**
Greece	**51 468**	**15 829**	**426**	312	114	*114*	NAP	NAP	NA	**34 981**	**232**
Hungary	**6 352**	**3 207**	**2 798**	2 685	81	NAP	*66*	*15*	32	**5**	**342**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**272 076**	**266 740**	**5 336**	5 336	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**1 397**	**890**	**21**	21	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**486**	NAP
Lithuania	**5 068**	**1 993**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**2 898**	**177**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 617**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**182**	**NA**
Malta	**1 576**	**1 576**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**24 855**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 164**	NAP
Poland	**134 062**	**64 343**	**5 049**	4 889	160	*NAP*	*160*	*NAP*	NAP	**36 476**	**28 194**
Portugal	**14 242**	**4 335**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 907**	NAP
Romania	**85 675**	**84 489**	**1 186**	355	831	*831*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**9 697**	**7 187**	**2 510**	2 510	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	NAP
Slovenia	**1 454**	**1 029**	**425**	399	26	*23*	*3*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**172 221**	**134 629**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**37 592**	NAP
Sweden	**13 210**	**969**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 544**	**2 697**
Average	**49 714**	**41 708**	**3 241**	3 219	296	*381*	*60*	*15*	49	**13 881**	**6 582**
Median	**9 697**	**3 749**	**1 630**	1 455	137	*335*	*38*	*15*	49	**2 898**	**569**
Minimum	**1 390**	**775**	**21**	21	26	*23*	*3*	*15*	32	**0**	**45**
Maximum	**278 471**	**266 740**	**16 928**	16 928	831	*831*	*160*	*15*	66	**54 267**	**28 194**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**15%**	**26%**	26%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	30%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.7.4b(2021): Second instance other than criminal cases - pending cases on 31 Dec. 2021)

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,06**	**0,04**	**0,02**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,28**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Croatia	**0,71**	**0,51**	**0,14**	0,12	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,05**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,54**	**0,41**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,13**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**0,09**	**0,08**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,01**
Denmark	**0,04**	**0,04**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,11**	**0,06**	**0,02**	0,02	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Finland	**0,03**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
France	**0,41**	**0,34**	**0,03**	0,03	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,05**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**0,12**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,07**	**0,02**
Greece	**0,48**	**0,15**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,33**	**0,00**
Hungary	**0,07**	**0,03**	**0,03**	0,03	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,46**	**0,45**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**0,07**	**0,05**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Lithuania	**0,18**	**0,07**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,10**	**0,01**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,25**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Malta	**0,31**	**0,31**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,14**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,08**	NAP
Poland	**0,35**	**0,17**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,10**	**0,07**
Portugal	**0,14**	**0,04**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,10**	NAP
Romania	**0,45**	**0,44**	**0,01**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,18**	**0,13**	**0,05**	0,05	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,07**	**0,05**	**0,02**	0,02	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**0,36**	**0,28**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,08**	NAP
Sweden	**0,13**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,09**	**0,03**
Average	**0,25**	**0,18**	**0,03**	0,02	0,00	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,08**	**0,02**
Median	**0,18**	**0,12**	**0,02**	0,02	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,07**	**0,01**
Minimum	**0,03**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,71**	**0,51**	**0,14**	0,12	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,33**	**0,07**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**15%**	**26%**	26%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	30%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Table 3.7.5(2021): Second instance cibil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2021

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q97)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	1	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	942	4,7%	7	0,3%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	4	0,5%	0	0,0%
Finland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	1 620	5,3%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	455	2,9%	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	120 828	45,3%	NAP	NAP
Latvia	33	3,7%	1	0,2%
Lithuania	12	0,6%	18	0,6%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	1 277	81,0%	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Poland	NA	NA	12 020	33,0%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	2 170	2,6%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	685	9,5%	0	-
Slovenia	6	0,6%	NAP	NAP
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	28	2,9%	39	0,4%
Average	**10 537**	**12,9%**	**1 713**	**5,7%**
Median	**244**	**2,9%**	**13**	**0,4%**
Minimum	**1**	**0,0%**	**0**	**0,0%**
Maximum	**120 828**	**81,0%**	**12 020**	**33,0%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**26**
% of NA	**56%**	**56%**	**37%**	**38%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**33%**	**35%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Romania: Cases older than 3 years are presented**.**

Table 3.7.1(2020): Second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 - Pending cases on 1st Jan. (Q97)

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**4 675**	**3 037**	**1 638**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**15 876**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**2 264**	**NA**
Croatia	**39 197**	**28 065**	**7 808**	6 544	1 194	*1 198*	*5*	*NAP*	70	**3 324**	NAP
Cyprus	**4 412**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**968**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**11 304**	**10 531**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**773**
Denmark	**2 466**	**2 466**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 154**	**644**	**222**	222	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**288**	NAP
Finland	**1 395**	**1 181**	**177**	177	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**37**
France	**295 549**	**247 769**	**16 837**	16 837	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 943**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**84 306**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**58 217**	**19 483**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**28 517**	NAP
Hungary	**8 643**	**3 741**	**3 925**	3 782	110	*NAP*	*94*	*16*	33	**418**	**559**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**308 057**	**302 701**	**5 356**	5 356	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**1 945**	**1 323**	**28**	28	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**594**	NAP
Lithuania	**7 320**	**3 305**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**3 839**	**176**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 648**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**163**	**NA**
Malta	**1 870**	**1 870**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Poland	**131 029**	**66 719**	**11 660**	11 453	207	*NAP*	*207*	*NAP*	NAP	**28 125**	**24 564**
Portugal	**14 881**	**5 811**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 070**	NAP
Romania	**72 979**	**71 874**	**1 105**	364	741	*741*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**13 616**	**11 248**	**2 367**	2 367	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**1**	NAP
Slovenia	**2 424**	**1 614**	**810**	789	21	*15*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**164 383**	**129 949**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**34 434**	NAP
Sweden	**15 996**	**882**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 500**	**2 614**
Average	**53 294**	**46 699**	**4 328**	4 356	455	*651*	*78*	*16*	52	**13 354**	**6 887**
Median	**11 304**	**3 741**	**2 003**	2 367	207	*741*	*50*	*16*	52	**3 582**	**773**
Minimum	**1 154**	**644**	**28**	28	21	*15*	*5*	*16*	33	**1**	**37**
Maximum	**308 057**	**302 701**	**16 837**	16 837	1 194	*1 198*	*207*	*16*	70	**58 217**	**24 564**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	**22%**	**30%**	33%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	**11%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.7.2a(2020): Second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 - Incoming cases (Q97)

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**23 070**	**12 862**	**10 208**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**22 195**	**22 195**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**56 644**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**12 717**	**NA**
Croatia	**57 590**	**29 392**	**22 363**	20 303	1 946	*1 835*	*111*	*NAP*	114	**5 835**	NAP
Cyprus	**1 021**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**203**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**53 147**	**49 597**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**3 550**
Denmark	**5 271**	**5 271**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**4 060**	**1 745**	**1 070**	1 070	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 245**	NAP
Finland	**2 493**	**1 833**	**581**	581	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**79**
France	**201 536**	**137 434**	**33 873**	33 873	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 229**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**108 810**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**45 059**	**40 385**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**17 925**	NAP
Hungary	**33 297**	**9 084**	**21 130**	20 164	643	*NAP*	*551*	*92*	323	**887**	**2 196**
Ireland	**1 403**	**1 403**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**96 914**	**89 839**	**7 075**	7 075	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**4 495**	**3 384**	**192**	192	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**919**	NAP
Lithuania	**15 742**	**10 788**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**3 286**	**1 668**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 112**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**285**	**NA**
Malta	**571**	**571**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**19 363**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 172**	NAP
Poland	**180 990**	**112 330**	**18 360**	18 031	329	*NAP*	*329*	*NAP*	NAP	**14 375**	**36 019**
Portugal	**20 067**	**15 838**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 229**	NAP
Romania	**169 147**	**166 596**	**2 551**	1 132	1 419	*1 419*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**27 048**	**15 658**	**11 390**	11 390	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	NAP
Slovenia	**11 186**	**6 545**	**4 641**	4 250	391	*324*	*67*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**177 404**	**146 275**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**31 129**	NAP
Sweden	**62 228**	**2 931**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**41 044**	**18 253**
Average	**51 953**	**41 369**	**11 120**	10 733	946	*1 193*	*265*	*92*	219	**12 796**	**14 593**
Median	**22 633**	**12 862**	**8 642**	7 075	643	*1 419*	*220*	*92*	219	**5 835**	**3 550**
Minimum	**571**	**571**	**192**	192	329	*324*	*67*	*92*	114	**0**	**79**
Maximum	**201 536**	**166 596**	**33 873**	33 873	1 946	*1 835*	*551*	*92*	323	**45 059**	**40 385**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	33%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.7.2b(2020): Second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 - Incoming cases per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	0,26	0,14	0,11	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	0,19	0,19	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	0,82	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	0,18	NA
Croatia	1,43	0,73	0,55	0,50	0,05	*0,05*	*0,00*	*NAP*	0,00	0,14	NAP
Cyprus	0,11	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,02	NA
Czech Republic	0,50	0,46	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	0,03
Denmark	0,09	0,09	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,31	0,13	0,08	0,08	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,09	NAP
Finland	0,05	0,03	0,01	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	0,00
France	0,30	0,20	0,05	0,05	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,04	NAP
Germany	NA	0,13	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,05	0,05
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,17	NAP
Hungary	0,34	0,09	0,21	0,20	0,01	*NAP*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,00	0,01	0,02
Ireland	0,03	0,03	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Italy	0,16	0,15	0,01	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	0,24	0,18	0,01	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,05	NAP
Lithuania	0,56	0,39	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	0,12	0,06
Luxembourg	NA	0,18	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	0,04	NA
Malta	0,11	0,11	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Netherlands	0,11	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,05	NAP
Poland	0,47	0,29	0,05	0,05	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	0,04	0,09
Portugal	0,19	0,15	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,04	NAP
Romania	0,88	0,87	0,01	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,50	0,29	0,21	0,21	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	0,00	NAP
Slovenia	0,53	0,31	0,22	0,20	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	0,37	0,31	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,07	NAP
Sweden	0,60	0,03	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,40	0,18
Average	0,38	0,24	0,13	0,12	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	0,09	0,06
Median	0,30	0,18	0,07	0,05	0,01	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	0,05	0,05
Minimum	0,03	0,03	0,01	0,01	0,00	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	0,00	0,00
Maximum	1,43	0,87	0,55	0,50	0,05	*0,05*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,00	0,40	0,18
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	15%	30%	33%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	7%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	26%	26%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	30%	59%

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Table 3.7.3a(2020): Second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 - Resolved cases (Q97)

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**23 469**	**13 127**	**10 342**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**23 095**	**23 095**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**53 814**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**12 744**	**NA**
Croatia	**67 378**	**38 036**	**23 030**	20 537	2 358	*2 249*	*109*	*NAP*	135	**6 312**	NAP
Cyprus	**790**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**140**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**53 053**	**49 443**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**3 610**
Denmark	**5 177**	**5 177**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**4 015**	**1 784**	**1 045**	1 045	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 186**	NAP
Finland	**2 604**	**1 914**	**625**	625	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**65**
France	**207 617**	**144 706**	**32 205**	32 205	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 706**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**111 956**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**48 058**	**40 418**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**17 585**	NAP
Hungary	**35 117**	**9 726**	**21 784**	20 770	684	*NAP*	*594*	*90*	330	**1 291**	**2 316**
Ireland	**1 468**	**1 468**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**109 828**	**102 989**	**6 839**	6 839	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**5 006**	**3 715**	**193**	193	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 098**	NAP
Lithuania	**17 657**	**11 941**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**4 021**	**1 695**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 169**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**208**	**NA**
Malta	**741**	**741**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**21 232**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 686**	NAP
Poland	**183 669**	**118 181**	**19 187**	18 867	320	*NAP*	*320*	*NAP*	NAP	**15 786**	**30 584**
Portugal	**20 952**	**17 045**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 907**	NAP
Romania	**163 922**	**161 403**	**2 519**	1 072	1 447	*1 447*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**29 114**	**18 108**	**11 005**	11 005	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**1**	NAP
Slovenia	**12 428**	**7 354**	**5 074**	4 678	396	*327*	*69*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**200 281**	**170 993**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**29 288**	NAP
Sweden	**66 197**	**2 824**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**45 106**	**18 267**
Average	**54 526**	**44 213**	**11 154**	10 712	1 041	*1 341*	*273*	*90*	233	**13 360**	**13 851**
Median	**23 282**	**13 127**	**8 591**	6 839	684	*1 447*	*215*	*90*	233	**6 312**	**3 610**
Minimum	**741**	**741**	**193**	193	320	*327*	*69*	*90*	135	**1**	**65**
Maximum	**207 617**	**170 993**	**32 205**	32 205	2 358	*2 249*	*594*	*90*	330	**48 058**	**40 418**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	33%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.7.3b(2020): Second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 - Resolved cases per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	0,26	0,15	0,12	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	NA
Belgium	0,20	0,20	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	0,78	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	0,18	NA
Croatia	1,67	0,94	0,57	0,51	0,06	*0,06*	*0,00*	*NAP*	0,00	0,16	NAP
Cyprus	0,09	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,02	NA
Czech Republic	0,50	0,46	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	0,03
Denmark	0,09	0,09	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,30	0,13	0,08	0,08	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,09	NAP
Finland	0,05	0,03	0,01	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	0,00
France	0,31	0,21	0,05	0,05	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,05	NAP
Germany	NA	0,13	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,06	0,05
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,16	NAP
Hungary	0,36	0,10	0,22	0,21	0,01	*NAP*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,00	0,01	0,02
Ireland	0,03	0,03	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Italy	0,19	0,17	0,01	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	0,26	0,20	0,01	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,06	NAP
Lithuania	0,63	0,43	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	0,14	0,06
Luxembourg	NA	0,18	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	0,03	NA
Malta	0,14	0,14	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Netherlands	0,12	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,06	NAP
Poland	0,48	0,31	0,05	0,05	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	0,04	0,08
Portugal	0,20	0,17	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,04	NAP
Romania	0,85	0,84	0,01	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,53	0,33	0,20	0,20	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	0,00	NAP
Slovenia	0,59	0,35	0,24	0,22	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	0,42	0,36	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,06	NAP
Sweden	0,64	0,03	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,43	0,18
Average	0,40	0,26	0,13	0,12	0,02	*0,03*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	0,09	0,06
Median	0,31	0,18	0,06	0,05	0,01	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	0,06	0,05
Minimum	0,03	0,03	0,01	0,01	0,00	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	0,00	0,00
Maximum	1,67	0,94	0,57	0,51	0,06	*0,06*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,00	0,43	0,18
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	15%	30%	33%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	7%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	26%	26%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	30%	59%

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Table 3.7.4a(2020): Second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 - Pending cases on 31 Dec. (Q97)

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**4 276**	**2 772**	**1 504**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**18 706**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**2 237**	**NA**
Croatia	**29 411**	**19 194**	**7 370**	6 540	782	*775*	*7*	*NAP*	48	**2 847**	NAP
Cyprus	**4 710**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1 031**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**11 398**	**10 685**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**713**
Denmark	**2 560**	**2 560**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 148**	**585**	**221**	221	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**342**	NAP
Finland	**1 284**	**1 100**	**133**	133	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**51**
France	**289 468**	**240 497**	**18 505**	18 505	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 466**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**81 223**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**55 197**	**19 826**
Greece	**65 912**	**34 954**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**28 857**	NAP
Hungary	**6 823**	**3 099**	**3 271**	3 176	69	*NAP*	*51*	*18*	26	**14**	**439**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**295 143**	**289 551**	**5 592**	5 592	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**1 434**	**992**	**27**	27	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**415**	NAP
Lithuania	**5 405**	**2 152**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**3 104**	**149**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 591**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**240**	**NA**
Malta	**1 701**	**1 701**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**24 530**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 340**	NAP
Poland	**128 350**	**60 868**	**10 833**	10 617	216	*NAP*	*216*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 714**	**29 999**
Portugal	**13 996**	**4 604**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 392**	NAP
Romania	**78 204**	**77 067**	**1 137**	424	713	*713*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**11 550**	**8 798**	**2 752**	2 752	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	NAP
Slovenia	**1 181**	**805**	**376**	361	15	*11*	*4*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**142 509**	**106 207**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**36 302**	NAP
Sweden	**12 027**	**989**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 438**	**2 600**
Average	**50 075**	**43 272**	**4 310**	4 395	359	*500*	*70*	*18*	37	**12 820**	**7 682**
Median	**11 550**	**3 852**	**2 128**	2 752	216	*713*	*29*	*18*	37	**3 104**	**713**
Minimum	**1 148**	**585**	**27**	27	15	*11*	*4*	*18*	26	**0**	**51**
Maximum	**295 143**	**289 551**	**18 505**	18 505	782	*775*	*216*	*18*	48	**55 197**	**29 999**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**19%**	**30%**	30%	22%	*22%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	30%	59%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.7.4b(2020): Second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 - Pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,05**	**0,03**	**0,02**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,27**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Croatia	**0,73**	**0,48**	**0,18**	0,16	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,07**	NAP
Cyprus	**0,53**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,12**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**0,11**	**0,10**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,01**
Denmark	**0,04**	**0,04**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,09**	**0,04**	**0,02**	0,02	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Finland	**0,02**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
France	**0,43**	**0,36**	**0,03**	0,03	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,05**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**0,10**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,07**	**0,02**
Greece	**0,61**	**0,33**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,27**	NAP
Hungary	**0,07**	**0,03**	**0,03**	0,03	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,50**	**0,49**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**0,08**	**0,05**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Lithuania	**0,19**	**0,08**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,11**	**0,01**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,25**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,04**	**NA**
Malta	**0,33**	**0,33**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**0,14**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	NAP
Poland	**0,34**	**0,16**	**0,03**	0,03	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,08**
Portugal	**0,14**	**0,04**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,09**	NAP
Romania	**0,41**	**0,40**	**0,01**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,21**	**0,16**	**0,05**	0,05	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,06**	**0,04**	**0,02**	0,02	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**0,30**	**0,22**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,08**	NAP
Sweden	**0,12**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,08**	**0,03**
Average	**0,25**	**0,17**	**0,03**	0,03	0,01	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,07**	**0,02**
Median	**0,19**	**0,10**	**0,02**	0,02	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,07**	**0,01**
Minimum	**0,02**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,73**	**0,49**	**0,18**	0,16	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,27**	**0,08**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**19%**	**30%**	30%	22%	*22%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	30%	59%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Table 3.7.5(2020): Second instance cibil (and commercial) litigious and administrative cases - pending more than 2 years in 2021

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q97)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	2	0,1%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	1 067	5,6%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Finland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	1 108	3,6%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	134 251	46,4%	NAP	NAP
Latvia	65	6,6%	3	0,7%
Lithuania	15	0,7%	2	0,1%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	908	53,4%	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Poland	NA	NA	6 843	25,6%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	1 740	2,3%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	588	6,7%	0	-
Slovenia	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	19	1,9%	83	1,0%
Average	**12 605**	**11,2%**	**1 148**	**5,2%**
Median	**65**	**2,3%**	**3**	**0,9%**
Minimum	**0**	**0,0%**	**0**	**0,0%**
Maximum	**134 251**	**53,4%**	**6 843**	**25,6%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**26**
% of NA	**59%**	**59%**	**41%**	**42%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**33%**	**35%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Romania: Cases older than 3 years are presented**.**

Table 3.7.1(2019): Second instance other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2019

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**4 732**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**13 611**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**2 411**	**NA**
Croatia	**47 023**	**34 807**	**9 454**	7 906	1 482	*1 478*	*4*	*NAP*	66	**2 762**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**4 215**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**939**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**13 224**	**12 291**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**933**
Denmark	**2 183**	**2 183**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**988**	**610**	**146**	146	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**323**	**NAP**
Finland	**1 288**	**1 120**	**117**	117	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**51**
France	**302 841**	**260 673**	**12 700**	12 700	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**29 468**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**66 211**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**57 216**	**19 399**
Greece	**NA**	**41 354**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**10 738**	**4 883**	**4 445**	4 197	190	*NAP*	*174*	*16*	58	**561**	**849**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**340 257**	**334 910**	**5 347**	5 347	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1 823**	**1 323**	**0**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**500**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**7 990**	**3 917**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 888**	**185**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 683**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**154**	**NA**
Malta	**1 951**	**1 951**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**27 940**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 880**	**NAP**
Poland	**103 913**	**51 551**	**5 537**	5 369	168	*NAP*	*168*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 649**	**19 176**
Portugal	**14 803**	**6 175**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 628**	**NAP**
Romania	**73 019**	**71 851**	**1 168**	339	829	*829*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**17 427**	**13 533**	**3 893**	3 893	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**1**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**2 799**	**1 996**	**803**	763	40	*33*	*7*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**139 348**	**116 091**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**23 257**	**NAP**
Sweden	**13 755**	**750**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**11 108**	**1 897**
Average	**52 085**	**49 041**	**3 965**	3 707	542	*780*	*88*	*16*	62	**11 422**	**6 070**
Median	**13 418**	**6 175**	**3 893**	3 893	190	*829*	*88*	*16*	62	**3 325**	**933**
Minimum	**988**	**610**	**0**	0	40	*33*	*4*	*16*	58	**1**	**51**
Maximum	**340 257**	**334 910**	**12 700**	12 700	1 482	*1 478*	*174*	*16*	66	**57 216**	**19 399**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**22%**	**30%**	26%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**30%**	33%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.7.2a(2019): Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming 1st Jan. 2019

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**25 523**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Belgium	**24 177**	**24 177**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**59 922**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**14 421**	**NA**
Croatia	**62 150**	**34 633**	**21 186**	19 168	1 874	*1 756*	*118*	*NAP*	144	**6 331**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**930**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**234**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**59 324**	**54 478**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**4 846**
Denmark	**5 022**	**5 022**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**3 822**	**1 841**	**865**	865	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 116**	**NAP**
Finland	**2 801**	**2 187**	**569**	569	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**45**
France	**263 044**	**190 203**	**37 157**	37 157	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**35 684**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**121 042**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**50 788**	**42 062**
Greece	**NA**	**23 187**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**40 152**	**11 857**	**23 619**	22 469	809	*NAP*	*693*	*116*	341	**2 246**	**2 430**
Ireland	**2 685**	**2 685**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**115 428**	**106 921**	**8 507**	8 507	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**5 272**	**4 170**	**0**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 102**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**17 082**	**11 463**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 683**	**1 936**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 197**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**218**	**NA**
Malta	**694**	**694**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**23 008**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 632**	**NAP**
Poland	**240 192**	**155 341**	**23 774**	23 378	396	*NAP*	*396*	*NAP*	NAP	**16 844**	**44 233**
Portugal	**24 466**	**20 123**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 343**	**NAP**
Romania	**191 115**	**188 249**	**2 866**	1 272	1 594	*1 594*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**34 411**	**21 167**	**13 244**	13 244	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**13 333**	**7 648**	**5 685**	5 265	420	*360*	*60*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**224 499**	**182 864**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**41 635**	**NAP**
Sweden	**64 516**	**2 888**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**44 555**	**17 073**
Average	**62 649**	**51 045**	**12 497**	11 990	1 019	*1 237*	*317*	*116*	243	**14 615**	**16 089**
Median	**24 995**	**20 123**	**8 507**	8 507	809	*1 594*	*257*	*116*	243	**5 337**	**4 846**
Minimum	**694**	**694**	**0**	0	396	*360*	*60*	*116*	144	**0**	**45**
Maximum	**263 044**	**190 203**	**37 157**	37 157	1 874	*1 756*	*693*	*116*	341	**50 788**	**44 233**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	26%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**30%**	33%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.7.2b(2019): Second instance other than criminal cases - incoming 1st Jan. 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,29**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,21**	**0,21**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**0,87**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,21**	**NA**
Croatia	**1,54**	**0,86**	**0,52**	0,47	0,05	*0,04*	*0,00*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,16**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**0,10**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**0,55**	**0,51**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,05**
Denmark	**0,09**	**0,09**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**0,29**	**0,14**	**0,07**	0,07	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,08**	**NAP**
Finland	**0,05**	**0,04**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,00**
France	**0,39**	**0,28**	**0,06**	0,06	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,05**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,15**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,06**	**0,05**
Greece	**NA**	**0,22**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**0,41**	**0,12**	**0,24**	0,23	0,01	*NAP*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,02**
Ireland	**0,05**	**0,05**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**0,19**	**0,18**	**0,01**	0,01	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**0,28**	**0,22**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,06**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**0,61**	**0,41**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,13**	**0,07**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,19**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Malta	**0,13**	**0,13**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**0,13**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,06**	**NAP**
Poland	**0,63**	**0,41**	**0,06**	0,06	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,12**
Portugal	**0,24**	**0,20**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**NAP**
Romania	**1,00**	**0,98**	**0,01**	0,01	0,01	*0,01*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**0,63**	**0,39**	**0,24**	0,24	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**0,63**	**0,36**	**0,27**	0,25	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**0,47**	**0,39**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,09**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,62**	**0,03**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,43**	**0,16**
Average	**0,43**	**0,28**	**0,14**	0,13	0,02	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,09**	**0,07**
Median	**0,34**	**0,21**	**0,06**	0,06	0,01	*0,02*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,06**	**0,05**
Minimum	**0,05**	**0,03**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,01*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**1,54**	**0,98**	**0,52**	0,47	0,05	*0,04*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,43**	**0,16**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	26%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**30%**	33%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**30%**	**56%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.7.3a(2019): Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved 1st Jan. 2019

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**25 580**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Belgium	**26 663**	**26 663**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**57 658**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**14 567**	**NA**
Croatia	**69 895**	**41 262**	**22 863**	20 561	2 162	*2 045*	*117*	*NAP*	140	**5 770**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**810**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**205**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**61 251**	**56 248**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**5 003**
Denmark	**4 717**	**4 717**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**3 751**	**1 792**	**814**	814	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 145**	**NAP**
Finland	**2 698**	**2 117**	**523**	523	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**58**
France	**264 733**	**194 479**	**35 994**	35 994	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**34 260**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**102 945**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**49 744**	**41 506**
Greece	**NA**	**23 477**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**42 247**	**12 999**	**24 139**	22 884	889	*NAP*	*773*	*116*	366	**2 389**	**2 720**
Ireland	**2 498**	**2 498**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**148 023**	**139 548**	**8 475**	8 475	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**5 151**	**4 143**	**0**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 008**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**17 752**	**12 075**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 732**	**1 945**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 232**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**209**	**NA**
Malta	**780**	**780**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**23 506**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 630**	**NAP**
Poland	**217 234**	**139 755**	**22 220**	21 863	357	*NAP*	*357*	*NAP*	NAP	**16 407**	**38 852**
Portugal	**24 387**	**20 486**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 901**	**NAP**
Romania	**191 155**	**188 226**	**2 929**	1 247	1 682	*1 682*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**38 222**	**23 452**	**14 770**	14 770	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**13 708**	**8 030**	**5 678**	5 239	439	*378*	*61*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**200 117**	**170 065**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**30 052**	**NAP**
Sweden	**62 280**	**2 756**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**43 166**	**16 358**
Average	**62 701**	**51 293**	**12 582**	12 034	1 106	*1 368*	*327*	*116*	253	**13 574**	**15 206**
Median	**26 122**	**20 486**	**8 475**	8 475	889	*1 682*	*237*	*116*	253	**4 836**	**5 003**
Minimum	**780**	**780**	**0**	0	357	*378*	*61*	*116*	140	**0**	**58**
Maximum	**264 733**	**194 479**	**35 994**	35 994	2 162	*2 045*	*773*	*116*	366	**49 744**	**41 506**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	26%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**30%**	33%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.7.3b(2019): Second instance other than criminal cases - resolved 1st Jan. 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	0,3	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	0,2	0,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	0,8	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	0,2	NA
Croatia	1,7	1,0	0,6	0,5	0,1	*0,1*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	0,1	NAP
Cyprus	0,1	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,0	NA
Czech Republic	0,6	0,5	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	0,0
Denmark	0,1	0,1	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,3	0,1	0,1	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,1	NAP
Finland	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	0,0
France	0,4	0,3	0,1	0,1	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,1	NAP
Germany	NA	0,1	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,1	0,0
Greece	NA	0,2	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,4	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	0,0	0,0
Ireland	0,1	0,1	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,2	0,2	0,0	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	0,3	0,2	0,0	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,1	NAP
Lithuania	0,6	0,4	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,1	0,1
Luxembourg	NA	0,2	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	0,0	NA
Malta	0,2	0,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Netherlands	0,1	NA	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,1	NAP
Poland	0,6	0,4	0,1	0,1	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	0,0	0,1
Portugal	0,2	0,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,0	NAP
Romania	1,0	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,7	0,4	0,3	0,3	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	0,0	NAP
Slovenia	0,6	0,4	0,3	0,2	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	0,4	0,4	NA	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	0,1	NAP
Sweden	0,6	0,0	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,4	0,2
Average	0,4	0,3	0,1	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	0,1	0,1
Median	0,3	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	0,1	0,0
Minimum	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	0,0	0,0
Maximum	1,7	1,0	0,6	0,5	0,1	*0,1*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	0,4	0,2
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	15%	30%	26%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	11%	19%
% of NAP	0%	0%	30%	33%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	30%	56%

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.7.4a(2019): Second instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2019

Absolute values (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**4 675**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**15 875**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**2 265**	**NA**
Croatia	**39 197**	**28 065**	**7 808**	6 544	1 194	*1 189*	*5*	*NAP*	70	**3 324**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**4 335**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**968**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**11 297**	**10 521**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**776**
Denmark	**2 488**	**2 488**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**1 109**	**639**	**182**	182	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**288**	**NAP**
Finland	**1 391**	**1 190**	**163**	163	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**38**
France	**301 152**	**256 397**	**13 863**	13 863	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 892**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**84 305**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**58 217**	**19 882**
Greece	**NA**	**41 064**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**8 643**	**3 741**	**3 925**	3 782	110	*NAP*	*94*	*16*	33	**418**	**559**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**307 662**	**302 283**	**5 379**	5 379	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**1 944**	**1 350**	**0**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**594**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**7 320**	**3 305**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 839**	**176**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**1 648**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**163**	**NA**
Malta	**1 870**	**1 870**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**27 510**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 870**	**NAP**
Poland	**126 871**	**67 137**	**7 091**	6 884	207	*NAP*	*207*	*NAP*	NAP	**28 086**	**24 557**
Portugal	**14 882**	**5 812**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 070**	**NAP**
Romania	**72 979**	**71 874**	**1 105**	364	741	*741*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**13 616**	**11 248**	**2 367**	2 367	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**1**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**2 424**	**1 614**	**810**	789	21	*15*	*6*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**164 341**	**129 907**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**34 434**	**NAP**
Sweden	**15 991**	**882**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 497**	**2 612**
Average	**52 162**	**48 921**	**3 881**	3 665	455	*648*	*78*	*16*	52	**12 433**	**6 943**
Median	**12 457**	**5 812**	**2 367**	2 367	207	*741*	*50*	*16*	52	**3 582**	**776**
Minimum	**1 109**	**639**	**0**	0	21	*15*	*5*	*16*	33	**1**	**38**
Maximum	**307 662**	**302 283**	**13 863**	13 863	1 194	*1 189*	*207*	*16*	70	**58 217**	**24 557**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**22%**	**30%**	26%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**30%**	33%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.7.4b(2019): Second instance other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,1**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**0,2**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,0**	**NA**
Croatia	**1,0**	**0,7**	**0,2**	0,2	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	0,0	**0,1**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**0,5**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,1**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**0,1**	**0,1**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,0**
Denmark	**0,0**	**0,0**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**0,1**	**0,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Finland	**0,0**	**0,0**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,0**
France	**0,4**	**0,4**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**0,1**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,1**	**0,0**
Greece	**NA**	**0,4**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**0,1**	**0,0**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**0,5**	**0,5**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**0,1**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**0,3**	**0,1**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,0**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,3**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,0**	**NA**
Malta	**0,4**	**0,4**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**0,2**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Poland	**0,3**	**0,2**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*NAP*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,1**
Portugal	**0,1**	**0,1**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**NAP**
Romania	**0,4**	**0,4**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**0,2**	**0,2**	**0,0**	0,0	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,0**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**0,1**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**0,3**	**0,3**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,1**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,2**	**0,0**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,1**	**0,0**
Average	**0,3**	**0,2**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Median	**0,2**	**0,1**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,0**
Minimum	**0,0**	**0,0**	**0,0**	0,0	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,0**	**0,0**
Maximum	**1,0**	**0,7**	**0,2**	0,2	0,0	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	**0,1**	**0,1**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**22%**	**30%**	26%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**30%**	33%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**30%**	**56%**

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.7.5(2019): Second instance courts, number of civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending older than 2 years in 2019 (Q97)

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q97)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	2 459	8,8%	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Finland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	950	3,1%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	134 551	44,5%	NAP	NAP
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	13	0,4%	13	0,3%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	973	52,0%	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	665	0,9%	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	8	0,9%	456	3,6%
Average	**17 334**	**13,4%**	**355**	**1,8%**
Median	**339**	**0,9%**	**235**	**1,7%**
Minimum	**0**	**0,0%**	**0**	**0,0%**
Maximum	**134 551**	**52,0%**	**950**	**3,6%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**70%**	**70%**	**59%**	**59%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	**26%**

Romania: Cases older than 3 years are presented.

Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases

Table 3.8.1(2021): Clearance rate for second instance other than criminal cases in 2021 (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**96,3%**	**94,4%**	**98,8%**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**105,0%**	**105,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**99,3%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**100,1%**	**NA**
Croatia	**103,4%**	**98,0%**	**109,9%**	110,0%	110,0%	*111,1%*	*98,9%*	*NAP*	87,7%	**116,0%**	NAP
Cyprus	**92,3%**	**100,4%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**59,6%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**103,5%**	**103,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**97,9%**
Denmark	**102,4%**	**102,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**91,9%**	**89,9%**	**94,7%**	94,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,2%**	NAP
Finland	**96,0%**	**95,2%**	**97,7%**	97,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**110,7%**
France	**104,5%**	**105,5%**	**104,1%**	104,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**100,0%**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**84,9%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**102,2%**	**99,1%**
Greece	**89,0%**	**102,1%**	**67,6%**	67,1%	69,1%	*69,1%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**83,3%**	**79,3%**
Hungary	**101,4%**	**98,9%**	**102,2%**	102,3%	97,9%	*NAP*	*96,9%*	*103,2%*	97,6%	**131,0%**	**105,5%**
Ireland	**77,4%**	**77,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**121,6%**	**123,3%**	**102,3%**	102,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**100,8%**	**103,1%**	**103,0%**	103,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,6%**	NAP
Lithuania	**102,0%**	**101,6%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**104,9%**	**98,6%**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**97,8%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**124,5%**	**NA**
Malta	**122,0%**	**122,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**96,3%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,7%**	NAP
Poland	**94,7%**	**97,3%**	**102,9%**	102,6%	116,7%	*NAP*	*116,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**63,7%**	**104,8%**
Portugal	**98,9%**	**101,5%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**89,4%**	NAP
Romania	**96,2%**	**96,2%**	**98,4%**	105,9%	93,5%	*93,5%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**107,9%**	**112,4%**	**102,3%**	102,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-**	NAP
Slovenia	**97,6%**	**96,6%**	**99,0%**	99,1%	97,2%	*96,3%*	*101,6%*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**87,6%**	**86,3%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**96,4%**	NAP
Sweden	**98,1%**	**100,7%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**97,1%**	**99,5%**
Average	**99,5%**	**99,9%**	**98,7%**	99,3%	97,4%	*92,5%*	*103,5%*	*103,2%*	92,6%	**96,6%**	**99,4%**
Median	**98,9%**	**100,4%**	**102,2%**	102,3%	97,6%	*94,9%*	*100,3%*	*103,2%*	92,6%	**96,8%**	**99,3%**
Minimum	**77,4%**	**77,4%**	**67,6%**	67,1%	69,1%	*69,1%*	*96,9%*	*103,2%*	87,7%	**59,6%**	**79,3%**
Maximum	**122,0%**	**123,3%**	**109,9%**	110,0%	116,7%	*111,1%*	*116,7%*	*103,2%*	97,6%	**131,0%**	**110,7%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**26%**	30%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.8.2(2021): Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases in 2021 (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**79**	**96**	**58**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**127**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**61**	**NA**
Croatia	**157**	**205**	**90**	90	87	*92*	*18*	*NAP*	178	**122**	NAP
Cyprus	**1693**	**1481**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3132**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**67**	**66**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**76**
Denmark	**176**	**176**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**132**	**166**	**92**	92	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**122**	NAP
Finland	**199**	**222**	**104**	104	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**265**
France	**399**	**466**	**155**	155	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**328**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**362**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**456**	**189**
Greece	**735**	**610**	**615**	612	621	*621*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**841**	**128**
Hungary	**68**	**116**	**46**	46	53	*NAP*	*52*	*56*	48	**48**	**67**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**777**	**817**	**226**	226	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**112**	**94**	**37**	37	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**199**	NAP
Lithuania	**110**	**70**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**240**	**32**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**501**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**225**	**NA**
Malta	**567**	**567**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**407**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**460**	NAP
Poland	**248**	**187**	**110**	110	149	*NAP*	*149*	*NAP*	NAP	**778**	**269**
Portugal	**234**	**89**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**836**	NAP
Romania	**164**	**164**	**148**	104	180	*180*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**140**	**180**	**85**	85	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-**	NAP
Slovenia	**49**	**59**	**34**	34	27	*29*	*18*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**305**	**280**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**450**	NAP
Sweden	**81**	**111**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**92**	**52**
Average	**305**	**308**	**138**	141	186	*231*	*59*	*56*	113	**524**	**135**
Median	**164**	**180**	**92**	98	118	*136*	*35*	*56*	113	**284**	**102**
Minimum	**49**	**59**	**34**	34	27	*29*	*18*	*56*	48	**48**	**32**
Maximum	**1 693**	**1 481**	**615**	612	621	*621*	*149*	*56*	178	**3 132**	**269**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**15%**	**26%**	26%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	30%	63%	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	63%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.8.1(2020): Clearance rate for second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**101,7%**	**102,1%**	**101,3%**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**104,1%**	**104,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**95,0%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**100,2%**	**NA**
Croatia	**117,0%**	**129,4%**	**103,0%**	101,2%	121,2%	*122,6%*	*98,2%*	*NAP*	118,4%	**108,2%**	NAP
Cyprus	**77,4%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**69,0%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**99,8%**	**99,7%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**101,7%**
Denmark	**98,2%**	**98,2%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**98,9%**	**102,2%**	**97,7%**	97,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**95,3%**	NAP
Finland	**104,5%**	**104,4%**	**107,6%**	107,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**82,3%**
France	**103,0%**	**105,3%**	**95,1%**	95,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**101,6%**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**102,9%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**106,7%**	**100,1%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**98,1%**	NAP
Hungary	**105,5%**	**107,1%**	**103,1%**	103,0%	106,4%	*NAP*	*107,8%*	*97,8%*	102,2%	**145,5%**	**105,5%**
Ireland	**104,6%**	**104,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**113,3%**	**114,6%**	**96,7%**	96,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**111,4%**	**109,8%**	**100,5%**	100,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**119,5%**	NAP
Lithuania	**112,2%**	**110,7%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**122,4%**	**101,6%**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**105,1%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**73,0%**	**NA**
Malta	**129,8%**	**129,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**109,7%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**118,5%**	NAP
Poland	**101,5%**	**105,2%**	**104,5%**	104,6%	97,3%	*NAP*	*97,3%*	*NAP*	NAP	**109,8%**	**84,9%**
Portugal	**104,4%**	**107,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**92,4%**	NAP
Romania	**96,9%**	**96,9%**	**98,7%**	94,7%	102,0%	*102,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**107,6%**	**115,6%**	**96,6%**	96,6%	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**-**	NAP
Slovenia	**111,1%**	**112,4%**	**109,3%**	110,1%	101,3%	*100,9%*	*103,0%*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**112,9%**	**116,9%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**94,1%**	NAP
Sweden	**106,4%**	**96,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**109,9%**	**100,1%**
Average	**105,3%**	**107,9%**	**101,2%**	100,7%	105,6%	*108,5%*	*101,6%*	*97,8%*	110,3%	**104,0%**	**96,6%**
Median	**104,5%**	**105,2%**	**100,9%**	100,5%	102,0%	*102,0%*	*100,6%*	*97,8%*	110,3%	**104,1%**	**100,1%**
Minimum	**77,4%**	**96,3%**	**95,1%**	94,7%	97,3%	*100,9%*	*97,3%*	*97,8%*	102,2%	**69,0%**	**82,3%**
Maximum	**129,8%**	**129,8%**	**109,3%**	110,1%	121,2%	*122,6%*	*107,8%*	*97,8%*	118,4%	**145,5%**	**105,5%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	33%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.8.2(2020): Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases in 2020 (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**67**	**77**	**53**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**127**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**64**	**NA**
Croatia	**159**	**184**	**117**	116	121	*126*	*23*	*NAP*	130	**165**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**2176**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**2688**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**78**	**79**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**72**
Denmark	**180**	**180**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**104**	**120**	**77**	77	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**105**	**NAP**
Finland	**180**	**210**	**78**	78	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**286**
France	**509**	**607**	**210**	210	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**362**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**265**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**419**	**179**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**599**	**NAP**
Hungary	**71**	**116**	**55**	56	37	*NAP*	*31*	*73*	29	**4**	**69**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**981**	**1026**	**298**	298	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**105**	**97**	**51**	51	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**138**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**112**	**66**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**282**	**32**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**497**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**421**	**NA**
Malta	**838**	**838**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**422**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**465**	**NAP**
Poland	**255**	**188**	**206**	205	246	*NAP*	*246*	*NAP*	NAP	**618**	**358**
Portugal	**244**	**99**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**877**	**NAP**
Romania	**174**	**174**	**165**	144	180	*180*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**145**	**177**	**91**	91	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**0**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**35**	**40**	**27**	28	14	*12*	*21*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**260**	**227**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**452**	**NAP**
Sweden	**66**	**128**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**68**	**52**
Average	**331**	**257**	**119**	123	120	*106*	*81*	*73*	79	**455**	**150**
Median	**167**	**177**	**84**	91	121	*126*	*27*	*73*	79	**362**	**72**
Minimum	**35**	**40**	**27**	28	14	*12*	*21*	*73*	29	**0**	**32**
Maximum	**2 176**	**1 026**	**298**	298	246	*180*	*246*	*73*	130	**2 688**	**358**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**22%**	**30%**	30%	22%	*22%*	*22%*	*19%*	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	30%	59%	*67%*	*63%*	*78%*	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.8.1(2019): Clearance rate for second instance other than criminal cases in 2019 (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**100,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Belgium	**110,3%**	**110,3%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**96,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**101,0%**	**NA**
Croatia	**112,5%**	**119,1%**	**107,9%**	107,3%	115,4%	*116,5%*	*99,2%*	*NAP*	97,2%	**91,1%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**87,1%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**87,6%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**103,2%**	**103,2%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**103,2%**
Denmark	**93,9%**	**93,9%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**98,1%**	**97,3%**	**94,1%**	94,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**102,6%**	**NAP**
Finland	**96,3%**	**96,8%**	**91,9%**	91,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**128,9%**
France	**100,6%**	**102,2%**	**96,9%**	96,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**96,0%**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**85,0%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**97,9%**	**98,7%**
Greece	**NA**	**101,3%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**105,2%**	**109,6%**	**102,2%**	101,8%	109,9%	*NAP*	*111,5%*	*100,0%*	107,3%	**106,4%**	**111,9%**
Ireland	**93,0%**	**93,0%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**128,2%**	**130,5%**	**99,6%**	99,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**97,7%**	**99,4%**	**-**	-	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**91,5%**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**103,9%**	**105,3%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**101,3%**	**100,5%**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**102,9%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**95,9%**	**NA**
Malta	**112,4%**	**112,4%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**102,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**100,0%**	**NAP**
Poland	**90,4%**	**90,0%**	**93,5%**	93,5%	90,2%	*NAP*	*90,2%*	*NAP*	NAP	**97,4%**	**87,8%**
Portugal	**99,7%**	**101,8%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**89,8%**	**NAP**
Romania	**100,0%**	**100,0%**	**102,2%**	98,0%	105,5%	*105,5%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**111,1%**	**110,8%**	**111,5%**	111,5%	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**-**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**102,8%**	**105,0%**	**99,9%**	99,5%	104,5%	*105,0%*	*101,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**89,1%**	**93,0%**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**72,2%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**96,5%**	**95,4%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**96,9%**	**95,8%**
Average	**101,3%**	**102,5%**	**100,0%**	99,4%	105,1%	*109,0%*	*100,6%*	*100,0%*	102,3%	**95,2%**	**103,8%**
Median	**100,1%**	**101,8%**	**99,8%**	98,8%	105,5%	*105,5%*	*100,4%*	*100,0%*	102,3%	**96,9%**	**100,5%**
Minimum	**87,1%**	**85,0%**	**91,9%**	91,9%	90,2%	*105,0%*	*90,2%*	*100,0%*	97,2%	**72,2%**	**87,8%**
Maximum	**128,2%**	**130,5%**	**111,5%**	111,5%	115,4%	*116,5%*	*111,5%*	*100,0%*	107,3%	**106,4%**	**128,9%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	26%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**30%**	33%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.8.2(2019): Disposition time for second instance other than criminal cases in 2019 (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**67**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**100**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**57**	**NA**
Croatia	**205**	**248**	**125**	116	202	*212*	*16*	*NAP*	183	**210**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**1953**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1724**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**67**	**68**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**57**
Denmark	**193**	**193**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**108**	**130**	**82**	82	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**92**	**NAP**
Finland	**188**	**205**	**114**	114	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**239**
France	**415**	**481**	**141**	141	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**329**	**NAP**
Germany	**NA**	**299**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**427**	**175**
Greece	**NA**	**638**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Hungary	**75**	**105**	**59**	60	45	*NAP*	*44*	*50*	33	**64**	**75**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**759**	**791**	**232**	232	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Latvia	**138**	**119**			NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**215**	**NAP**
Lithuania	**151**	**100**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**375**	**33**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**488**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**285**	**NA**
Malta	**875**	**875**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**427**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**476**	**NAP**
Poland	**213**	**175**	**116**	115	212	*NAP*	*212*	*NAP*	NAP	**625**	**231**
Portugal	**223**	**104**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**849**	**NAP**
Romania	**139**	**139**	**138**	107	161	*161*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**130**	**175**	**58**	58	NA	*NAP*	*NA*	*NAP*	NAP	**-**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**65**	**73**	**52**	55	17	*14*	*36*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Spain	**300**	**279**	**NA**	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**418**	**NAP**
Sweden	**94**	**117**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**106**	**58**
Average	**313**	**276**	**112**	108	127	*129*	*77*	*50*	108	**417**	**124**
Median	**169**	**175**	**115**	110	161	*161*	*40*	*50*	108	**329**	**75**
Minimum	**65**	**68**	**52**	55	17	*14*	*16*	*50*	33	**57**	**33**
Maximum	**1 953**	**875**	**232**	232	212	*212*	*212*	*50*	183	**1 724**	**239**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**26**	26	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**22%**	**31%**	27%	22%	*19%*	*22%*	*19%*	26%	**11%**	**19%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**31%**	35%	59%	*70%*	*63%*	*78%*	67%	**30%**	**56%**

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Variations of second instance other than criminal cases by case categories

Table 3.9.1: Second instance courts, variation of incoming other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**7,5%**	**11,9%**	**2,0%**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**6,5%**	**6,5%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**-1,5%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**6,7%**	**NA**
Croatia	**11,4%**	**28,3%**	**-7,0%**	-9,5%	15,9%	*12,4%*	*73,7%*	NAP	40,8%	**-2,5%**	NAP
Cyprus	**11,4%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**11,2%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**-2,6%**	**-3,7%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**12,5%**
Denmark	**-8,3%**	**-8,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**12,4%**	**8,8%**	**10,1%**	10,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**19,5%**	NAP
Finland	**6,1%**	**13,1%**	**-11,1%**	-11,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**-29,3%**
France	**20,5%**	**24,3%**	**12,5%**	12,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12,2%**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**7,9%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-5,8%**	**-3,0%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	NAP	NAP	NA	**2,1%**	NAP
Hungary	**3,3%**	**14,5%**	**4,9%**	5,8%	-9,2%	NAP	*-11,6%*	*5,4%*	-21,0%	**-96,7%**	**-17,5%**
Ireland	**-2,0%**	**-2,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**8,9%**	**8,1%**	**19,5%**	19,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**1,0%**	**-0,5%**	**5,1%**	5,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5,9%**	NAP
Lithuania	**4,1%**	**-6,1%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**27,6%**	**23,6%**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**6,5%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-18,2%**	**NA**
Malta	**45,1%**	**45,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**19,4%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**37,5%**	NAP
Poland	**15,8%**	**15,4%**	**-11,3%**	-11,6%	2,2%	*NAP*	*2,2%*	*NAP*	NAP	**87,7%**	**1,7%**
Portugal	**11,1%**	**10,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13,8%**	NAP
Romania	**18,4%**	**18,4%**	**17,7%**	4,7%	28,0%	*28,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**-12,8%**	**-16,8%**	**-7,2%**	-7,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP		NAP
Slovenia	**0,1%**	**0,5%**	**-0,4%**	0,4%	-8,6%	*-8,6%*	*-8,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**32,4%**	**39,0%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1,5%**	NAP
Sweden	**-2,7%**	**6,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-6,2%**	**3,7%**
Average	**8,6%**	**9,9%**	**2,9%**	1,7%	5,7%	*10,6%*	*13,9%*	*5,4%*	9,9%	**6,0%**	**-1,2%**
Median	**7,0%**	**8,1%**	**3,5%**	4,7%	2,2%	*12,4%*	*-3,3%*	*5,4%*	9,9%	**6,3%**	**1,7%**
Minimum	**-12,8%**	**-16,8%**	**-11,3%**	-11,6%	-9,2%	*-8,6%*	*-11,6%*	*5,4%*	-21,0%	**-96,7%**	**-29,3%**
Maximum	**45,1%**	**45,1%**	**19,5%**	19,5%	28,0%	*28,0%*	*73,7%*	*5,4%*	40,8%	**87,7%**	**23,6%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	33%	19%	19%	15%	15%	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	63%	70%	70%	81%	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Table 3.9.2: Second instance courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021
in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**1,7%**	**3,5%**	**-0,5%**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**7,5%**	**7,5%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**3,0%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**6,6%**	**NA**
Croatia	**-1,5%**	**-2,9%**	**-0,8%**	-1,6%	5,3%	*1,9%*	*75,0%*	*NAP*	4,2%	**4,5%**	NAP
Cyprus	**32,9%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-3,8%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**0,9%**	**0,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**8,3%**
Denmark	**-4,4%**	**-4,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**4,5%**	**-4,4%**	**6,8%**	6,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**15,6%**	NAP
Finland	**-2,4%**	**3,1%**	**-19,3%**	-19,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**-4,9%**
France	**22,3%**	**24,6%**	**23,2%**	23,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10,4%**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**-11,0%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-9,8%**	**-3,9%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-13,3%**	NAP
Hungary	**-0,6%**	**5,8%**	**4,0%**	5,1%	-16,4%	*NAP*	*-20,6%*	*11,2%*	-24,5%	**-97,0%**	**-17,5%**
Ireland	**-27,5%**	**-27,5%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**16,9%**	**16,3%**	**26,4%**	26,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	NAP
Latvia	**-8,5%**	**-6,6%**	**7,7%**	7,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-17,9%**	NAP
Lithuania	**-5,3%**	**-13,8%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**9,3%**	**20,0%**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**-0,9%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**39,5%**	**NA**
Malta	**36,4%**	**36,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**4,9%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7,5%**	NAP
Poland	**8,1%**	**6,8%**	**-12,7%**	-13,3%	22,7%	*NAP*	*22,7%*	*NAP*	NAP	**8,8%**	**25,5%**
Portugal	**5,2%**	**4,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10,1%**	NAP
Romania	**17,5%**	**17,5%**	**17,2%**	17,0%	17,4%	*17,4%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**-12,6%**	**-19,1%**	**-1,8%**	-1,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-100,0%**	NAP
Slovenia	**-12,1%**	**-13,6%**	**-9,8%**	-9,6%	-12,3%	*-12,8%*	*-10,1%*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**2,8%**	**2,6%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**4,0%**	NAP
Sweden	**-10,3%**	**11,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-17,1%**	**3,1%**
Average	**3,3%**	**1,6%**	**3,4%**	3,7%	3,3%	*2,2%*	*16,8%*	*11,2%*	-10,1%	**-8,4%**	**4,4%**
Median	**2,3%**	**2,6%**	**1,8%**	5,1%	5,3%	*1,9%*	*6,3%*	*11,2%*	-10,1%	**4,5%**	**3,1%**
Minimum	**-27,5%**	**-27,5%**	**-19,3%**	-19,3%	-16,4%	*-12,8%*	*-20,6%*	*11,2%*	-24,5%	**-100,0%**	**-17,5%**
Maximum	**36,4%**	**36,4%**	**26,4%**	26,4%	22,7%	*17,4%*	*75,0%*	*11,2%*	4,2%	**39,5%**	**25,5%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	33%	19%	19%	15%	15%	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	63%	70%	70%	81%	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Table 3.9.3: Second instance courts, variation of other than criminal cases pending on 31 Dec. between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**21,1%**	**28,3%**	**7,8%**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**3,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**1,0%**	**NA**
Croatia	**-2,8%**	**8,3%**	**-23,7%**	-24,1%	-24,7%	*-25,2%*	*34,0%*	*NAP*	43,3%	**-22,7%**	NAP
Cyprus	**3,4%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**12,1%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**-13,9%**	**-15,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**13,6%**
Denmark	**-6,8%**	**-6,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**32,0%**	**32,4%**	**28,0%**	28,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**33,9%**	NAP
Finland	**8,0%**	**8,9%**	**8,0%**	8,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**-12,0%**
France	**-4,1%**	**-4,2%**	**-8,8%**	-8,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-0,2%**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**21,7%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-1,8%**	**1,6%**
Greece	**-21,6%**	**-54,5%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**21,7%**	NAP
Hungary	**-5,0%**	**5,6%**	**-12,7%**	-13,7%	19,8%	*NAP*	*32,1%*	*-14,9%*	25,6%	**-63,5%**	**-20,5%**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**-7,4%**	**-7,4%**	**-4,1%**	-4,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**-1,7%**	**-9,4%**	**-21,5%**	-21,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**18,2%**	NAP
Lithuania	**-6,6%**	**-7,7%**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-7,0%**	**18,4%**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,0%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-25,4%**	**NA**
Malta	**-7,6%**	**-7,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**1,1%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**6,5%**	NAP
Poland	**4,9%**	**6,1%**	**-53,2%**	-53,8%	-25,6%	*NAP*	*-25,6%*	*NAP*	NAP	**37,1%**	**-5,6%**
Portugal	**1,2%**	**-6,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4,9%**	NAP
Romania	**10,4%**	**10,5%**	**5,1%**	-15,6%	17,5%	*17,5%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**-15,7%**	**-17,9%**	**-8,4%**	-8,4%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP		NAP
Slovenia	**23,2%**	**27,9%**	**13,1%**	10,6%	73,5%	*109,3%*	*-24,9%*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**20,6%**	**26,5%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3,4%**	NAP
Sweden	**9,1%**	**-2,7%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12,3%**	**3,0%**
Average	**2,0%**	**1,6%**	**-5,9%**	-9,4%	12,1%	*33,8%*	*3,9%*	*-14,9%*	34,5%	**1,9%**	**-0,2%**
Median	**1,1%**	**-1,4%**	**-6,3%**	-8,8%	17,5%	*17,5%*	*3,6%*	*-14,9%*	34,5%	**4,1%**	**1,6%**
Standard deviation											
Minimum	**-21,6%**	**-54,5%**	**-53,2%**	-53,8%	-25,6%	*-25,2%*	*-25,6%*	*-14,9%*	25,6%	**-63,5%**	**-20,5%**
Maximum	**32,0%**	**32,4%**	**28,0%**	28,0%	73,5%	*109,3%*	*34,0%*	*-14,9%*	43,3%	**37,1%**	**18,4%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**19%**	**30%**	30%	19%	19%	15%	15%	30%	**7%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	30%	63%	70%	70%	81%	63%	**30%**	**59%**

Table 3.9.4: Second instance courts, variation of Clearance rate of other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage points (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**-5,5**	**-7,6**	**-2,5**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**+1,0**	**+1,0**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**+4,3**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-0,1**	**NA**
Croatia	**-13,6**	**-31,4**	**+6,9**	+8,9	-11,1	*-11,5*	*+0,7*	*NAP*	-30,8	**+7,9**	NAP
Cyprus	**+15,0**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-9,3**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**+3,6**	**+4,2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**-3,8**
Denmark	**+4,2**	**+4,2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**-7,0**	**-12,3**	**-2,9**	-2,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-3,1**	NAP
Finland	**-8,4**	**-9,2**	**-9,9**	-9,9	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**+28,4**
France	**+1,5**	**+0,2**	**+9,0**	+9,0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-1,6**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**-18,0**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-4,5**	**-0,9**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-14,8**	NAP
Hungary	**-4,1**	**-8,1**	**-0,9**	-0,7	-8,5	*NAP*	*-10,9*	*+5,3*	-4,6	**-14,5**	**+0,0**
Ireland	**-27,2**	**-27,2**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**+8,3**	**+8,7**	**+5,6**	+5,6	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**-10,5**	**-6,7**	**+2,5**	+2,5	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-26,8**	NAP
Lithuania	**-10,1**	**-9,1**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-17,5**	**-3,0**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**-7,3**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**+51,5**	**NA**
Malta	**-7,8**	**-7,8**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**-13,4**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-25,9**	NAP
Poland	**-6,8**	**-7,9**	**-1,6**	-2,0	+19,5	*NAP*	*+19,5*	*NAP*	NAP	**-46,1**	**+19,8**
Portugal	**-5,5**	**-6,1**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-3,0**	NAP
Romania	**-0,7**	**-0,7**	**-0,4**	+11,2	-8,5	*-8,5*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**+0,3**	**-3,2**	**+5,7**	+5,7	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-**	NAP
Slovenia	**-13,5**	**-15,8**	**-10,4**	-11,0	-4,1	*-4,6*	*-1,3*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**-25,3**	**-30,6**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**+2,3**	NAP
Sweden	**-8,3**	**+4,3**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-12,8**	**-0,6**
Average	**-5,4**	**-8,1**	**+0,1**	+1,5	*-2,6*	*-8,2*	*+2,0*	*+5,3*	*-17,7*	**-7,4**	**+5,7**
Median	**-6,1**	**-7,6**	**-0,7**	+2,5	*-8,5*	*-8,5*	*-0,3*	*+5,3*	*-17,7*	**-6,9**	**-0,6**
Minimum	**-27,2**	**-31,4**	**-10,4**	-11,0	*-11,1*	*-11,5*	*-10,9*	*+5,3*	*-30,8*	**-46,1**	**-3,8**
Maximum	**+15,0**	**+8,7**	**+9,0**	+11,2	*+19,5*	*-4,6*	*+19,5*	*+5,3*	*-4,6*	**+51,5**	**+28,4**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**26**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**15%**	**30%**	33%	*19%*	*19%*	*15%*	*15%*	*30%*	**8%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	26%	*63%*	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	*63%*	**31%**	**59%**

Table 3.9.5: Second instance courts, variation of Disposition time of other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage (Q97)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**19,0%**	**23,9%**	**8,4%**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NAP	**NA**
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-5,3%**	**NA**
Croatia	**-1,3%**	**11,4%**	**-23,1%**	-22,9%	-28,4%	*-26,6%*	*-23,4%*	*NAP*	37,5%	**-26,1%**	NAP
Cyprus	**-22,2%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**16,5%**	**NA**
Czech Republic	**-14,7%**	**-16,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**4,9%**
Denmark	**-2,5%**	**-2,5%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**26,4%**	**38,5%**	**19,8%**	19,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**15,8%**	NAP
Finland	**10,7%**	**5,6%**	**33,7%**	33,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**-7,5%**
France	**-21,6%**	**-23,1%**	**-26,0%**	-26,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-9,6%**	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**36,7%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**8,8%**	**5,8%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**40,4%**	NAP
Hungary	**-4,4%**	**-0,1%**	**-16,0%**	-17,9%	43,4%	*NAP*	*66,4%*	*-23,5%*	66,5%	**1113,3%**	**-3,6%**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**-20,8%**	**-20,4%**	**-24,2%**	-24,2%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**7,5%**	**-3,1%**	**-27,1%**	-27,1%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**44,0%**	NAP
Lithuania	**-1,4%**	**7,1%**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-14,9%**	**-1,4%**
Luxembourg	**NA**	**0,9%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-46,5%**	**NA**
Malta	**-32,3%**	**-32,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Netherlands	**-3,6%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-1,0%**	NAP
Poland	**-3,0%**	**-0,6%**	**-46,4%**	-46,7%	-39,4%	*NAP*	*-39,4%*	*NAP*	NAP	**26,0%**	**-24,8%**
Portugal	**-3,8%**	**-10,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-4,7%**	NAP
Romania	**-6,1%**	**-6,0%**	**-10,3%**	-27,9%	0,1%	*0,1%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**-3,5%**	**1,5%**	**-6,7%**	-6,7%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-**	NAP
Slovenia	**40,1%**	**48,1%**	**25,5%**	22,4%	97,8%	*139,9%*	*-16,5%*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Spain	**17,4%**	**23,3%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-0,6%**	NAP
Sweden	**21,6%**	**-12,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**35,4%**	**-0,1%**
Average	**+0,1%**	**+3,3%**	**-7,7%**	-11,2%	*+14,7%*	*+37,8%*	*-3,2%*	*-23,5%*	*+52,0%*	**+74,5%**	**-3,8%**
Median	**-2,7%**	**-0,1%**	**-13,2%**	-22,9%	*+0,1%*	*+0,1%*	*-20,0%*	*-23,5%*	*+52,0%*	**+4,1%**	**-1,4%**
Minimum	**-32,3%**	**-32,3%**	**-46,4%**	-46,7%	*-39,4%*	*-26,6%*	*-39,4%*	*-23,5%*	*+37,5%*	**-46,5%**	**-24,8%**
Maximum	**+40,1%**	**+48,1%**	**+33,7%**	+33,7%	*+97,8%*	*+139,9%*	*+66,4%*	*-23,5%*	*+66,5%*	**+1113,3%**	**+5,8%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**26**	**27**
% of NA	**19%**	**22%**	**30%**	30%	*19%*	*19%*	*15%*	*15%*	*30%*	**8%**	**15%**
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	**26%**	30%	*63%*	*70%*	*70%*	*81%*	*63%*	**31%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Malta: In the second instance courts, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.10.1(2021): Supreme court other than criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. in 2021

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**762**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**3 182**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 797**	**1 178**	**58**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	58	**547**	**14**
Bulgaria	**7 358**	**3 841**	**3**	3	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**3 514**	**NAP**
Croatia	**12 016**	**11 367**	**532**	434	90	*90*	*NAP*	*NAP*	8	**117**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**5 095**	**1 662**	**38**	38	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 136**	**259**
Denmark	**146**	**146**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**86**	**48**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**38**	**NAP**
Finland	**3 543**	**259**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 129**	**155**
France	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 860**	**NAP**
Germany	**8 973**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 111**	**996**
Greece	**14 339**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**12 039**	**NA**
Hungary	**1 642**	**961**	**55**	44	10	*NAP*	*10*	*0*	1	**551**	**75**
Ireland	**115**	**115**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**144 308**	**120 089**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**23 835**	**384**
Latvia	**1 158**	**419**	**2**	NAP	2	*2*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0	**737**	**0**
Lithuania	**408**	**389**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**19**
Luxembourg	**109**	**109**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 277**	**460**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**817**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**1 613**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**83**
Portugal	**1 814**	**819**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**995**	**NAP**
Romania	**36 870**	**16 476**	**98**	1	97	*97*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 296**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**4 209**	**2 317**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 891**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**435**	**291**	**22**	17	5	*5*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**122**	**NAP**
Spain	**30 903**	**22 880**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 023**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2 626**	**77**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 854**	**695**
Average	**12 692**	**8 467**	**101**	90	41	*49*	*10*	*0*	17	**4 690**	**268**
Median	**2 220**	**791**	**47**	28	10	*48*	*10*	*0*	5	**2 501**	**119**
Minimum	**86**	**48**	**2**	1	2	*2*	*10*	*0*	0	**38**	**0**
Maximum	**144 308**	**120 089**	**532**	434	97	*97*	*10*	*0*	58	**23 835**	**996**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	63%	**19%**	**56%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.10.2a(2021): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**2 359**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**6 048**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 675**	**844**	**264**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	264	**541**	**26**
Bulgaria	**20 789**	**7 798**	**160**	160	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**12 831**	**NAP**
Croatia	**7 956**	**7 185**	**597**	523	64	*64*	*NAP*	*NAP*	10	**174**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**8 200**	**3 762**	**187**	187	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 012**	**239**
Denmark	**242**	**242**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**186**	**114**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**72**	**NAP**
Finland	**5 143**	**733**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 099**	**311**
France	**27 094**	**15 781**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**11 313**	**NAP**
Germany	**13 167**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**4 990**	**1 491**
Greece	**6 301**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 657**	**NA**
Hungary	**7 397**	**2 042**	**721**	674	18	*NAP*	*14*	*4*	29	**4 414**	**235**
Ireland	**160**	**160**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**43 652**	**31 114**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 108**	**430**
Latvia	**1 798**	**1 069**	**23**	NAP	23	*23*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0	**706**	**0**
Lithuania	**454**	**335**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**119**
Luxembourg	**82**	**82**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 621**	**401**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**1 220**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**12 687**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**1 312**
Portugal	**3 952**	**2 781**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 171**	**NAP**
Romania	**50 974**	**22 512**	**232**	39	193	*193*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**28 230**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3 985**	**3 101**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**884**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**2 161**	**1 651**	**114**	101	13	*13*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**396**	**NAP**
Spain	**26 457**	**16 113**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 344**	**NAP**
Sweden	**13 195**	**258**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 731**	**5 206**
Average	**10 724**	**5 788**	**287**	281	62	*73*	*14*	*4*	76	**5 747**	**937**
Median	**5 143**	**2 042**	**210**	174	23	*44*	*14*	*4*	20	**4 056**	**275**
Minimum	**82**	**82**	**23**	39	13	*13*	*14*	*4*	0	**72**	**0**
Maximum	**50 974**	**31 114**	**721**	674	193	*193*	*14*	*4*	264	**28 230**	**5 206**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	63%	**19%**	**56%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.10.2b(2021): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**0,03**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,07**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Bulgaria	**0,30**	**0,11**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,19**	**NAP**
Croatia	**0,21**	**0,19**	**0,02**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,00**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Finland	**0,09**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,01**
France	**0,04**	**0,02**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Germany	**0,02**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,01**	**0,00**
Greece	**0,06**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Hungary	**0,08**	**0,02**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,05**	**0,00**
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**0,07**	**0,05**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,10**	**0,06**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,00**
Lithuania	**0,02**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,01**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,01**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**0,03**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**0,00**
Portugal	**0,04**	**0,03**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Romania	**0,27**	**0,12**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,15**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**0,07**	**0,06**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**0,10**	**0,08**	**0,01**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Spain	**0,06**	**0,03**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,13**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,05**
Average	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,01**
Median	**0,06**	**0,03**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,30**	**0,19**	**0,02**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,19**	**0,05**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	63%	**19%**	**56%**

Table 3.10.3a(2021): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**2 199**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**5 838**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 702**	**973**	**282**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	282	**425**	**22**
Bulgaria	**19 946**	**6 940**	**163**	163	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**12 843**	**NAP**
Croatia	**8 886**	**8 310**	**529**	463	49	*49*	*NAP*	*NAP*	17	**47**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**8 140**	**3 855**	**173**	173	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 822**	**290**
Denmark	**231**	**231**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**181**	**103**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**78**	**NAP**
Finland	**6 048**	**673**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 083**	**292**
France	**28 032**	**16 421**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**11 611**	**NAP**
Germany	**13 313**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 487**	**1 549**
Greece	**5 657**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 395**	**NA**
Hungary	**7 335**	**2 126**	**680**	631	19	*NAP*	*18*	*1*	30	**4 311**	**234**
Ireland	**176**	**176**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**53 759**	**40 361**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 983**	**415**
Latvia	**1 939**	**1 068**	**20**	NAP	20	*20*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0	**851**	**0**
Lithuania	**431**	**344**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**87**
Luxembourg	**103**	**103**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 207**	**372**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**835**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**8 335**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**806**
Portugal	**4 054**	**2 792**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 262**	**NAP**
Romania	**53 810**	**24 471**	**241**	38	203	*203*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**29 098**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3 638**	**2 788**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**849**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**2 133**	**1 616**	**118**	103	15	*15*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**399**	**NAP**
Spain	**23 934**	**11 926**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 008**	**NAP**
Sweden	**12 747**	**245**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 532**	**4 970**
Average	**11 191**	**5 932**	**276**	262	61	*72*	*18*	*1*	82	**5 938**	**867**
Median	**5 657**	**2 126**	**207**	168	20	*35*	*18*	*1*	24	**4 067**	**291**
Minimum	**103**	**103**	**20**	38	15	*15*	*18*	*1*	0	**47**	**0**
Maximum	**53 810**	**40 361**	**680**	631	203	*203*	*18*	*1*	282	**29 098**	**4 970**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	63%	**19%**	**56%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.10.3b(2021): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**0,02**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,07**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Bulgaria	**0,29**	**0,10**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,19**	**NAP**
Croatia	**0,23**	**0,21**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,00**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Finland	**0,11**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,09**	**0,01**
France	**0,04**	**0,02**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Germany	**0,02**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,01**	**0,00**
Greece	**0,05**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Hungary	**0,08**	**0,02**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,00**
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**0,09**	**0,07**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,10**	**0,06**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,05**	**0,00**
Lithuania	**0,02**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,02**	**0,02**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,00**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**0,00**
Portugal	**0,04**	**0,03**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Romania	**0,28**	**0,13**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,15**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**0,07**	**0,05**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**0,10**	**0,08**	**0,01**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Spain	**0,05**	**0,03**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,12**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,05**
Average	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,01**
Median	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,29**	**0,21**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,19**	**0,05**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	63%	**19%**	**56%**

Table 3.10.4a(2021): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec.2021

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**922**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**3 392**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 690**	**1 049**	**40**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	40	**583**	**18**
Bulgaria	**8 311**	**4 699**	**0**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**3 612**	**NAP**
Croatia	**11 084**	**10 240**	**600**	494	105	*105*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1	**244**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**5 155**	**1 569**	**52**	52	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 326**	**208**
Denmark	**157**	**157**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**91**	**59**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**32**	**NAP**
Finland	**2 638**	**319**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 145**	**174**
France	**25 456**	**19 894**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 562**	**NAP**
Germany	**9 409**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 196**	**938**
Greece	**14 994**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**12 312**	**NA**
Hungary	**1 703**	**877**	**96**	87	9	*NAP*	*6*	*3*	0	**654**	**76**
Ireland	**99**	**99**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**134 201**	**110 842**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**22 960**	**399**
Latvia	**1 017**	**420**	**5**	NAP	5	*5*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0	**592**	**0**
Lithuania	**431**	**380**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**51**
Luxembourg	**88**	**88**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 407**	**459**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**948**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**5 965**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**589**
Portugal	**1 712**	**808**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**904**	**NAP**
Romania	**34 034**	**14 517**	**89**	2	87	*87*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**19 428**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**4 556**	**2 630**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 926**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**463**	**326**	**18**	15	3	*3*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**119**	**NAP**
Spain	**34 828**	**26 996**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 832**	**NAP**
Sweden	**3 074**	**90**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 053**	**931**
Average	**12 896**	**8 844**	**113**	108	42	*50*	*6*	*3*	10	**4 591**	**338**
Median	**2 638**	**877**	**46**	34	9	*46*	*6*	*3*	1	**2 099**	**191**
Minimum	**88**	**59**	**0**	0	3	*3*	*6*	*3*	0	**32**	**0**
Maximum	**134 201**	**110 842**	**600**	494	105	*105*	*6*	*3*	40	**22 960**	**938**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	63%	**19%**	**56%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.10.4b(2021): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec.2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**0,01**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,04**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,01**	**0,00**
Bulgaria	**0,12**	**0,07**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,05**	**NAP**
Croatia	**0,29**	**0,26**	**0,02**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,01**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**0,05**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	**NAP**
Finland	**0,05**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
France	**0,04**	**0,03**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Germany	**0,01**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,00**	**0,00**
Greece	**0,14**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,12**	**NA**
Hungary	**0,02**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,01**	**0,00**
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**0,23**	**0,19**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Lithuania	**0,02**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,01**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,01**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**0,00**
Portugal	**0,02**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Romania	**0,18**	**0,08**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,10**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**0,08**	**0,05**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**0,02**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Spain	**0,07**	**0,06**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,03**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,01**
Average	**0,06**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Median	**0,03**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,29**	**0,26**	**0,02**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,12**	**0,01**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	63%	**19%**	**56%**

Table 3.10.5(2021): Supreme courts, number of civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending older than 2 years in 2021 (Q99)

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q99)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	0	0,0%	389	11,5%
Belgium	168	16,0%	55	9,4%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	66	1,8%
Croatia	5 471	53,4%	59	24,2%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	102	1,8%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	55 458	50,0%	10 843	47,2%
Latvia	5	1,2%	167	28,2%
Lithuania	2	0,5%	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	397	2,7%	1 680	8,6%
Slovak Republic	123	4,7%	346	18,0%
Slovenia	11	3,4%	11	9,2%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	1	1,1%	3	0,1%
Average	5 603	12,1%	1 143	13,3%
Median	11	2,7%	84	9,3%
Minimum	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Maximum	55 458	53,4%	10 843	47,2%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	52%	52%	41%	41%
% of NAP	7%	7%	15%	15%

Table 3.10.1(2020): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - pending on 1 Jan. 2020

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**848**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**3 064**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 532**	**1 155**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**363**	**14**
Bulgaria	**8 988**	**4 048**	**3**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**4 937**	**NAP**
Croatia	**13 243**	**12 681**	**431**	361	67	*67*	*NAP*	*NAP*	3	**131**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**5 191**	**1 970**	**47**	47	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 884**	**290**
Denmark	**156**	**156**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**61**	**28**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**33**	**NAP**
Finland	**3 758**	**314**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 312**	**132**
France	**24 729**	**19 231**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 498**	**NAP**
Germany	**9 292**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 649**	**1 231**
Greece	**14 654**	**2 000**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 654**	**NAP**
Hungary	**2 620**	**1 508**	**87**	63	19	*NAP*	*18*	*1*	5	**824**	**201**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**143 134**	**116 635**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 101**	**398**
Latvia	**1 500**	**647**	**2**	NAP	1	*1*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1	**851**	**0**
Lithuania	**328**	**307**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**21**
Luxembourg	**109**	**109**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 307**	**445**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**862**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**4 757**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**254**
Portugal	**1 739**	**532**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 207**	**NAP**
Romania	**39 454**	**17 586**	**111**	1	110	*110*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**21 757**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3 804**	**1 927**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 877**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**606**	**467**	**16**	14	2	*2*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**123**	**NAP**
Spain	**26 346**	**19 700**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**6 646**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2 273**	**78**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 621**	**574**
Average	**13 856**	**9 006**	**100**	97	40	*45*	*18*	*1*	3	**4 920**	**312**
Median	**3 189**	**1 155**	**47**	47	19	*35*	*18*	*1*	3	**2 381**	**228**
Minimum	**61**	**28**	**2**	1	1	*1*	*18*	*1*	1	**33**	**0**
Maximum	**143 134**	**116 635**	**431**	361	110	*110*	*18*	*1*	5	**26 101**	**1 231**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**15%**	22%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**59%**	59%	70%	*74%*	*85%*	*85%*	74%	**19%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.10.2a(2020): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - incoming in 2020

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**2 278**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**6 300**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 475**	**876**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**587**	**11**
Bulgaria	**20 862**	**6 693**	**139**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**14 030**	**NAP**
Croatia	**6 162**	**5 770**	**360**	296	45	*45*	*NAP*	*NAP*	19	**32**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**8 402**	**3 927**	**151**	151	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 037**	**287**
Denmark	**197**	**197**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**196**	**122**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**74**	**NAP**
Finland	**6 188**	**683**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 204**	**301**
France	**23 451**	**13 417**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 034**	**NAP**
Germany	**14 472**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 729**	**1 938**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 354**	**NAP**
Hungary	**5 553**	**1 718**	**413**	372	27	*NAP*	*24*	*3*	14	**3 177**	**245**
Ireland	**109**	**109**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**43 829**	**32 208**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**11 281**	**340**
Latvia	**1 953**	**1 104**	**23**	NAP	22	*22*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1	**826**	**0**
Lithuania	**546**	**447**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**99**
Luxembourg	**108**	**108**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 316**	**439**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**877**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**5 895**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**7 008**
Portugal	**3 698**	**2 662**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 036**	**NAP**
Romania	**49 338**	**23 746**	**208**	34	174	*174*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**25 384**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**5 583**	**3 789**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 794**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**2 062**	**1 621**	**76**	66	10	*10*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**365**	**NAP**
Spain	**22 013**	**12 585**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**9 428**	**NAP**
Sweden	**12 185**	**217**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 439**	**4 529**
Average	**10 441**	**5 244**	**196**	184	56	*63*	*24*	*3*	11	**5 549**	**1 476**
Median	**5 568**	**1 718**	**151**	151	27	*34*	*24*	*3*	14	**3 696**	**294**
Minimum	**108**	**108**	**23**	34	10	*10*	*24*	*3*	1	**32**	**0**
Maximum	**49 338**	**32 208**	**413**	372	174	*174*	*24*	*3*	19	**25 384**	**7 008**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**15%**	22%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	19%	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**59%**	59%	70%	*74%*	*85%*	*85%*	70%	**19%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.10.2b(2020): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - incoming in 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**0,03**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,07**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**0,00**
Bulgaria	**0,30**	**0,10**	**0,00**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,20**	NAP
Croatia	**0,15**	**0,14**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,00**	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Finland	**0,11**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,09**	**0,01**
France	**0,03**	**0,02**	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Germany	**0,02**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,01**	**0,00**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Hungary	**0,06**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,07**	**0,05**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,10**	**0,06**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,00**
Lithuania	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**0,02**
Portugal	**0,04**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,26**	**0,12**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,13**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,10**	**0,07**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,10**	**0,08**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Spain	**0,05**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,02**	NAP
Sweden	**0,12**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,04**
Average	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,01**
Median	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,30**	**0,14**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,20**	**0,04**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**15%**	22%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	19%	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**59%**	59%	70%	*74%*	*85%*	*85%*	70%	**19%**	**59%**

Table 3.10.3a(2020): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - resolved in 2020

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**2 364**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**6 321**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 343**	**853**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**479**	**11**
Bulgaria	**22 473**	**6 876**	**139**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**15 458**	**NAP**
Croatia	**7 389**	**7 084**	**259**	223	22	*22*	*NAP*	*NAP*	14	**46**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**8 497**	**4 234**	**160**	160	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 785**	**318**
Denmark	**207**	**207**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**170**	**102**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**68**	**NAP**
Finland	**6 383**	**740**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 365**	**278**
France	**23 742**	**14 071**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 671**	**NAP**
Germany	**14 413**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**6 086**	**2 173**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 968**	**NAP**
Hungary	**6 533**	**2 265**	**446**	391	36	*NAP*	*32*	*4*	19	**3 450**	**371**
Ireland	**124**	**124**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**42 329**	**28 730**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 221**	**378**
Latvia	**2 295**	**1 332**	**23**	NAP	21	*21*	*NAP*	*NAP*	2	**940**	**0**
Lithuania	**466**	**365**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**101**
Luxembourg	**108**	**108**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 259**	**393**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**866**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**7 456**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**7 105**
Portugal	**3 623**	**2 375**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 248**	**NAP**
Romania	**51 922**	**24 856**	**221**	34	187	*187*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**26 845**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**5 179**	**3 399**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 780**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**2 233**	**1 797**	**70**	63	7	*7*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**366**	**NAP**
Spain	**17 777**	**9 405**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 372**	**NAP**
Sweden	**11 832**	**219**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 206**	**4 407**
Average	**10 468**	**5 189**	**188**	174	55	*59*	*32*	*4*	12	**5 777**	**1 514**
Median	**5 781**	**2 265**	**160**	160	22	*22*	*32*	*4*	14	**3 877**	**345**
Minimum	**108**	**102**	**23**	34	7	*7*	*32*	*4*	2	**46**	**0**
Maximum	**51 922**	**28 730**	**446**	391	187	*187*	*32*	*4*	19	**26 845**	**7 105**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**15%**	22%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**59%**	59%	70%	*74%*	*85%*	*85%*	74%	**19%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.10.3b(2020): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - resolved in 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**0,03**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,07**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	**0,00**
Bulgaria	**0,32**	**0,10**	**0,00**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,22**	NAP
Croatia	**0,18**	**0,18**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,00**	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Finland	**0,12**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,10**	**0,01**
France	**0,04**	**0,02**	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Germany	**0,02**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,01**	**0,00**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Hungary	**0,07**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,07**	**0,05**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,12**	**0,07**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,05**	**0,00**
Lithuania	**0,02**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**0,02**
Portugal	**0,04**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,27**	**0,13**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,14**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,09**	**0,06**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,11**	**0,09**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Spain	**0,04**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Sweden	**0,11**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,04**
Average	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,01**
Median	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,32**	**0,18**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,22**	**0,04**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**15%**	22%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**59%**	59%	70%	*74%*	*85%*	*85%*	74%	**19%**	**59%**

Table 3.10.4a(2020): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**762**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**3 043**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 737**	**1 178**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**545**	**14**
Bulgaria	**7 375**	**3 863**	**3**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**3 509**	**NAP**
Croatia	**12 016**	**11 367**	**532**	434	90	*90*	*NAP*	*NAP*	8	**117**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**5 096**	**1 663**	**38**	38	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 136**	**259**
Denmark	**146**	**146**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**87**	**48**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**38**	**NAP**
Finland	**3 563**	**257**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 151**	**155**
France	**24 575**	**18 714**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 861**	**NAP**
Germany	**9 351**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 292**	**995**
Greece	**14 339**	**2 300**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 039**	**NAP**
Hungary	**1 640**	**961**	**54**	44	10	*NAP*	*10*	*0*	0	**551**	**75**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**144 634**	**120 113**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**24 161**	**360**
Latvia	**1 158**	**419**	**2**	NAP	2	*2*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0	**737**	**0**
Lithuania	**408**	**389**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**19**
Luxembourg	**109**	**109**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 277**	**460**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**817**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**3 196**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**157**
Portugal	**1 814**	**819**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**995**	**NAP**
Romania	**36 870**	**16 476**	**98**	1	97	*97*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**20 296**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**4 208**	**2 317**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 891**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**435**	**291**	**22**	17	5	*5*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**122**	**NAP**
Spain	**30 903**	**22 880**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8 023**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2 626**	**76**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 854**	**696**
Average	**13 835**	**9 078**	**107**	107	41	*49*	*10*	*0*	3	**4 709**	**273**
Median	**3 095**	**961**	**38**	38	10	*48*	*10*	*0*	0	**2 467**	**156**
Minimum	**87**	**48**	**2**	1	2	*2*	*10*	*0*	0	**38**	**0**
Maximum	**144 634**	**120 113**	**532**	434	97	*97*	*10*	*0*	8	**24 161**	**995**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**15%**	22%	11%	*15%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**59%**	59%	70%	*70%*	*85%*	*85%*	74%	**19%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.10.4b(2020): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**NA**	**0,01**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,02**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	**0,00**
Bulgaria	**0,11**	**0,06**	**0,00**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,05**	**NAP**
Croatia	**0,30**	**0,28**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,00**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**0,01**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	**NAP**
Finland	**0,06**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,06**	**0,00**
France	**0,04**	**0,03**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Germany	**0,01**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,00**	**0,00**
Greece	**0,13**	**0,02**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,11**	**NAP**
Hungary	**0,02**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,01**	**0,00**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**0,24**	**0,20**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,06**	**0,02**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,04**	**0,00**
Lithuania	**0,01**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,02**	**0,02**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**0,01**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**0,00**
Portugal	**0,02**	**0,01**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Romania	**0,19**	**0,09**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,11**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**0,08**	**0,04**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**0,02**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	**NAP**
Spain	**0,07**	**0,05**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**NAP**
Sweden	**0,03**	**0,00**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,01**
Average	**0,07**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Median	**0,03**	**0,01**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,30**	**0,28**	**0,01**	0,01	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,11**	**0,01**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**15%**	22%	11%	*15%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**59%**	59%	70%	*70%*	*85%*	*85%*	74%	**19%**	**59%**

Table 3.10.5(2020): Supreme courts, number of civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending older than 2 years in 2020 (Q99)

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q99)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	NA	NA	205	6,7%
Belgium	164	13,9%	47	8,6%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	53	1,5%
Croatia	5 476	48,2%	59	50,4%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	132	2,3%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	57 631	48,0%	12 610	52,2%
Latvia	13	3,1%	124	16,8%
Lithuania	3	0,8%	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	421	2,6%	460	2,3%
Slovak Republic	83	3,6%	138	7,3%
Slovenia	3	1,0%	29	23,8%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	0	0,0%	17	0,9%
Average	6 379	12,1%	1 156	14,4%
Median	48	2,8%	92	7,0%
Minimum	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Maximum	57 631	48,2%	12 610	52,2%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	56%	56%	41%	41%
% of NAP	7%	7%	15%	15%

Table 3.10.1(2019): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - pending on 1 Jan. 2019

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**2 966**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**2 206**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 463**	**1 119**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**344**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**10 063**	**3 917**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**6 146**	**NAP**
Croatia	**14 219**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**5 274**	**2 404**	**35**	35	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 503**	**124**
Denmark	**133**	**133**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**73**	**29**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**44**	**NAP**
Finland	**3 791**	**292**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 337**	**162**
France	**25 062**	**19 635**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 427**	**NAP**
Germany	**9 495**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 549**	**1 113**
Greece	**15 496**	**2 012**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 484**	**NAP**
Hungary	**3 448**	**1 744**	**139**	104	32	*NAP*	*30*	*2*	3	**1 218**	**347**
Ireland	**181**	**181**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**138 641**	**110 979**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**27 288**	**374**
Latvia	**1 651**	**653**	**1**	NAP	1	*1*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0	**958**	**39**
Lithuania	**250**	**226**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**24**
Luxembourg	**104**	**104**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 037**	**378**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**659**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**4 596**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**332**
Portugal	**1 442**	**378**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 064**	**NAP**
Romania	**39 695**	**17 884**	**116**	0	116	*116*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**21 695**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**4 257**	**2 157**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 100**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**912**	**690**	**9**	9	0	*0*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**213**	**NAP**
Spain	**26 113**	**17 084**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 029**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2 211**	**99**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 711**	**401**
Average	**12 832**	**8 486**	**60**	37	37	*39*	*30*	*2*	2	**5 420**	**324**
Median	**3 207**	**905**	**35**	22	17	*1*	*30*	*2*	2	**2 206**	**332**
Minimum	**73**	**29**	**1**	0	0	*0*	*30*	*2*	0	**44**	**24**
Maximum	**138 641**	**110 979**	**139**	104	116	*116*	*30*	*2*	3	**27 288**	**1 113**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.10.2a(2019): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - incoming 2019

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**9 335**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**6 968**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 392**	**920**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**472**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**23 075**	**8 015**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**15 060**	**NAP**
Croatia	**6 166**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**9 097**	**4 340**	**195**	195	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**4 261**	**144**
Denmark	**302**	**302**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**210**	**140**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**70**	**NAP**
Finland	**7 177**	**725**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**6 113**	**339**
France	**27 287**	**17 071**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 216**	**NAP**
Germany	**13 606**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 522**	**2 401**
Greece	**5 864**	**2 343**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 521**	**NAP**
Hungary	**5 161**	**2 139**	**426**	374	31	*NAP*	*29*	*2*	21	**2 188**	**408**
Ireland	**323**	**323**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**50 769**	**38 330**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 044**	**395**
Latvia	**2 008**	**1 142**	**22**	NAP	19	*19*	*NAP*	*NAP*	3	**844**	**NA**
Lithuania	**585**	**476**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**109**
Luxembourg	**116**	**116**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 447**	**421**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 026**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**7 585**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**1 163**
Portugal	**4 107**	**2 943**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 164**	**NAP**
Romania	**59 978**	**29 625**	**253**	41	212	*212*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 100**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**5 816**	**3 857**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 959**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**2 370**	**1 970**	**53**	45	8	*8*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**347**	**NAP**
Spain	**22 997**	**13 171**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9 826**	**NAP**
Sweden	**11 837**	**277**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 096**	**4 464**
Average	**11 293**	**6 192**	**190**	164	68	*80*	*29*	*2*	12	**6 252**	**1 178**
Median	**5 840**	**2 055**	**195**	120	25	*19*	*29*	*2*	12	**4 261**	**402**
Minimum	**116**	**116**	**22**	41	8	*8*	*29*	*2*	3	**70**	**109**
Maximum	**59 978**	**38 330**	**426**	374	212	*212*	*29*	*2*	21	**30 100**	**4 464**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.10.2b(2019): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - incoming 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,10**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,08**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,33**	**0,12**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,22**	NAP
Croatia	**0,15**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**0,09**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,02**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Finland	**0,13**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,11**	**0,01**
France	**0,04**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Germany	**0,02**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,01**	**0,00**
Greece	**0,05**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Hungary	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Ireland	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**0,08**	**0,06**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,11**	**0,06**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,04**	**NA**
Lithuania	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**0,00**
Portugal	**0,04**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,31**	**0,15**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,16**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,11**	**0,07**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,11**	**0,09**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Spain	**0,05**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Sweden	**0,11**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,04**
Average	**0,08**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,05**	**0,01**
Median	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,01**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,33**	**0,15**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,22**	**0,04**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.10.3a(2019): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - resolved 2019

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**8 691**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**6 412**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 268**	**818**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**450**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**25 085**	**7 846**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**17 239**	**NAP**
Croatia	**7 140**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**9 180**	**4 774**	**183**	183	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 880**	**159**
Denmark	**272**	**272**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**223**	**141**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**82**	**NAP**
Finland	**7 215**	**703**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**6 138**	**374**
France	**27 795**	**17 475**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10 320**	**NAP**
Germany	**13 784**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**5 671**	**2 283**
Greece	**5 983**	**2 217**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 766**	**NAP**
Hungary	**5 989**	**2 375**	**478**	415	44	*NAP*	*41*	*3*	19	**2 582**	**554**
Ireland	**343**	**343**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**46 596**	**32 685**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 551**	**360**
Latvia	**2 159**	**1 187**	**21**	NAP	19	*19*	*NAP*	*NAP*	2	**951**	**NA**
Lithuania	**507**	**395**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**112**
Luxembourg	**111**	**111**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 177**	**354**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**823**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**7 424**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**1 236**
Portugal	**3 810**	**2 789**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 021**	**NAP**
Romania	**60 219**	**29 923**	**258**	40	218	*218*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**30 038**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**6 269**	**4 087**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 182**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**2 676**	**2 193**	**46**	40	6	*6*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**437**	**NAP**
Spain	**22 910**	**10 555**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12 355**	**NAP**
Sweden	**11 763**	**298**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7 174**	**4 291**
Average	**11 299**	**5 862**	**197**	170	72	*81*	*41*	*3*	11	**6 583**	**1 171**
Median	**6 129**	**2 205**	**183**	112	32	*19*	*41*	*3*	11	**3 880**	**464**
Minimum	**111**	**111**	**21**	40	6	*6*	*41*	*3*	2	**82**	**112**
Maximum	**60 219**	**32 685**	**478**	415	218	*218*	*41*	*3*	19	**30 038**	**4 291**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.10.3b(2019): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - resolved 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,10**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,07**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,36**	**0,11**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,25**	NAP
Croatia	**0,18**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**0,09**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,02**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Finland	**0,13**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,11**	**0,01**
France	**0,04**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Germany	**0,02**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,01**	**0,00**
Greece	**0,06**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Hungary	**0,06**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,01**
Ireland	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**0,08**	**0,05**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,11**	**0,06**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,05**	**NA**
Lithuania	**0,02**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**0,00**
Portugal	**0,04**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,31**	**0,15**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,15**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,11**	**0,07**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,13**	**0,10**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	NAP
Spain	**0,05**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Sweden	**0,11**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,07**	**0,04**
Average	**0,09**	**0,04**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,05**	**0,01**
Median	**0,06**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,36**	**0,15**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,25**	**0,04**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.10.4a(2019): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2019

Absolute values (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**3 610**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**2 762**	**NA**
Belgium	**1 590**	**1 221**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**369**	**NAP**
Bulgaria	**8 053**	**4 086**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**3 967**	**NAP**
Croatia	**13 243**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**5 191**	**1 970**	**47**	47	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2 884**	**109**
Denmark	**163**	**163**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**61**	**28**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**33**	**NAP**
Finland	**3 753**	**314**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3 312**	**127**
France	**24 554**	**19 231**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**5 323**	**NAP**
Germany	**9 317**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**3 400**	**1 231**
Greece	**15 377**	**2 138**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**13 239**	**NAP**
Hungary	**2 620**	**1 508**	**87**	63	19	*NAP*	*18*	*1*	5	**824**	**201**
Ireland	**161**	**161**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Italy	**142 814**	**116 624**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**25 781**	**409**
Latvia	**1 500**	**608**	**2**	NAP	1	*1*	*NAP*	*NAP*	1	**851**	**NA**
Lithuania	**328**	**307**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**21**
Luxembourg	**109**	**109**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**1 307**	**445**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**862**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**4 757**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**259**
Portugal	**1 739**	**532**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 207**	**NAP**
Romania	**39 454**	**17 586**	**111**	1	110	*110*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**21 757**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**3 804**	**1 927**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 877**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**606**	**467**	**16**	14	2	*2*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**123**	**NAP**
Spain	**26 346**	**19 700**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**6 646**	**NAP**
Sweden	**2 285**	**78**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1 633**	**574**
Average	**12 833**	**8 816**	**53**	31	33	*38*	*18*	*1*	3	**5 097**	**366**
Median	**3 115**	**915**	**47**	31	11	*2*	*18*	*1*	3	**2 762**	**230**
Minimum	**61**	**28**	**2**	1	1	*1*	*18*	*1*	1	**33**	**21**
Maximum	**142 814**	**116 624**	**111**	63	110	*110*	*18*	*1*	5	**25 781**	**1 231**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.10.4b(2019): Supreme courts, number of other than criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2019

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	**2** = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	**0,04**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,03**	**NA**
Belgium	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Bulgaria	**0,12**	**0,06**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**0,06**	NAP
Croatia	**0,33**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**0,05**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	**0,00**
Denmark	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Finland	**0,07**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,06**	**0,00**
France	**0,04**	**0,03**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Germany	**0,01**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**0,00**	**0,00**
Greece	**0,14**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,12**	NAP
Hungary	**0,03**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,01**	**0,00**
Ireland	**0,00**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**0,24**	**0,19**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,04**	**0,00**
Latvia	**0,08**	**0,03**	**0,00**	NAP	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0,00	**0,04**	**NA**
Lithuania	**0,01**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**0,00**
Luxembourg	**0,02**	**0,02**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**0,01**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,00**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**0,00**
Portugal	**0,02**	**0,01**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Romania	**0,20**	**0,09**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,11**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**0,07**	**0,04**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,03**	NAP
Slovenia	**0,03**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Spain	**0,06**	**0,04**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,01**	NAP
Sweden	**0,02**	**0,00**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,02**	**0,01**
Average	**0,07**	**0,03**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,03**	**0,00**
Median	**0,03**	**0,02**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,02**	**0,00**
Minimum	**0,00**	**0,00**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,00**	**0,00**
Maximum	**0,33**	**0,19**	**0,00**	0,00	0,00	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,00*	0,00	**0,12**	**0,01**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.10.5(2019): Supreme courts, number of civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases - Pending older than 2 years in 2019 (Q99)

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q99)

States	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases pending more than 2 years		Administrative law cases pending more than 2 years	
	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec	Number	as a % of pending cases on 31 Dec
Austria	NA	NA	96	3,5%
Belgium	NA	NA	17	4,6%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	85	2,1%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	89	1,7%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	52 408	44,9%	11 567	44,9%
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	448	2,5%	494	2,3%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	3	0,6%	27	22,0%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	1	1,3%	1	0,1%
Average	7 551	7,1%	1 238	8,1%
Median	1	0,6%	56	2,2%
Minimum	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Maximum	52 408	44,9%	11 567	44,9%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	67%	67%	44%	44%
% of NAP	7%	7%	19%	19%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Romania: Cases older than 3 years are presented**.**

Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court other than criminal cases

Table 3.11.1(2021): Clearance rate of the Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2021 (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**NA**	**93,2%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**96,5%**	**NA**
Belgium	**101,6%**	**115,3%**	**106,8%**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	106,8%	**78,6%**	**84,6%**
Bulgaria	**95,9%**	**89,0%**	**101,9%**	101,9%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**100,1%**	**NAP**
Croatia	**111,7%**	**115,7%**	**88,6%**	88,5%	76,6%	*76,6%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	170,0%	**27,0%**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**99,3%**	**102,5%**	**92,5%**	92,5%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**95,3%**	**121,3%**
Denmark	**95,5%**	**95,5%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**97,3%**	**90,4%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**108,3%**	**NAP**
Finland	**117,6%**	**91,8%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**124,0%**	**93,9%**
France	**103,5%**	**104,1%**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**102,6%**	**NAP**
Germany	**101,1%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**110,0%**	**103,9%**
Greece	**89,8%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**92,8%**	**NA**
Hungary	**99,2%**	**104,1%**	**94,3%**	93,6%	105,6%	*NAP*	*128,6%*	*25,0%*	103,4%	**97,7%**	**99,6%**
Ireland	**110,0%**	**110,0%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**123,2%**	**129,7%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**107,2%**	**96,5%**
Latvia	**107,8%**	**99,9%**	**87,0%**	NAP	87,0%	*87,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-	**120,5%**	**-**
Lithuania	**94,9%**	**102,7%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**73,1%**
Luxembourg	**125,6%**	**125,6%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**74,5%**	**92,8%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**68,4%**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**65,7%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**61,4%**
Portugal	**102,6%**	**100,4%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**107,8%**	**NAP**
Romania	**105,6%**	**108,7%**	**103,9%**	97,4%	105,2%	*105,2%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**103,1%**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**91,3%**	**89,9%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**96,0%**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**98,7%**	**97,9%**	**103,5%**	102,0%	115,4%	*115,4%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**100,8%**	**NAP**
Spain	**90,5%**	**74,0%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**116,1%**	**NAP**
Sweden	**96,6%**	**95,0%**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**97,4%**	**95,5%**
Average	**101,5%**	**99,7%**	**97,3%**	96,0%	97,9%	*96,0%*	*128,6%*	*25,0%*	126,8%	**97,5%**	**92,2%**
Median	**99,3%**	**99,9%**	**98,1%**	95,5%	105,2%	*96,1%*	*128,6%*	*25,0%*	106,8%	**100,4%**	**95,5%**
Minimum	**74,5%**	**65,7%**	**87,0%**	88,5%	76,6%	*76,6%*	*128,6%*	*25,0%*	103,4%	**27,0%**	**61,4%**
Maximum	**125,6%**	**129,7%**	**106,8%**	102,0%	115,4%	*115,4%*	*128,6%*	*25,0%*	170,0%	**124,0%**	**121,3%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	26	**27**	**26**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	23%	**7%**	**8%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	65%	**19%**	**58%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.11.2(2021): Disposition time (in days) of the Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2021 (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**NA**	**153**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**212**	**NA**
Belgium	**362**	**394**	**52**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	52	**501**	**299**
Bulgaria	**152**	**247**	**0**	0	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**103**	**NAP**
Croatia	**455**	**450**	**414**	389	782	*782*	*NAP*	*NAP*	21	**1895**	**NAP**
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Czech Republic	**231**	**149**	**110**	110	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**318**	**262**
Denmark	**248**	**248**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Estonia	**184**	**209**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**150**	**NAP**
Finland	**159**	**173**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**154**	**218**
France	**331**	**442**	**NAP**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**175**	**NAP**
Germany	**258**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**213**	**221**
Greece	**967**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**1324**	**NA**
Hungary	**85**	**151**	**52**	50	173	*NAP*	*122*	*1095*	0	**55**	**119**
Ireland	**205**	**205**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**NAP**
Italy	**911**	**1002**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**645**	**351**
Latvia	**191**	**144**	**91**	NAP	91	*91*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-	**254**	**-**
Lithuania	**365**	**403**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**214**
Luxembourg	**312**	**312**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NAP**	**NAP**
Netherlands	**425**	**450**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**414**	**NAP**
Poland	**NA**	**261**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**267**
Portugal	**154**	**106**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**261**	**NAP**
Romania	**231**	**217**	**135**	19	156	*156*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**244**	**NAP**
Slovak Republic	**457**	**344**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**828**	**NAP**
Slovenia	**79**	**74**	**56**	53	73	*73*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**109**	**NAP**
Spain	**531**	**826**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**238**	**NAP**
Sweden	**88**	**134**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**99**	**68**
Average	**321**	**308**	**114**	104	255	*276*	*122*	*1 095*	24	**410**	**224**
Median	**248**	**247**	**73**	52	156	*124*	*122*	*1 095*	21	**241**	**221**
Minimum	**79**	**74**	**0**	0	73	*73*	*122*	*1 095*	0	**55**	**68**
Maximum	**967**	**1 002**	**414**	389	782	*782*	*122*	*1 095*	52	**1 895**	**351**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	**7%**	**19%**	22%	15%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**52%**	56%	67%	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	63%	**19%**	**56%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.11.1(2020): Clearance rate of the Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2020 (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	NA	103,8%	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	100,3%	NA
Belgium	91,1%	97,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	81,6%	100,0%
Bulgaria	107,7%	102,7%	100,0%	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	110,2%	NAP
Croatia	119,9%	122,8%	71,9%	75,3%	48,9%	*48,9%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	73,7%	143,8%	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	101,1%	107,8%	106,0%	106,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	93,8%	110,8%
Denmark	105,1%	105,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	86,7%	83,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	91,9%	NAP
Finland	103,2%	108,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	103,1%	92,4%
France	101,2%	104,9%	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	96,4%	NAP
Germany	99,6%	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	106,2%	112,1%
Greece	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	118,3%	NAP
Hungary	117,6%	131,8%	108,0%	105,1%	133,3%	*NAP*	*133,3%*	*133,3%*	135,7%	108,6%	151,4%
Ireland	113,8%	113,8%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Italy	96,6%	89,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	117,2%	111,2%
Latvia	117,5%	120,7%	100,0%	NAP	95,5%	*95,5%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	200,0%	113,8%	-
Lithuania	85,3%	81,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	102,0%
Luxembourg	100,0%	100,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	95,7%	89,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	98,7%	NAP
Poland	NA	126,5%	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	101,4%
Portugal	98,0%	89,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	120,5%	NAP
Romania	105,2%	104,7%	106,3%	100,0%	107,5%	*107,5%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	105,8%	NAP
Slovak Republic	92,8%	89,7%	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	99,2%	NAP
Slovenia	108,3%	110,9%	92,1%	95,5%	70,0%	*70,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	100,3%	NAP
Spain	80,8%	74,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	88,8%	NAP
Sweden	97,1%	100,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	96,9%	97,3%
Average	101,1%	102,6%	97,8%	96,4%	91,0%	*80,5%*	*133,3%*	*133,3%*	136,5%	104,8%	108,7%
Median	100,6%	103,8%	100,0%	100,0%	95,5%	*82,7%*	*133,3%*	*133,3%*	135,7%	101,7%	102,0%
Minimum	80,8%	74,7%	71,9%	75,3%	48,9%	*48,9%*	*133,3%*	*133,3%*	73,7%	81,6%	92,4%
Maximum	119,9%	131,8%	108,0%	106,0%	133,3%	*107,5%*	*133,3%*	*133,3%*	200,0%	143,8%	151,4%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	26
% of NA	11%	7%	15%	22%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	7%	4%
% of NAP	7%	7%	59%	59%	70%	*74%*	*85%*	*85%*	74%	19%	62%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.11.2(2020): Disposition time (in days) of the Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2020 (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**NA**	**118**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**176**	**NA**
Belgium	**472**	**504**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**415**	**465**
Bulgaria	**120**	**205**	**8**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**83**	NAP
Croatia	**594**	**586**	**750**	710	1493	*1493*	*NAP*	*NAP*	209	**928**	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**219**	**143**	**87**	87	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**302**	**297**
Denmark	**257**	**257**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**187**	**172**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**204**	NAP
Finland	**204**	**127**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**214**	**204**
France	**378**	**485**	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**221**	NAP
Germany	**237**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**197**	**167**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1107**	NAP
Hungary	**92**	**155**	**44**	41	101	*NAP*	*114*	*0*	0	**58**	**74**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**1247**	**1526**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**667**	**348**
Latvia	**184**	**115**	**32**	NAP	35	*35*	*NAP*	*NAP*	0	**286**	**-**
Lithuania	**320**	**389**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**69**
Luxembourg	**368**	**368**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**370**	**427**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**344**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**156**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**8**
Portugal	**183**	**126**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**291**	NAP
Romania	**259**	**242**	**162**	11	189	*189*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**276**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**297**	**249**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**388**	NAP
Slovenia	**71**	**59**	**115**	98	261	*261*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**122**	NAP
Spain	**635**	**888**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NA*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**350**	NAP
Sweden	**81**	**127**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**94**	**58**
Average	**323**	**337**	**171**	189	416	*494*	*114*	*0*	70	**336**	**188**
Median	**257**	**224**	**87**	87	189	*225*	*114*	*0*	0	**281**	**167**
Minimum	**71**	**59**	**8**	11	35	*35*	*114*	*0*	0	**58**	**8**
Maximum	**1 247**	**1 526**	**750**	710	1 493	*1 493*	*114*	*0*	209	**1 107**	**465**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	**11%**	**15%**	22%	11%	*15%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**4%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**59%**	59%	70%	*70%*	*85%*	*85%*	74%	**19%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Table 3.11.1(2019): Clearance rate of the Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2019 (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**93,1%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**92,0%**	**NA**
Belgium	**91,1%**	**88,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**95,3%**	NAP
Bulgaria	**108,7%**	**97,9%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**114,5%**	NAP
Croatia	**115,8%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**100,9%**	**110,0%**	**93,8%**	93,8%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**91,1%**	**110,4%**
Denmark	**90,1%**	**90,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**106,2%**	**100,7%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**117,1%**	NAP
Finland	**100,5%**	**97,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**100,4%**	**110,3%**
France	**101,9%**	**102,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**101,0%**	NAP
Germany	**101,3%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**102,7%**	**95,1%**
Greece	**102,0%**	**94,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**107,0%**	NAP
Hungary	**116,0%**	**111,0%**	**112,2%**	111,0%	141,9%	*NAP*	*141,4%*	*150,0%*	90,5%	**118,0%**	**135,8%**
Ireland	**106,2%**	**106,2%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**91,8%**	**85,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**112,5%**	**91,1%**
Latvia	**107,5%**	**103,9%**	**95,5%**	NAP	100,0%	*100,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	66,7%	**112,7%**	**NA**
Lithuania	**86,7%**	**83,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**102,8%**
Luxembourg	**95,7%**	**95,7%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**81,3%**	**84,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**80,2%**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**97,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**106,3%**
Portugal	**92,8%**	**94,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**87,7%**	NAP
Romania	**100,4%**	**101,0%**	**102,0%**	97,6%	102,8%	*102,8%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**99,8%**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**107,8%**	**106,0%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**111,4%**	NAP
Slovenia	**112,9%**	**111,3%**	**86,8%**	88,9%	75,0%	*75,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**125,9%**	NAP
Spain	**99,6%**	**80,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**125,7%**	NAP
Sweden	**99,4%**	**107,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**101,1%**	**96,1%**
Average	**100,4%**	**97,7%**	**98,1%**	97,8%	104,9%	*92,6%*	*141,4%*	*150,0%*	78,6%	**105,1%**	**106,0%**
Median	**100,7%**	**97,9%**	**95,5%**	95,7%	101,4%	*100,0%*	*141,4%*	*150,0%*	78,6%	**102,7%**	**104,5%**
Minimum	**81,3%**	**80,1%**	**86,8%**	88,9%	75,0%	*75,0%*	*141,4%*	*150,0%*	66,7%	**80,2%**	**91,1%**
Maximum	**116,0%**	**111,3%**	**112,2%**	111,0%	141,9%	*102,8%*	*141,4%*	*150,0%*	90,5%	**125,9%**	**135,8%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.11.2(2019): Disposition time (in days) of the Supreme court other than criminal cases in 2019 (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**152**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**157**	**NA**
Belgium	**458**	**545**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**299**	NAP
Bulgaria	**117**	**190**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**84**	NAP
Croatia	**677**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**NA**
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**206**	**151**	**94**	94	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**271**	**250**
Denmark	**219**	**219**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**100**	**72**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**147**	NAP
Finland	**190**	**163**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**197**	**124**
France	**322**	**402**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**188**	NAP
Germany	**247**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**219**	**197**
Greece	**938**	**352**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1283**	NAP
Hungary	**160**	**232**	**66**	55	158	*NAP*	*160*	*122*	96	**116**	**132**
Ireland	**171**	**171**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**1119**	**1302**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**694**	**415**
Latvia	**254**	**187**	**35**	NAP	19	*19*	*NAP*	*NAP*	183	**327**	**NA**
Lithuania	**236**	**284**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**68**
Luxembourg	**358**	**358**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**405**	**459**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**382**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**234**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	**76**
Portugal	**167**	**70**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**431**	NAP
Romania	**239**	**215**	**157**	9	184	*184*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**264**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**221**	**172**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**314**	NAP
Slovenia	**83**	**78**	**127**	128	122	*122*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**103**	NAP
Spain	**420**	**681**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**196**	NAP
Sweden	**71**	**96**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	**83**	**49**
Average	**314**	**301**	**96**	72	121	*108*	*160*	*122*	139	**303**	**164**
Median	**229**	**217**	**94**	75	140	*122*	*160*	*122*	139	**219**	**128**
Minimum	**71**	**70**	**35**	9	19	*19*	*160*	*122*	96	**83**	**49**
Maximum	**1 119**	**1 302**	**157**	128	184	*184*	*160*	*122*	183	**1 283**	**415**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**4%**	**11%**	**19%**	19%	11%	*11%*	*11%*	*11%*	15%	**7%**	**11%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**63%**	67%	74%	*78%*	*85%*	*85%*	78%	**22%**	**59%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Poland: The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97.

Slovak Republic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Variations of Supreme court other than criminal cases by case categories

Table 3.12.1: Supreme courts, variation of incoming other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**NA**	**3,0%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-4,5%**	**NA**
Belgium	**13,1%**	**-4,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-8,2%**	**135,4%**
Bulgaria	**0,8%**	**17,8%**	**16,4%**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-7,5%**	NAP
Croatia	**34,6%**	**29,8%**	**72,9%**	84,2%	48,3%	*48,3%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-45,1%	**466,9%**	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**-0,7%**	**-2,5%**	**26,0%**	26,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**1,1%**	**-15,3%**
Denmark	**22,1%**	**22,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**-5,1%**	**-6,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-2,7%**	NAP
Finland	**-17,1%**	**7,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-21,4%**	**3,1%**
France	**15,2%**	**17,2%**	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12,4%**	NAP
Germany	**-9,1%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-13,0%**	**-23,1%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**9,4%**	**NA**
Hungary	**36,0%**	**21,3%**	**78,2%**	85,0%	-31,9%	*NAP*	*-40,5%*	*36,1%*	111,5%	**41,8%**	**-2,1%**
Ireland	**42,6%**	**42,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**0,1%**	**-2,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7,8%**	**27,1%**
Latvia	**-7,1%**	**-2,3%**	**0,9%**	NAP	5,5%	*5,5%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-100,0%	**-13,7%**	
Lithuania	**-17,2%**	**-25,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**19,8%**
Luxembourg	**-25,3%**	**-25,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**22,9%**	**-8,8%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**38,8%**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**116,1%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**-81,2%**
Portugal	**6,3%**	**3,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12,4%**	NAP
Romania	**4,1%**	**-4,5%**	**12,4%**	15,6%	11,8%	*11,8%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**12,1%**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**-28,3%**	**-17,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-50,5%**	NAP
Slovenia	**4,9%**	**1,9%**	**50,1%**	53,2%	30,1%	*30,1%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**8,6%**	NAP
Spain	**20,0%**	**27,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9,5%**	NAP
Sweden	**7,5%**	**18,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3,2%**	**14,1%**
Average	**5,5%**	**9,9%**	**36,7%**	52,8%	12,7%	*23,9%*	*-40,5%*	*36,1%*	-11,2%	**25,1%**	**8,6%**
Median	**4,5%**	**3,0%**	**26,0%**	53,2%	11,8%	*20,9%*	*-40,5%*	*36,1%*	-45,1%	**5,5%**	**3,1%**
Standard deviation											
Minimum	**-28,3%**	**-25,3%**	**0,9%**	15,6%	-31,9%	*5,5%*	*-40,5%*	*36,1%*	-100,0%	**-50,5%**	**-81,2%**
Maximum	**42,6%**	**116,1%**	**78,2%**	85,0%	48,3%	*48,3%*	*-40,5%*	*36,1%*	111,5%	**466,9%**	**135,4%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	26%	15%	15%	15%	15%	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**56%**	56%	67%	70%	81%	81%	67%	**19%**	**56%**

Table 3.12.2: Supreme courts, variation of resolved other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**NA**	**-7,5%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-8,1%**	**NA**
Belgium	**26,2%**	**13,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-11,6%**	**99,2%**
Bulgaria	**-10,2%**	**2,1%**	**18,6%**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-16,0%**	NAP
Croatia	**25,4%**	**22,3%**	**112,9%**	116,4%	132,2%	*132,2%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	26,6%	**6,5%**	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**-2,5%**	**-7,3%**	**10,0%**	10,0%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2,8%**	**-7,2%**
Denmark	**11,0%**	**11,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**6,4%**	**0,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**14,7%**	NAP
Finland	**-5,5%**	**-9,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-5,5%**	**4,8%**
France	**17,7%**	**16,3%**	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**19,7%**	NAP
Germany	**-7,7%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-9,9%**	**-28,8%**
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-14,1%**	**NA**
Hungary	**14,6%**	**-4,2%**	**55,6%**	64,7%	-46,1%	*NAP*	*-42,6%*	*-74,5%*	61,2%	**27,6%**	**-35,6%**
Ireland	**37,9%**	**37,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**27,6%**	**41,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-1,3%**	**10,3%**
Latvia	**-14,7%**	**-19,1%**	**-12,2%**	NAP	-3,9%	*-3,9%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-100,0%	**-8,6%**	
Lithuania	**-7,9%**	**-6,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**-14,2%**
Luxembourg	**-6,2%**	**-6,2%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**-4,3%**	**-5,5%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**-3,8%**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**12,2%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**-88,6%**
Portugal	**11,3%**	**16,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**0,6%**	NAP
Romania	**4,4%**	**-0,8%**	**9,9%**	12,6%	9,4%	*9,4%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9,2%**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**-29,4%**	**-17,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-52,1%**	NAP
Slovenia	**-4,4%**	**-10,0%**	**68,7%**	63,6%	114,5%	*114,5%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**9,1%**	NAP
Spain	**34,4%**	**26,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**43,2%**	NAP
Sweden	**7,0%**	**11,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**3,8%**	**12,0%**
Average	**6,0%**	**5,2%**	**37,7%**	53,5%	41,2%	*63,0%*	*-42,6%*	*-74,5%*	-4,1%	**0,3%**	**-5,4%**
Median	**5,4%**	**0,9%**	**18,6%**	63,6%	9,4%	*61,9%*	*-42,6%*	*-74,5%*	26,6%	**-0,4%**	**-7,2%**
Standard deviation											
Minimum	**-29,4%**	**-19,1%**	**-12,2%**	10,0%	-46,1%	*-3,9%*	*-42,6%*	*-74,5%*	-100,0%	**-52,1%**	**-88,6%**
Maximum	**37,9%**	**41,1%**	**112,9%**	116,4%	132,2%	*132,2%*	*-42,6%*	*-74,5%*	61,2%	**43,2%**	**99,2%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**7%**	**19%**	26%	15%	15%	15%	15%	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**56%**	56%	67%	70%	81%	81%	67%	**19%**	**56%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.12.3: Supreme courts, variation of pending 31 Dec. other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
Austria	**NA**	**20,4%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**10,9%**	**NA**
Belgium	**-3,1%**	**-11,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**6,5%**	**28,0%**
Bulgaria	**14,0%**	**23,0%**	**-100,0%**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**4,1%**	NAP
Croatia	**-3,8%**	**-6,1%**	**17,6%**	18,7%	21,6%	*21,6%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-87,0%	**117,4%**	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**2,9%**	**-4,0%**	**39,3%**	39,3%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**7,9%**	**-18,3%**
Denmark	**6,9%**	**6,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**4,5%**	**22,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-15,8%**	NAP
Finland	**-26,2%**	**23,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-32,1%**	**12,0%**
France	**3,2%**	**6,0%**	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-5,4%**	NAP
Germany	**0,5%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**-3,0%**	**-5,8%**
Greece	**5,0%**	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**2,7%**	**NA**
Hungary	**6,0%**	**-6,8%**	**81,5%**	101,8%	-8,1%	*NAP*	*-38,8%*			**21,2%**	**3,4%**
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**NA**	NAP
Italy	**-6,8%**	**-7,3%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-4,5%**	**11,3%**
Latvia	**-11,4%**	**1,2%**	**152,3%**	NAP	152,3%	*152,3%*	*NAP*	*NAP*		**-18,9%**	
Lithuania	**5,2%**	**-2,7%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	**167,4%**
Luxembourg	**-20,6%**	**-20,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**10,0%**	**-0,4%**	**NA**	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	**15,8%**	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**87,4%**	**NA**	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	**NA**	**276,7%**
Portugal	**-6,1%**	**-1,9%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-9,6%**	NAP
Romania	**-7,0%**	**-11,2%**	**-8,5%**	101,6%	-9,6%	*-9,6%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-3,5%**	NAP
Slovak Republic	**8,8%**	**14,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**2,3%**	NAP
Slovenia	**6,5%**	**12,1%**	**-18,1%**	-11,7%	-39,9%	*-39,9%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-2,4%**	NAP
Spain	**12,5%**	**17,8%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**-2,6%**	NAP
Sweden	**16,2%**	**17,6%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	**10,0%**	**32,8%**
Average	**0,8%**	**8,2%**	**23,4%**	49,9%	23,3%	*31,1%*	*-38,8%*	*#DIV/0!*	-87,0%	**5,0%**	**56,4%**
Median	**3,9%**	**3,6%**	**17,6%**	39,3%	-8,1%	*6,0%*	*-38,8%*	*#NUM!*	-87,0%	**0,0%**	**12,0%**
Standard deviation											
Minimum	**-26,2%**	**-20,6%**	**-100,0%**	-11,7%	-39,9%	*-39,9%*	*-38,8%*	*0,0%*	-87,0%	**-32,1%**	**-18,3%**
Maximum	**16,2%**	**87,4%**	**152,3%**	101,8%	152,3%	*152,3%*	*-38,8%*	*0,0%*	-87,0%	**117,4%**	**276,7%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27	**27**	**27**
% of NA	**11%**	**11%**	**19%**	26%	15%	15%	15%	15%	22%	**7%**	**7%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**56%**	56%	67%	70%	81%	81%	67%	**19%**	**56%**

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.12.4: Supreme courts, variation of clearance rate of other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage points (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal law cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	NA	-10,6	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	-3,8	NA
Belgium	+10,6	+17,9	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-3,0	-15,4
Bulgaria	-11,8	-13,7	+1,9	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	-10,1	NAP
Croatia	-8,2	-7,1	+16,7	+13,2	+27,7	*+27,7*	*NAP*	*NAP*	+96,3	-116,7	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-1,9	-5,3	-13,4	-13,4	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	+1,5	+10,5
Denmark	-9,6	-9,6	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	+10,6	+6,7	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	+16,4	NAP
Finland	+14,4	-16,5	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	+20,9	+1,5
France	+2,2	-0,8	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	+6,3	NAP
Germany	+1,5	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	+3,7	-8,2
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	-25,5	NA
Hungary	-18,5	-27,7	-13,7	-11,5	-27,8	*NAP*	*-4,8*	*-108,3*	-32,3	-10,9	-51,9
Ireland	-3,8	-3,8	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Italy	+26,6	+40,5	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-10,0	-14,7
Latvia	-9,7	-20,7	-13,0	NAP	-8,5	*-8,5*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-	+6,7	-
Lithuania	+9,6	+21,0	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	-28,9
Luxembourg	+25,6	+25,6	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	-21,2	+3,2	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	-30,3	NAP
Poland	NA	-60,8	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	-40,0
Portugal	+4,6	+11,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-12,7	NAP
Romania	+0,3	+4,0	-2,4	-2,6	-2,3	*-2,3*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-2,7	NAP
Slovak Republic	-1,5	+0,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-3,2	NAP
Slovenia	-9,6	-13,0	+11,4	+6,5	+45,4	*+45,4*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	+0,5	NAP
Spain	+9,7	-0,7	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	+27,3	NAP
Sweden	-0,5	-6,0	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	+0,6	-1,8
Average	+0,9	-2,9	-1,8	-1,6	*+6,9*	*+15,6*	*-4,8*	*-108,3*	*+32,0*	-7,2	-16,5
Median	-0,1	-3,8	-2,4	-2,6	*-2,3*	*+12,7*	*-4,8*	*-108,3*	*+32,0*	-2,9	-14,7
Minimum	-21,2	-60,8	-13,7	-13,4	*-27,8*	*-8,5*	*-4,8*	*-108,3*	*-32,3*	-116,7	-51,9
Maximum	+26,6	+40,5	+16,7	+13,2	*+45,4*	*+45,4*	*-4,8*	*-108,3*	*+96,3*	+27,3	+10,5
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	*27*	*27*	*27*	26	27	26
% of NA	11%	7%	19%	26%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	*23%*	7%	8%
% of NAP	7%	7%	56%	56%	*67%*	*70%*	*81%*	*81%*	*69%*	19%	58%

Table 3.12.5: Supreme courts, variation of disposition time of other than criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage (Q99)

States	Total number of other than criminal cases	Civil (and commercial) litigious cases	Total non-litigious cases	General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases *	Registry cases	*Non-litigious land registry cases*	*Non-litigious business registry cases*	*Other registry cases*	Other non-litigious cases	Administrative law cases	Other cases
	1+2+3+4	1	2 = 2.1+2.2+2.3	2.1	2.2 = 2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3	*2.2.1*	*2.2.2*	*2.2.3*	2.3	3	4
Austria	NA	30,1%	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	20,7%	NA
Belgium	-23,2%	-21,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	20,6%	-35,7%
Bulgaria	27,0%	20,5%	-100,0%	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	23,9%	NAP
Croatia	-23,3%	-23,2%	-44,8%	-45,2%	-47,6%	*-47,6%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-89,7%	104,1%	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	5,6%	3,6%	26,6%	26,6%	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	5,0%	-11,9%
Denmark	-3,6%	-3,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	-1,8%	21,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-26,6%	NAP
Finland	-21,9%	36,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-28,1%	6,9%
France	-12,3%	-8,9%	NAP	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-21,0%	NAP
Germany	8,9%	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	7,7%	32,2%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	19,5%	NA
Hungary	-7,5%	-2,8%	16,6%	22,5%	70,5%	*NAP*	*6,7%*	-	-	-5,0%	60,7%
Ireland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NA	NAP
Italy	-26,9%	-34,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-3,2%	1,0%
Latvia	3,9%	25,0%	187,5%	NAP	162,5%	*162,5%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	-	-11,3%	-
Lithuania	14,2%	3,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	211,6%
Luxembourg	-15,3%	-15,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	14,9%	5,4%	NA	NA	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NA	20,3%	NAP
Poland	NA	67,0%	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	3207,1%
Portugal	-15,7%	-16,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-10,2%	NAP
Romania	-10,9%	-10,5%	-16,7%	78,9%	-17,4%	*-17,4%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-11,7%	NAP
Slovak Republic	54,1%	38,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	113,5%	NAP
Slovenia	11,4%	24,6%	-51,5%	-46,0%	-72,0%	*-72,0%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-10,5%	NAP
Spain	-16,3%	-7,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-31,9%	NAP
Sweden	8,7%	5,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP	*NAP*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	5,9%	18,6%
Average	**-1,4%**	**+6,3%**	**+2,5%**	+7,4%	*+19,2%*	*+6,4%*	*+6,7%*		*-89,7%*	**+9,1%**	**+387,8%**
Median	**-3,6%**	**+3,6%**	**-16,7%**	+22,5%	*-17,4%*	*-32,5%*	*+6,7%*		*-89,7%*	**+0,9%**	**+18,6%**
Minimum	**-26,9%**	**-34,3%**	**-100,0%**	-46,0%	*-72,0%*	*-72,0%*	*+6,7%*		*-89,7%*	**-31,9%**	**-35,7%**
Maximum	**+54,1%**	**+67,0%**	**+187,5%**	+78,9%	*+162,5%*	*+162,5%*	*+6,7%*		*-89,7%*	**+113,5%**	**+3207,1%**
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27	27	*27*	*27*	*26*	25	**27**	**26**
% of NA	**15%**	**11%**	**19%**	26%	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	*15%*	*24%*	**7%**	**8%**
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	**56%**	56%	*67%*	*70%*	*81%*	*85%*	*72%*	**19%**	**58%**

European Comission templates for first instance cases

Table 3.13.1 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance total of other than criminal cases**, from 2012 to 2021 (Q91)

*** Other than criminal cases refer to the CEPEJ categories: Civil (and commercial) litigious cases, general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, non-litigious land registry cases, non-litigious business registry cases, other non-litigious registry cases, other non-litigious cases, administrative law cases and other cases*

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2913	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	54	53	NA	53	57	59	57	59	63	61
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	*2*	74	78	78	78	84	83	91	93	107	91
Croatia	*11*	133	129	134	132	117	114	102	130	120	120
Cyprus	*13*	534	NA	903	839	862	1 118	737	882	1 087	947
Czech Republic	*3*	116	76	157	164	155	163	162	158	170	159
Denmark	*4*	17	18	19	17	21	22	24	19	17	17
Estonia	*6*	44	NA	33	39	40	24	30	32	25	27
Finland	*26*	101	97	103	111	113	118	86	105	97	88
France	*10*	275	274	304	304	312	300	381	388	554	440
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	677	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	664
Hungary	*17*	NA	NA	63	59	57	63	63	69	80	65
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	391	369	377	393	387	399	373	367	471	381
Latvia	*14*	186	167	179	38	33	29	28	25	28	30
Lithuania	*15*	44	53	54	50	41	44	53	52	68	65
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	158	158
Malta	*18*	707	789	558	447	446	331	322	344	414	350
Netherlands	*19*	84	91	91	87	83	83	80	80	91	76
Poland	*21*	50	-	55	-	85	73	82	111	110	107
Portugal	*22*	860	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	161	128	148	154	154	161	154	152	186	160
Slovak Republic	*25*	218	235	231	240	98	107	111	135	87	83
Slovenia	*24*	113	111	102	82	72	65	61	56	69	54
Spain	*9*	NA	-	242	238	227	258	276	274	349	265
Sweden	*27*	149	146	133	126	133	151	152	138	123	117

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

$$*CEPEJ\ Calculated\ Disposition\ Time\ (days) = \frac{Number\ of\ pending\ cases\ at\ the\ end\ of\ a\ period}{Number\ of\ resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 365$$

Table 3.13.2 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases, from 2012 to 2021 (Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	135	135	130	131	133	141	138	137	156	135
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	87	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	*11*	457	386	380	391	364	387	374	488	655	559
Cyprus	*13*	NA	638	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	174	187	163	159	153	157	149	140	165	141
Denmark	*4*	165	164	177	174	176	172	207	222	190	238
Estonia	*6*	167	130	125	136	139	140	143	147	135	146
Finland	*26*	325	288	289	332	252	258	273	280	300	305
France	*10*	311	308	348	346	353	341	420	432	637	495
Germany	*5*	183	192	198	190	196	204	220	217	237	231
Greece	*8*	469	407	330	378	610	479	559	637	NA	728
Hungary	*17*	97	169	144	159	159	181	151	152	165	145
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	590	608	532	527	514	548	527	532	674	560
Latvia	*14*	241	247	255	238	217	208	236	213	239	216
Lithuania	*15*	88	94	97	96	88	85	84	87	117	106
Luxembourg	*16*	73	53	103	86	91	108	123	139	161	154
Malta	*18*	685	750	536	445	432	435	440	465	550	529
Netherlands	*19*	NA	NA	132	115	121	124	110	110	127	NA
Poland	*21*	195	-	203	-	225	232	273	270	317	330
Portugal	*22*	369	386	NA	315	289	250	229	200	280	253
Romania	*23*	193	187	146	154	153	167	157	152	168	150
Slovak Republic	*25*	437	505	524	401	130	171	157	170	204	206
Slovenia	*24*	318	301	270	277	280	292	283	281	350	309
Spain	*9*	264	-	318	325	282	329	362	353	468	344
Sweden	*27*	179	171	157	152	164	159	166	167	161	148

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

$$*CEPEJ\ Calculated\ Disposition\ Time\ (days) = \frac{Number\ of\ \ pending\ cases\ at\ the\ end\ of\ a\ period}{Number\ of\ resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 365$$

Table 3.13.3 (EC): Disposition time* (in days) for first instance administrative law cases, from 2012 to 2021 (Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	380	446	449	440	388	312
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	625	444	429	497	370	418	399	235
Bulgaria	*2*	150	110	124	122	108	116	112	107	124	125
Croatia	*11*	523	493	426	413	319	258	197	187	179	166
Cyprus	*13*	1 270	775	1 775	1 391	1 582	2 162	487	495	863	844
Czech Republic	*3*	NAP	NAP	415	437	421	408	412	356	317	265
Denmark	*4*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	*6*	108	139	141	117	108	108	119	136	142	162
Finland	*26*	248	277	280	271	279	255	235	254	274	296
France	*10*	302	284	305	313	314	290	285	284	333	299
Germany	*5*	354	357	367	349	375	421	435	397	426	422
Greece	*8*	1 520	1 148	NA	964	1 086	735	601	NA	551	595
Hungary	*17*	147	115	148	110	109	116	109	103	110	103
Ireland	*7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	886	1 043	984	1 008	925	887	889	821	862	756
Latvia	*14*	300	203	155	200	228	249	248	225	220	256
Lithuania	*15*	144	290	310	236	72	76	129	96	112	106
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	513	524
Malta	*18*	1 457	2 036	1 408	495	1 464	1 147	1 057	839	924	1 356
Netherlands	*19*	163	164	171	168	178	165	200	215	304	265
Poland	*21*	112	-	139	-	143	121	118	123	150	151
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	NA	989	911	988	928	846	847	792
Romania	*23*	272	106	179	170	170	114	117	138	690	293
Slovak Republic	*25*	733	746	397	374	203	317	401	518	585	679
Slovenia	*24*	130	126	112	122	282	448	406	516	443	546
Spain	*9*	427	-	361	317	312	322	331	338	406	352
Sweden	*27*	126	126	114	105	115	147	146	125	107	102

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

$$* \, CEPEJ \; Calculated \; Disposition \; Time \; (days) = \frac{Number \; of \; pending \; cases \; at \; the \; end \; of \; a \; period}{Number \; of \; resolved \; cases \; in \; a \; period} \times 365$$

Table 3.13.4 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) of first instance total of other than criminal cases**, from 2012 to 2021 (Q91)

*** Other than criminal cases refer to the CEPEJ categories: Civil (and commercial) litigious cases, general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, non-litigious land registry cases, non-litigious business registry cases, other non-litigious registry cases, other non-litigious cases, administrative law cases and other cases*

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	99,6%	100,8%	NA	100,2%	100,4%	100,6%	100,2%	100,4%	99,7%	99,8%
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	NA	102,2%	NA	108,4%	100,8%	98,4%	104,5%
Bulgaria	*2*	98,9%	100,9%	102,0%	99,0%	98,8%	97,4%	97,6%	99,1%	100,9%	101,2%
Croatia	*11*	102,0%	102,2%	103,2%	101,6%	101,8%	101,7%	104,5%	92,8%	103,6%	97,3%
Cyprus	*13*	87,0%	NA	88,5%	90,2%	106,2%	113,2%	124,9%	97,9%	88,3%	81,3%
Czech Republic	*3*	113,7%	96,8%	97,3%	102,3%	105,2%	101,0%	102,3%	100,8%	98,2%	102,6%
Denmark	*4*	101,1%	100,3%	100,0%	100,0%	99,6%	99,7%	99,6%	100,6%	100,8%	100,3%
Estonia	*6*	111,4%	NA	98,2%	139,7%	97,7%	104,0%	100,5%	100,0%	101,3%	99,0%
Finland	*26*	94,8%	99,9%	102,3%	98,8%	98,1%	96,4%	106,0%	94,8%	105,1%	102,3%
France	*10*	100,2%	98,2%	94,9%	97,7%	98,5%	103,7%	96,3%	99,4%	93,6%	105,3%
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	65,4%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	91,2%
Hungary	*17*	104,2%	97,5%	102,7%	101,4%	102,1%	99,2%	106,0%	100,7%	98,3%	103,7%
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	72,8%	76,6%	76,1%	81,6%	78,6%	75,4%	62,0%	75,4%
Italy	*12*	108,4%	106,6%	109,3%	111,7%	104,5%	102,9%	102,9%	103,3%	102,6%	106,8%
Latvia	*14*	112,4%	105,7%	100,4%	101,0%	101,0%	101,1%	100,2%	100,0%	99,0%	100,2%
Lithuania	*15*	100,5%	97,3%	98,8%	100,5%	101,7%	102,0%	101,0%	101,2%	96,7%	101,1%
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	101,6%	98,7%	95,6%	92,6%	95,2%	99,1%
Malta	*18*	108,2%	104,1%	102,2%	110,5%	107,4%	95,8%	97,1%	91,3%	90,9%	89,2%
Netherlands	*19*	98,8%	98,5%	99,1%	100,6%	100,2%	99,6%	100,7%	99,6%	98,5%	103,5%
Poland	*21*	100,6%	-	101,9%	-	92,9%	100,6%	99,0%	90,2%	104,3%	101,7%
Portugal	*22*	96,0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	95,7%	110,1%	111,1%	106,1%	101,3%	99,4%	103,5%	100,2%	96,7%	102,4%
Slovak Republic	*25*	90,9%	90,7%	101,9%	105,1%	106,2%	108,6%	111,4%	91,1%	113,0%	100,3%
Slovenia	*24*	105,6%	101,9%	103,8%	107,4%	106,1%	103,9%	102,0%	101,8%	98,9%	102,1%
Spain	*9*	NA	-	101,1%	99,7%	104,6%	93,8%	91,7%	93,6%	89,8%	101,7%
Sweden	*27*	101,7%	100,7%	103,1%	103,5%	95,9%	93,4%	97,1%	100,4%	102,2%	103,4%

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

$$* \, CEPEJ \; Clearance \; Rate \; (\%) = \frac{Resolved \; cases \; in \; a \; period}{Incoming \; Cases \; in \; a \; period} \times 100$$

Table 3.13.5 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) for first instance civil and commercial litigious cases from 2012 to 2021 (Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	100,6%	101,0%	103,0%	102,0%	102,0%	98,9%	100,8%	100,4%	99,8%	103,7%
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	97,9%	98,9%	102,5%	112,3%	112,5%	100,8%	98,8%	105,7%
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	*11*	95,0%	101,2%	113,4%	107,1%	118,1%	108,7%	112,5%	87,5%	85,0%	80,6%
Cyprus	*13*	NA	78,3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	98,8%	90,2%	104,7%	107,3%	110,0%	101,4%	101,6%	101,4%	98,0%	103,5%
Denmark	*4*	109,0%	107,1%	102,2%	101,9%	101,2%	102,4%	95,0%	91,8%	111,1%	97,6%
Estonia	*6*	112,5%	107,6%	104,2%	102,1%	97,6%	99,3%	100,6%	94,2%	99,8%	100,0%
Finland	*26*	103,2%	106,3%	104,6%	94,2%	124,8%	110,8%	102,2%	99,9%	93,6%	100,3%
France	*10*	99,2%	97,5%	94,4%	97,7%	99,0%	102,5%	95,8%	99,7%	92,9%	107,2%
Germany	*5*	100,4%	99,4%	100,2%	102,0%	102,7%	101,3%	97,2%	98,9%	98,1%	105,1%
Greece	*8*	57,7%	80,1%	113,1%	101,7%	99,1%	96,0%	86,3%	86,2%	NA	82,4%
Hungary	*17*	105,1%	97,9%	104,3%	99,0%	98,4%	96,4%	116,3%	104,4%	100,2%	105,5%
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	55,6%	63,2%	59,2%	72,8%	63,1%	63,0%	60,3%	71,6%
Italy	*12*	131,3%	118,1%	119,3%	120,1%	113,2%	106,4%	102,9%	104,5%	104,0%	109,1%
Latvia	*14*	117,7%	109,2%	98,5%	108,6%	107,4%	119,4%	103,4%	102,1%	96,1%	102,7%
Lithuania	*15*	100,5%	98,9%	97,5%	102,5%	98,4%	102,1%	103,6%	101,3%	93,9%	101,2%
Luxembourg	*16*	172,8%	181,6%	96,8%	105,4%	100,0%	96,3%	93,5%	88,0%	92,5%	99,0%
Malta	*18*	113,8%	109,6%	101,3%	107,3%	107,3%	97,0%	93,4%	91,8%	90,5%	78,1%
Netherlands	*19*	NA	NA	99,1%	100,4%	100,7%	99,1%	101,2%	100,2%	99,7%	NA
Poland	*21*	88,5%	-	99,3%	-	98,8%	93,8%	92,1%	99,3%	105,3%	103,3%
Portugal	*22*	97,7%	103,2%	NA	116,3%	112,3%	113,0%	109,2%	105,0%	97,8%	102,2%
Romania	*23*	99,0%	112,2%	108,7%	104,7%	102,0%	99,2%	102,7%	100,4%	100,1%	102,4%
Slovak Republic	*25*	81,6%	80,6%	91,7%	132,8%	132,0%	129,2%	130,6%	109,9%	99,7%	104,2%
Slovenia	*24*	101,5%	102,4%	109,1%	104,9%	106,4%	108,0%	109,8%	109,4%	100,5%	107,2%
Spain	*9*	99,6%	-	98,0%	94,7%	103,1%	87,9%	86,7%	94,0%	86,3%	102,4%
Sweden	*27*	98,8%	101,0%	103,9%	103,9%	99,3%	99,7%	97,5%	97,5%	102,8%	102,7%

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Ireland: CR and number of resolved cases show lower values because many cases discontinued or settled out of courts are not registered as resolved.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

$$* \, CEPEJ \; Clearance \; Rate \; (\%) = \frac{Resolved \; cases \; in \; a \; period}{Incoming \; Cases \; in \; a \; period} \times 100$$

Table 3.13.6 (EC): Clearance rate* (in percentage) for first instance administrative cases, from 2012 to 2021 (Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	90,8%	79,5%	89,7%	110,7%	126,0%	125,2%
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	88,2%	116,8%	120,9%	100,8%	118,8%	111,8%	108,5%	131,1%
Bulgaria	*2*	92,1%	108,6%	100,8%	99,0%	104,2%	94,7%	99,7%	98,6%	100,1%	100,1%
Croatia	*11*	41,1%	64,3%	85,8%	92,7%	109,3%	126,5%	115,9%	108,8%	106,9%	101,8%
Cyprus	*13*	74,0%	57,5%	103,5%	119,8%	112,8%	73,6%	219,2%	169,8%	83,8%	45,9%
Czech Republic	*3*	NAP	NAP	90,9%	92,1%	80,2%	91,7%	88,0%	107,2%	112,6%	118,9%
Denmark	*4*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	*6*	105,5%	90,9%	90,4%	104,5%	105,6%	99,4%	100,0%	94,3%	92,5%	89,6%
Finland	*26*	101,0%	94,8%	97,1%	101,8%	79,4%	107,4%	112,3%	99,8%	98,7%	101,7%
France	*10*	106,7%	104,2%	96,3%	98,3%	99,1%	102,1%	98,4%	96,5%	95,2%	96,6%
Germany	*5*	101,7%	99,7%	100,3%	102,6%	92,3%	84,0%	97,1%	109,0%	110,0%	109,9%
Greece	*8*	143,2%	153,4%	NA	183,4%	148,1%	166,0%	163,5%	NA	162,8%	129,7%
Hungary	*17*	108,0%	104,3%	92,1%	105,3%	99,7%	102,1%	101,7%	102,5%	89,3%	107,8%
Ireland	*7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	279,8%	190,2%	155,6%	141,9%	153,5%	156,2%	136,3%	131,1%	136,4%	124,6%
Latvia	*14*	130,5%	163,3%	143,9%	106,0%	95,3%	99,7%	105,2%	105,3%	107,0%	92,5%
Lithuania	*15*	98,1%	65,4%	89,4%	99,7%	144,4%	113,0%	87,6%	104,6%	97,5%	98,0%
Luxembourg	*16*	69,8%	93,5%	93,5%	90,7%	97,7%	94,3%	86,0%	75,2%	87,4%	92,3%
Malta	*18*	40,2%	40,1%	148,7%	410,7%	114,4%	146,9%	91,2%	120,8%	106,2%	69,5%
Netherlands	*19*	97,5%	100,3%	98,9%	103,0%	95,3%	105,1%	95,2%	93,7%	86,3%	108,1%
Poland	*21*	99,6%	-	96,5%	-	103,0%	107,1%	105,1%	98,6%	95,0%	92,8%
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	NA	79,8%	111,5%	105,0%	111,0%	106,2%	126,1%	106,8%
Romania	*23*	78,1%	130,2%	161,0%	132,7%	91,8%	102,2%	118,0%	100,3%	48,4%	105,2%
Slovak Republic	*25*	47,2%	84,6%	124,8%	124,1%	112,0%	118,1%	96,1%	81,4%	86,8%	80,1%
Slovenia	*24*	110,0%	101,8%	103,0%	101,0%	87,1%	67,5%	91,3%	88,9%	106,7%	94,7%
Spain	*9*	123,7%	-	112,5%	117,3%	111,6%	104,5%	99,6%	92,2%	99,5%	98,5%
Sweden	*27*	104,8%	100,7%	102,8%	103,7%	93,9%	89,8%	96,8%	101,7%	102,3%	103,4%

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

$$* \, CEPEJ \; Clearance \; Rate \; (\%) = \frac{Resolved \; cases \; in \; a \; period}{Incoming \; Cases \; in \; a \; period} \times 100$$

Table 3.13.7 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q91)

** Other than criminal cases refer to the CEPEJ categories: Civil (and commercial) litigious cases, general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, non-litigious land registry cases, non-litigious business registry cases, other non-litigious registry cases, other non-litigious cases, administrative law cases and other cases*

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	6,1	5,8	NA	5,5	5,8	5,9	5,8	5,8	6,0	5,8
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	*2*	1,1	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,1	1,2	1,3	1,4	1,3	1,3
Croatia	*11*	9,6	9,2	8,4	7,9	7,5	7,2	6,3	8,2	7,5	8,6
Cyprus	*13*	5,4	NA	6,1	7,2	6,0	6,2	6,0	5,5	6,3	6,6
Czech Republic	*3*	3,6	3,3	3,8	4,9	4,4	4,3	4,0	3,9	4,0	3,8
Denmark	*4*	2,1	2,0	2,1	2,1	2,3	2,4	2,6	2,5	2,3	2,2
Estonia	*6*	2,8	NA	1,6	2,7	2,7	1,4	1,8	2,0	1,6	1,8
Finland	*26*	2,5	2,5	2,3	2,4	2,5	2,8	2,3	2,6	2,4	2,2
France	*10*	2,5	2,6	2,7	2,8	2,8	2,7	2,8	2,8	3,0	2,8
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	7,8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,0
Hungary	*17*	NA	NA	1,5	1,5	1,4	1,5	1,4	1,3	1,4	1,2
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	7,8	7,5	7,4	6,9	6,7	6,4	6,1	5,9	6,0	5,7
Latvia	*14*	2,0	1,8	1,8	1,6	1,5	1,3	1,3	1,3	1,5	1,5
Lithuania	*15*	1,1	1,4	1,6	1,5	1,4	1,2	1,1	1,0	1,3	1,2
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,9	0,9
Malta	*18*	2,2	2,2	2,4	2,1	1,9	2,0	2,1	2,3	2,2	2,2
Netherlands	*19*	1,7	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,7	1,6	1,5	1,5	1,6	1,3
Poland	*21*	3,6	-	4,0	-	6,1	6,0	6,3	9,8	8,7	8,2
Portugal	*22*	15,5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	3,7	3,1	3,3	3,3	3,2	3,3	3,0	3,0	3,3	3,1
Slovak Republic	*25*	6,4	7,5	7,3	6,8	4,9	5,0	3,7	5,0	3,3	3,3
Slovenia	*24*	14,7	13,8	12,2	9,3	7,2	5,9	5,3	4,7	4,9	4,3
Spain	*9*	NA	-	3,1	3,1	2,8	3,0	3,4	3,7	4,2	4,2
Sweden	*27*	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,7	0,8	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,9

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.13.8 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious pending cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	0,5	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,3
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	1,6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	*11*	5,1	5,1	4,6	4,4	3,8	3,6	3,3	3,7	4,2	5,2
Cyprus	*13*	NA	6,1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	1,6	2,1	2,1	1,8	1,4	1,5	1,3	1,3	1,3	1,2
Denmark	*4*	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,4	0,5	0,4	0,5
Estonia	*6*	0,7	0,5	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5
Finland	*26*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
France	*10*	2,2	2,2	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,4	2,5	2,5	2,6	2,4
Germany	*5*	1,0	0,9	1,0	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9
Greece	*8*	4,3	5,6	2,3	2,2	2,3	2,3	2,6	2,9	NA	2,8
Hungary	*17*	1,2	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,5
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	5,5	5,3	4,5	4,4	4,1	3,9	3,8	3,7	3,7	3,6
Latvia	*14*	1,7	1,5	1,6	1,4	1,3	1,0	1,0	0,9	1,0	0,9
Lithuania	*15*	0,9	0,9	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,8	0,8	1,0	1,0
Luxembourg	*16*	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,4	0,5	0,5
Malta	*18*	2,1	2,1	2,2	2,0	1,8	1,9	2,0	2,1	2,0	2,1
Netherlands	*19*	NA	NA	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,3	NA
Poland	*21*	1,3	-	1,8	-	1,9	2,1	2,4	2,4	2,3	2,2
Portugal	*22*	3,5	3,4	NA	3,1	2,7	2,3	2,0	1,8	1,9	1,8
Romania	*23*	2,7	2,4	3,0	3,0	2,9	3,0	2,8	2,8	2,8	2,7
Slovak Republic	*25*	2,9	3,4	3,7	3,0	1,7	2,1	1,3	1,1	1,1	1,1
Slovenia	*24*	2,7	2,6	2,3	2,2	2,0	1,9	1,7	1,5	1,5	1,4
Spain	*9*	2,8	-	1,8	2,0	1,7	2,0	2,3	2,5	2,8	2,7
Sweden	*27*	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.13.9 (EC): Number of first instance administrative cases pending on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants, from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,6	0,8	0,9	0,8	0,7	0,6
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1
Bulgaria	*2*	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Croatia	*11*	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Cyprus	*13*	0,6	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,9	0,7	0,5	0,6	1,3
Czech Republic	*3*	NAP	NAP	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Denmark	*4*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	*6*	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Finland	*26*	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3
France	*10*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,3
Germany	*5*	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,8
Greece	*8*	3,5	3,1	NA	2,4	2,2	1,9	1,5	NA	1,0	0,9
Hungary	*17*	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,1	0,1
Ireland	*7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	0,6	0,5	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2
Latvia	*14*	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Lithuania	*15*	0,1	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,2
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,2	0,2
Malta	*18*	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Netherlands	*19*	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,4	0,4
Poland	*21*	0,1	-	0,1	-	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	NA	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,6	0,6
Romania	*23*	0,6	0,4	0,3	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,4	0,4
Slovak Republic	*25*	0,3	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Slovenia	*24*	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Spain	*9*	0,6	-	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,4
Sweden	*27*	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,3	0,4	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,5

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.13.10 (EC): Number of first instance total other than criminal* incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q91)

** Other than criminal cases refer to the CEPEJ categories: Civil (and commercial) litigious cases, general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, non-litigious land registry cases, non-litigious business registry cases, other non-litigious registry cases, other non-litigious cases, administrative law cases and other cases*

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	41,3	39,9	NA	37,8	37,6	36,7	37,0	36,2	35,0	34,7
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,7	4,4	9,3	8,6	8,6	8,4
Bulgaria	*2*	5,4	4,9	4,4	4,8	4,8	5,6	5,4	5,4	4,5	5,1
Croatia	*11*	25,8	25,6	22,2	21,6	23,2	22,9	21,7	24,6	22,1	26,8
Cyprus	*13*	4,3	NA	2,8	3,5	2,4	1,8	2,4	2,3	2,4	3,1
Czech Republic	*3*	10,0	16,5	9,1	10,8	9,8	9,5	8,8	9,0	8,7	8,6
Denmark	*4*	46,9	41,2	40,4	45,4	38,8	39,5	39,2	49,3	47,5	46,1
Estonia	*6*	20,6	NA	18,1	18,0	24,7	20,3	22,6	22,7	23,4	24,3
Finland	*26*	9,7	9,5	8,1	8,1	8,2	9,0	9,1	9,5	8,5	8,8
France	*10*	3,3	3,5	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,2	2,8	2,7	2,1	2,2
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	6,4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2,4
Hungary	*17*	11,4	11,8	8,6	9,2	8,9	8,6	7,5	6,8	6,4	6,4
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	5,4	5,3	5,0	4,7	4,6	4,7	4,2	2,7
Italy	*12*	6,7	7,0	6,6	5,7	6,0	5,7	5,8	5,7	4,5	5,1
Latvia	*14*	3,5	3,8	3,6	15,7	16,2	16,4	16,5	18,7	19,3	18,3
Lithuania	*15*	9,3	10,1	10,7	11,1	11,7	9,5	7,5	7,2	7,0	6,6
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,8	1,8	1,9	2,3	2,1	2,0
Malta	*18*	1,1	1,0	1,5	1,6	1,5	2,3	2,5	2,6	2,1	2,6
Netherlands	*19*	7,5	7,4	7,5	7,4	7,3	7,2	6,9	7,0	6,4	6,2
Poland	*21*	26,1	-	26,0	-	28,0	30,3	28,6	35,6	27,6	27,6
Portugal	*22*	6,8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	8,6	8,0	7,3	7,3	7,5	7,5	7,0	7,3	6,7	7,0
Slovak Republic	*25*	11,8	12,8	11,3	9,9	17,0	15,7	10,9	14,7	12,4	14,5
Slovenia	*24*	45,1	44,7	42,3	38,8	34,4	32,2	30,7	30,1	26,2	28,5
Spain	*9*	NA	-	4,6	4,8	4,2	4,6	4,9	5,3	4,9	5,6
Sweden	*27*	2,1	2,1	2,0	1,9	2,3	2,5	2,5	2,7	2,7	2,6

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.13.11 (EC): Number of first instance civil and commercial litigious incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	1,2	1,2	1,1	1,0	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,9	0,8	0,8
Belgium	*1*	6,8	6,7	6,7	6,8	6,4	1,9	6,7	6,1	6,1	5,9
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	*11*	4,3	4,8	3,9	3,8	3,3	3,1	2,9	3,2	2,7	4,2
Cyprus	*13*	NA	4,5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	3,5	4,5	4,6	3,8	3,1	3,4	3,3	3,3	2,9	3,0
Denmark	*4*	0,8	0,8	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,8	0,7	0,7
Estonia	*6*	1,3	1,3	1,3	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,4	1,4	1,3
Finland	*26*	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,2
France	*10*	2,6	2,7	2,6	2,6	2,5	2,5	2,2	2,1	1,6	1,7
Germany	*5*	2,0	1,8	1,8	1,7	1,6	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,5	1,3
Greece	*8*	5,8	6,2	2,2	2,1	1,4	1,9	2,0	1,9	NA	1,7
Hungary	*17*	4,4	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,9	1,8	1,4	1,4	1,3	1,3
Ireland	*7*	3,9	4,2	3,1	3,0	2,7	2,7	2,7	2,7	3,3	2,1
Italy	*12*	2,6	2,7	2,6	2,5	2,6	2,5	2,6	2,4	1,9	2,1
Latvia	*14*	2,2	2,0	2,3	2,0	2,0	1,5	1,4	1,6	1,5	1,5
Lithuania	*15*	3,6	3,6	4,0	3,6	4,4	4,1	3,6	3,3	3,3	3,3
Luxembourg	*16*	0,9	0,8	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	1,2	1,2	1,2
Malta	*18*	1,0	0,9	1,5	1,5	1,4	1,6	1,8	1,8	1,4	1,9
Netherlands	*19*	NA	NA	1,0	1,0	0,9	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,7	NA
Poland	*21*	2,8	-	3,2	-	3,1	3,5	3,4	3,3	2,5	2,4
Portugal	*22*	3,5	3,1	NA	3,1	3,0	2,9	2,9	3,1	2,5	2,5
Romania	*23*	5,2	4,2	6,9	6,8	6,8	6,6	6,4	6,7	6,1	6,4
Slovak Republic	*25*	3,0	3,0	2,8	2,1	3,7	3,5	2,3	2,1	2,0	1,8
Slovenia	*24*	3,0	3,1	2,9	2,8	2,5	2,2	2,0	1,8	1,5	1,5
Spain	*9*	3,8	-	2,2	2,3	2,1	2,5	2,7	2,7	2,5	2,8
Sweden	*27*	0,7	0,7	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,7	0,6	0,6

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

Table 3.13.12 (EC): Number of first instance administrative incoming cases per 100 inhabitants, from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q91)

States / Entities	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	0,6	0,8	0,8	0,6	0,5	0,5
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,2	0,1
Bulgaria	*2*	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,5	0,4	0,4
Croatia	*11*	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3
Cyprus	*13*	0,2	0,8	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	1,2
Czech Republic	*3*	NAP	NAP	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Denmark	*4*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP
Estonia	*6*	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Finland	*26*	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,7	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,4	0,4
France	*10*	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,3	0,4
Germany	*5*	0,9	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,9	1,0	0,9	0,8	0,7	0,7
Greece	*8*	0,6	0,6	NA	0,5	0,5	0,6	0,6	NA	0,4	0,4
Hungary	*17*	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,2
Ireland	*7*	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Italy	*12*	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Latvia	*14*	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Lithuania	*15*	0,3	0,6	0,5	0,6	0,5	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,6
Luxembourg	*16*	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Malta	*18*	0,1	0,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Netherlands	*19*	0,7	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,7	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,6	0,5
Poland	*21*	0,2	-	0,2	-	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2
Portugal	*22*	NA	NA	NA	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,3	0,2	0,2
Romania	*23*	1,1	1,0	0,4	0,3	0,6	0,7	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4
Slovak Republic	*25*	0,3	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Slovenia	*24*	0,2	0,3	0,3	0,2	0,1	0,2	0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1
Spain	*9*	0,4	-	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,4	0,3	0,4
Sweden	*27*	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,0	1,4	1,6	1,6	1,7	1,8	1,7

Greece: In 2017 new IT management systems were introduced for civil as well as administrative cases and some variations can be noticed.

Italy: Only since 2014 the 29 regional administrative courts data are taken into account in the number of cases on first instance.

Slovak Repuublic: Because of changes in the structure of the caseload data the number of cases is not comparable between different cycles.

First instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.14.1a(2021): First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2021

Absolute values (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**23 968**	5 315	8 770	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	**23 281**	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**105 697**	29 337	65 651	10 709
Cyprus	**49 542**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**12 884**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**26 760**	13 932	12 828	NAP
Estonia	**1 672**	645	557	470
Finland	**28 360**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	**NA**	258 490	117 952	NA
Greece	**23 912**	79	23 818	15
Hungary	**52 390**	23 407	28 983	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**1 240 684**	1 132 280	108 404	NAP
Latvia	**6 125**	5 350	775	NAP
Lithuania	**3 353**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Malta	**15 883**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	**410 425**	191 257	86 960	132 208
Portugal	**44 668**	41 188	2 075	1 405
Romania	**105 887**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**22 504**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**31 802**	11 182	12 125	8 495
Spain	**400 907**	276 086	124 821	NAP
Sweden	**46 939**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**127 507**	152 965	45 671	25 550
Median	**28 360**	23 407	23 818	4 950
Minimum	**1 672**	79	557	15
Maximum	**1 240 684**	1 132 280	124 821	132 208
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	44%	44%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Table 3.14.1b(2021): First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,27	0,06	0,10	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	0,34	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	2,73	0,76	1,70	0,28
Cyprus	5,48	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,12	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,46	0,24	0,22	NAP
Estonia	0,13	0,05	0,04	0,04
Finland	0,51	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	NA	0,31	0,14	NA
Greece	0,22	0,00	0,22	0,00
Hungary	0,54	0,24	0,30	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	2,10	1,92	0,18	NAP
Latvia	0,33	0,29	0,04	NAP
Lithuania	0,12	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	3,08	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	1,08	0,50	0,23	0,35
Portugal	0,43	0,40	0,02	0,01
Romania	0,56	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,41	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	1,51	0,53	0,58	0,40
Spain	0,85	0,58	0,26	NAP
Sweden	0,45	NA	NA	NA
Average	1,03	0,45	0,31	0,18
Median	0,46	0,31	0,22	0,16
Minimum	0,12	0,00	0,02	0,00
Maximum	5,48	1,92	1,70	0,40
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	44%	44%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Table 3.14.2a(2021): First instance criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Absolute values (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**65 974**	21 319	21 834	NAP
Belgium	**232 220**	40 339	191 881	NAP
Bulgaria	**131 575**	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**199 693**	18 640	127 909	53 144
Cyprus	**56 867**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**62 338**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**139 350**	22 314	117 036	NAP
Estonia	**19 374**	4 764	5 500	9 110
Finland	**70 375**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	551 370	455 348	NAP
Germany	**1 133 482**	580 267	397 602	155 613
Greece	**169 013**	951	164 256	3 806
Hungary	**432 163**	130 909	301 254	NAP
Ireland	**375 517**	22 022	353 495	NAP
Italy	**1 125 952**	1 006 112	119 840	NAP
Latvia	**9 548**	6 528	3 020	NAP
Lithuania	**15 516**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	2 176
Malta	**11 628**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**254 503**	168 896	85 607	NAP
Poland	**2 027 328**	381 028	361 735	1 284 565
Portugal	**74 166**	59 276	6 365	8 525
Romania	**361 037**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**62 601**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**72 212**	8 914	27 876	35 422
Spain	**721 475**	309 737	411 738	NAP
Sweden	**122 417**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**317 853**	196 082	185 429	194 045
Median	**131 575**	40 339	127 909	22 266
Minimum	**9 548**	951	3 020	2 176
Maximum	**2 027 328**	1 006 112	455 348	1 284 565
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	30%	30%	22%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.14.2b(2021): First instance criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,73	0,24	0,24	NAP
Belgium	2,01	0,35	1,66	NAP
Bulgaria	1,92	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	5,16	0,48	3,30	1,37
Cyprus	6,29	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,59	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	2,37	0,38	1,99	NAP
Estonia	1,46	0,36	0,41	0,68
Finland	1,27	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	0,82	0,67	NAP
Germany	1,36	0,70	0,48	0,19
Greece	1,58	0,01	1,54	0,04
Hungary	4,46	1,35	3,11	NAP
Ireland	7,33	0,43	6,90	NAP
Italy	1,91	1,71	0,20	NAP
Latvia	0,51	0,35	0,16	NAP
Lithuania	0,55	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	0,34
Malta	2,25	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	1,45	0,96	0,49	NAP
Poland	5,32	1,00	0,95	3,37
Portugal	0,72	0,57	0,06	0,08
Romania	1,90	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1,15	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	3,43	0,42	1,32	1,68
Spain	1,52	0,65	0,87	NAP
Sweden	1,17	NA	NA	NA
Average	2,34	0,63	1,43	0,97
Median	1,58	0,48	0,87	0,51
Minimum	0,51	0,01	0,06	0,04
Maximum	7,33	1,71	6,90	3,37
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	7%	30%	30%	22%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.14.3a(2021): First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Absolute values (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**66 171**	21 539	23 085	NAP
Belgium	**231 425**	40 325	191 100	NAP
Bulgaria	**131 463**	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**185 708**	17 039	116 684	51 985
Cyprus	**63 546**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**64 352**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**134 781**	21 651	113 130	NAP
Estonia	**19 259**	4 704	5 446	9 109
Finland	**68 638**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	NA	387 728	NAP
Germany	**NA**	596 352	397 252	NA
Greece	**113 634**	739	110 688	2 207
Hungary	**433 621**	131 050	302 571	NAP
Ireland	**283 666**	19 185	264 481	NAP
Italy	**1 131 159**	1 002 329	128 830	NAP
Latvia	**10 279**	7 315	2 964	NAP
Lithuania	**15 627**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**14 253**	4 699	7 848	1 706
Malta	**10 195**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**254 775**	166 875	87 900	NAP
Poland	**2 037 487**	382 211	363 569	1 291 707
Portugal	**73 668**	59 239	6 052	8 377
Romania	**365 216**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**61 961**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**72 616**	8 845	27 664	36 107
Spain	**743 805**	312 980	430 825	NAP
Sweden	**122 015**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**268 373**	164 534	164 879	200 171
Median	**113 634**	21 651	114 907	9 109
Minimum	**10 195**	739	2 964	1 706
Maximum	**2 037 487**	1 002 329	430 825	1 291 707
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	30%	26%	26%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.14.3b(2021): First instance criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,74	0,24	0,26	NAP
Belgium	2,00	0,35	1,65	NAP
Bulgaria	1,92	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	4,80	0,44	3,01	1,34
Cyprus	7,02	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,61	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	2,29	0,37	1,93	NAP
Estonia	1,45	0,35	0,41	0,68
Finland	1,24	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	0,57	NAP
Germany	NA	0,72	0,48	NA
Greece	1,06	0,01	1,04	0,02
Hungary	4,48	1,35	3,12	NAP
Ireland	5,54	0,37	5,16	NAP
Italy	1,92	1,70	0,22	NAP
Latvia	0,55	0,39	0,16	NAP
Lithuania	0,56	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	2,21	0,73	1,22	0,26
Malta	1,98	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	1,46	0,95	0,50	NAP
Poland	5,35	1,00	0,95	3,39
Portugal	0,71	0,57	0,06	0,08
Romania	1,92	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1,14	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	3,45	0,42	1,31	1,71
Spain	1,57	0,66	0,91	NAP
Sweden	1,17	NA	NA	NA
Average	2,28	0,63	1,28	1,07
Median	1,92	0,44	0,93	0,68
Minimum	0,55	0,01	0,06	0,02
Maximum	7,02	1,70	5,16	3,39
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	7%	30%	26%	26%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.14.4a(2021): First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2021

Absolute values (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	23 771	5 095	7 519	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	23 393	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	120 976	31 164	77 865	11 947
Cyprus	42 863	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	10 870	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	31 329	14 595	16 734	NAP
Estonia	1 621	643	508	470
Finland	30 097	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	NA	242 337	118 296	NA
Greece	38 221	147	36 813	1 261
Hungary	50 932	23 266	27 666	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	1 235 477	1 136 063	99 414	NAP
Latvia	5 394	4 563	831	NAP
Lithuania	3 242	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	15 806	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	69 599	47 680	21 919	NAP
Poland	400 266	190 074	85 126	125 066
Portugal	45 166	41 225	2 388	1 553
Romania	101 708	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	23 144	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	31 398	11 251	12 337	7 810
Spain	395 326	284 198	111 128	NAP
Sweden	47 341	NA	NA	NA
Average	124 906	145 164	44 182	24 685
Median	34 810	27 215	24 793	4 682
Minimum	1 621	147	508	470
Maximum	1 235 477	1 136 063	118 296	125 066
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	41%	41%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Table 3.14.4b(2021): First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,26	0,06	0,08	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	0,34	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	3,12	0,80	2,01	0,31
Cyprus	4,74	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,10	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,53	0,25	0,28	NAP
Estonia	0,12	0,05	0,04	0,04
Finland	0,54	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	NA	0,29	0,14	NA
Greece	0,36	0,00	0,34	0,01
Hungary	0,53	0,24	0,29	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	2,09	1,93	0,17	NAP
Latvia	0,29	0,24	0,04	NAP
Lithuania	0,12	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	3,06	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,40	0,27	0,13	NAP
Poland	1,05	0,50	0,22	0,33
Portugal	0,44	0,40	0,02	0,02
Romania	0,53	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,43	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	1,49	0,53	0,59	0,37
Spain	0,83	0,60	0,23	NAP
Sweden	0,45	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,99	0,44	0,33	0,18
Median	0,49	0,28	0,20	0,17
Minimum	0,10	0,00	0,02	0,01
Maximum	4,74	1,93	2,01	0,37
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	41%	41%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Table 3.14.5(2021): First instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2021

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases pending more than 2 years 1+2+3		Severe criminal ending more than 2 years cases 1		Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases ending more than 2 2		Other criminal ending more than 2 years cases 3	
	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.
Austria	**669**	**2,8%**	183	3,6%	362	4,8%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**23 127**	**19,1%**	15 271	49,0%	6 387	8,2%	1 469	12,3%
Cyprus	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**904**	**8,3%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	**44**	**2,7%**	28	4,4%	3	0,6%	13	2,8%
Finland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**20 203**	**52,9%**	17	11,6%	20 174	54,8%	12	1,0%
Hungary	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	**NA**	**NA**	414 909	36,5%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**982**	**18,2%**	973	21,3%	9	1,1%	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	**227**	**7,0%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**16 077**	**35,6%**	15 471	37,5%	181	7,6%	425	27,4%
Romania	**4 231**	**4,2%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**2 912**	**12,6%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**4 546**	**14,5%**	3 656	32,5%	345	2,8%	545	7,0%
Spain	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Sweden	**2 081**	**4,4%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	**6 334**	**15,2%**	56 314	24,5%	3 923	11,4%	493	10,1%
Median	**2 497**	**10,4%**	2 315	26,9%	345	4,8%	425	7,0%
Minimum	**44**	**2,7%**	17	3,6%	3	0,6%	12	1,0%
Maximum	**23 127**	**52,9%**	414 909	49,0%	20 174	54,8%	1 469	27,4%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**56%**	**56%**	63%	63%	67%	67%	41%	41%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	7%	7%	7%	7%	41%	41%

Austria: The total number of first instance criminal cases is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it also includes administrative criminal cases for which the distinction between severe and minor offences is not possible

Table 3.14.1(2020): First instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020

Absolute values (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**22 930**	5 469	8 283	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	**21 184**	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**82 475**	27 040	44 977	10 728
Cyprus	**45 674**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**13 017**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**19 143**	9 781	9 362	NAP
Estonia	**1 859**	597	675	587
Finland	**20 227**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	**NA**	247 214	109 040	NA
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**42 484**	20 753	21 731	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**1 193 323**	1 094 651	98 672	NAP
Latvia	**5 895**	4 052	1 843	NAP
Lithuania	**2 907**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Malta	**11 899**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	**374 052**	173 746	78 511	121 795
Portugal	**41 395**	38 178	1 654	1 563
Romania	**106 622**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**22 452**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**28 879**	9 170	12 393	7 316
Spain	**358 146**	253 301	104 845	NAP
Sweden	**42 178**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**122 837**	156 996	40 999	28 398
Median	**25 905**	23 897	17 062	7 316
Minimum	**1 859**	597	675	587
Maximum	**1 193 323**	1 094 651	109 040	121 795
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	**27**
% of NA	**26%**	48%	48%	33%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal law cases as well.

Table 3.14.2a(2020): First instance criminal cases - incoming 2020

Absolute values (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**66 767**	21 966	24 453	NAP
Belgium	**191 132**	33 531	157 601	NAP
Bulgaria	**130 282**	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**196 602**	17 944	126 616	52 042
Cyprus	**59 300**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**65 131**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**162 899**	26 889	136 010	NAP
Estonia	**20 392**	5 210	5 952	9 230
Finland	**56 932**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**965 679**	497 526	468 153	NAP
Germany	**1 187 545**	640 143	390 866	156 536
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**360 839**	125 130	235 709	NAP
Ireland	**360 576**	21 322	382 455	NAP
Italy	**1 042 721**	922 368	120 353	NAP
Latvia	**15 022**	8 391	6 631	NAP
Lithuania	**17 225**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	1 995
Malta	**11 086**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**223 723**	159 476	64 247	NAP
Poland	**1 862 695**	351 326	330 848	1 180 521
Portugal	**63 435**	51 701	4 416	7 318
Romania	**341 899**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**65 860**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**73 368**	9 550	27 970	35 848
Spain	**623 828**	248 714	375 114	NAP
Sweden	**119 936**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**331 395**	196 324	178 587	206 213
Median	**130 282**	42 616	131 313	35 848
Minimum	**11 086**	5 210	4 416	1 995
Maximum	**1 862 695**	922 368	468 153	1 180 521
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	33%	33%	26%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal law cases as well.

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.14.2b(2020): First instance criminal cases - incoming 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,75	0,25	0,27	NAP
Belgium	1,66	0,29	1,37	NAP
Bulgaria	1,88	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	4,87	0,44	3,14	1,29
Cyprus	6,62	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,61	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	2,79	0,46	2,33	NAP
Estonia	1,53	0,39	0,45	0,69
Finland	1,03	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	1,43	0,74	0,69	NAP
Germany	1,43	0,77	0,47	0,19
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	3,65	1,27	2,38	NAP
Ireland	7,24	0,43	7,68	NAP
Italy	1,76	1,56	0,20	NAP
Latvia	0,79	0,44	0,35	NAP
Lithuania	0,62	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	0,31
Malta	2,15	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	1,28	0,91	0,37	NAP
Poland	4,87	0,92	0,87	3,09
Portugal	0,62	0,50	0,04	0,07
Romania	1,78	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1,21	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	3,48	0,45	1,33	1,70
Spain	1,32	0,53	0,79	NAP
Sweden	1,16	NA	NA	NA
Average	2,26	0,65	1,42	1,05
Median	1,53	0,48	0,74	0,69
Minimum	0,61	0,25	0,04	0,07
Maximum	7,24	1,56	7,68	3,09
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	7%	33%	33%	26%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal law cases as well.

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.14.3a(2020): First instance criminal cases - resolved 2020

Absolute values (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**65 549**	22 120	23 966	NAP
Belgium	**180 946**	35 035	145 911	NAP
Bulgaria	**128 186**	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**173 197**	15 769	105 375	52 053
Cyprus	**56 142**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**65 264**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**155 064**	22 648	132 416	NAP
Estonia	**20 385**	5 114	5 926	9 345
Finland	**50 834**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**882 087**	490 172	391 915	NAP
Germany	**NA**	628 662	381 932	NA
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**350 933**	122 476	228 457	NAP
Ireland	**224 048**	17 535	194 796	NAP
Italy	**945 778**	834 920	110 858	NAP
Latvia	**13 696**	7 941	5 755	NAP
Lithuania	**16 779**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**13 858**	4 272	7 998	1 588
Malta	**7 321**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**213 096**	158 827	54 269	NAP
Poland	**1 826 322**	333 815	322 399	1 170 108
Portugal	**59 309**	48 078	3 952	7 279
Romania	**342 634**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**65 808**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**70 425**	7 546	28 237	34 642
Spain	**593 304**	234 348	358 956	NAP
Sweden	**115 152**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**265 445**	175 840	147 242	212 503
Median	**115 152**	35 035	110 858	21 994
Minimum	**7 321**	4 272	3 952	1 588
Maximum	**1 826 322**	834 920	391 915	1 170 108
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	**27**
% of NA	**7%**	30%	30%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal law cases as well.

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.14.3b(2020): First instance criminal cases - resolved 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,73	0,25	0,27	NAP
Belgium	1,57	0,30	1,27	NAP
Bulgaria	1,85	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	4,29	0,39	2,61	1,29
Cyprus	6,27	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,61	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	2,66	0,39	2,27	NAP
Estonia	1,53	0,38	0,45	0,70
Finland	0,92	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	1,31	0,73	0,58	NAP
Germany	NA	0,76	0,46	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	3,55	1,24	2,31	NAP
Ireland	4,50	0,35	3,91	NAP
Italy	1,60	1,41	0,19	NAP
Latvia	0,72	0,42	0,30	NAP
Lithuania	0,60	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	2,18	0,67	1,26	0,25
Malta	1,42	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	1,22	0,91	0,31	NAP
Poland	4,78	0,87	0,84	3,06
Portugal	0,58	0,47	0,04	0,07
Romania	1,79	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1,21	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	3,34	0,36	1,34	1,64
Spain	1,25	0,49	0,76	NAP
Sweden	1,11	NA	NA	NA
Average	2,06	0,61	1,13	1,17
Median	1,53	0,47	0,76	1,00
Minimum	0,58	0,25	0,04	0,07
Maximum	6,27	1,41	3,91	3,06
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	7%	30%	30%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal law cases as well.

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.14.4a(2020): First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Absolute values (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**23 968**	5 315	8 770	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	**23 280**	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**105 697**	29 337	65 651	10 709
Cyprus	**48 832**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**12 884**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**26 978**	14 022	12 956	NAP
Estonia	**1 688**	642	574	472
Finland	**26 325**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	**NA**	258 492	117 953	NA
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**52 390**	23 407	28 983	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**1 290 266**	1 182 099	108 167	NAP
Latvia	**7 221**	4 502	2 719	NAP
Lithuania	**3 353**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Malta	**15 883**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**81 040**	56 620	24 420	NAP
Poland	**410 425**	191 257	86 960	132 208
Portugal	**45 521**	41 801	2 118	1 602
Romania	**105 887**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**22 504**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**31 823**	11 174	12 126	8 523
Spain	**400 834**	276 013	124 821	NAP
Sweden	**46 962**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**132 560**	161 129	45 863	30 703
Median	**31 823**	29 337	24 420	8 523
Minimum	**1 688**	642	574	472
Maximum	**1 290 266**	1 182 099	124 821	132 208
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**22%**	44%	44%	33%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal law cases as well.

Table 3.14.4b(2020): First instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,27	0,06	0,10	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	0,34	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	2,62	0,73	1,63	0,27
Cyprus	5,45	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,12	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,46	0,24	0,22	NAP
Estonia	0,13	0,05	0,04	0,04
Finland	0,48	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	NA	0,31	0,14	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,53	0,24	0,29	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	2,18	1,99	0,18	NAP
Latvia	0,38	0,24	0,14	NAP
Lithuania	0,12	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	3,09	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,46	0,32	0,14	NAP
Poland	1,07	0,50	0,23	0,35
Portugal	0,44	0,41	0,02	0,02
Romania	0,55	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,41	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	1,51	0,53	0,57	0,40
Spain	0,85	0,58	0,26	NAP
Sweden	0,45	NA	NA	NA
Average	1,04	0,48	0,31	0,21
Median	0,46	0,32	0,18	0,27
Minimum	0,12	0,05	0,02	0,02
Maximum	5,45	1,99	1,63	0,40
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	44%	44%	33%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal law cases as well.

Table 3.14.5(2020): First instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2020

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal cases pending more than 2 years 1+2+3		Severe criminal ending more than 2 years cases 1		Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases ending more than 2 2		Other criminal ending more than 2 years cases 3	
	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.
Austria	**870**	**3,6%**	201	3,8%	405	4,6%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**NA**	**NA**	14 501	49,4%	NA	NA	1 467	13,7%
Cyprus	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**1 069**	**8,3%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	**59**	**3,5%**	28	4,4%	19	3,3%	12	2,5%
Finland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	**NA**	**NA**	408 895	34,6%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**913**	**12,6%**	898	19,9%	15	0,6%	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	**208**	**6,2%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Poland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**15 941**	**35,0%**	15 413	36,9%	86	4,1%	442	27,6%
Romania	**4 316**	**4,1%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**2 511**	**11,2%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**4 272**	**13,4%**	3 222	28,8%	521	4,3%	529	6,2%
Spain	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Sweden	**1 859**	**4,0%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	**3 202**	**10,2%**	63 308	25,4%	209	3,4%	613	12,5%
Median	**1 464**	**7,3%**	3 222	28,8%	86	4,1%	486	10,0%
Minimum	**59**	**3,5%**	28	3,8%	15	0,6%	12	2,5%
Maximum	**15 941**	**35,0%**	408 895	49,4%	521	4,6%	1 467	27,6%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**63%**	**63%**	67%	67%	74%	74%	44%	44%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	7%	7%	7%	7%	41%	41%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal cases as well.

Clearance rate and Disposition time for first instance criminal cases

Table 3.15.1(2021): Clearance rate of first instance criminal cases in 2021 (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	100,3%	101%	106%	NAP
Belgium	99,7%	100%	100%	NAP
Bulgaria	99,9%	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	93,0%	91%	91%	97,8%
Cyprus	111,7%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	103,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	96,7%	97%	97%	NAP
Estonia	99,4%	99%	99%	100,0%
Finland	97,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	85%	NAP
Germany	NA	103%	100%	NA
Greece	67,2%	78%	67%	58,0%
Hungary	100,3%	100%	100%	NAP
Ireland	75,5%	87%	75%	NAP
Italy	100,5%	100%	108%	NAP
Latvia	107,7%	112%	98%	NAP
Lithuania	100,7%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	78,4%
Malta	87,7%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	100,1%	99%	103%	NAP
Poland	100,5%	100%	101%	100,6%
Portugal	99,3%	100%	95%	98,3%
Romania	101,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,0%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	100,6%	99%	99%	101,9%
Spain	103,1%	101%	105%	NAP
Sweden	99,7%	NA	NA	NA
Average	97,7%	97,9%	95,7%	90,7%
Median	100,0%	99,8%	99,2%	98,3%
Minimum	67,2%	77,7%	67,4%	58,0%
Maximum	111,7%	112,1%	107,5%	101,9%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	33%	30%	26%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Table 3.15.2(2021): Disposition time (in days) of first instance criminal cases in 2021 (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	131	86	119	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	65	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	238	668	244	84
Cyprus	246	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	62	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	85	246	54	NAP
Estonia	31	50	34	19
Finland	160	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	NA	148	109	NA
Greece	123	73	121	209
Hungary	43	65	33	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	399	414	282	NAP
Latvia	192	228	102	NAP
Lithuania	76	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	566	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	100	104	91	NAP
Poland	72	182	85	35
Portugal	224	254	144	68
Romania	102	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	136	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	158	464	163	79
Spain	194	331	94	NAP
Sweden	142	NA	NA	NA
Average	161	237	120	82
Median	134	205	106	73
Minimum	31	50	33	19
Maximum	566	668	282	209
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	41%	41%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Table 3.15.1(2020): Clearance rate of first instance criminal cases in 2020 (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	98,2%	100,7%	98,0%	NAP
Belgium	94,7%	104,5%	92,6%	NAP
Bulgaria	98,4%	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	88,1%	87,9%	83,2%	100,0%
Cyprus	94,7%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	100,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	95,2%	84,2%	97,4%	NAP
Estonia	100,0%	98,2%	99,6%	101,2%
Finland	89,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	91,3%	98,5%	83,7%	NAP
Germany	NA	98,2%	97,7%	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	97,3%	97,9%	96,9%	NAP
Ireland	62,1%	82,2%	50,9%	NAP
Italy	90,7%	90,5%	92,1%	NAP
Latvia	91,2%	94,6%	86,8%	NAP
Lithuania	97,4%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	79,6%
Malta	66,0%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	95,2%	99,6%	84,5%	NAP
Poland	98,0%	95,0%	97,4%	99,1%
Portugal	93,5%	93,0%	89,5%	99,5%
Romania	100,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,9%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	96,0%	79,0%	101,0%	96,6%
Spain	95,1%	94,2%	95,7%	NAP
Sweden	96,0%	NA	NA	NA
Average	92,9%	93,6%	90,4%	96,0%
Median	95,2%	94,8%	94,1%	99,3%
Minimum	62,1%	79,0%	50,9%	79,6%
Maximum	100,2%	104,5%	101,0%	101,2%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	33%	33%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Table 3.15.2(2020): Disposition time (in days) of first instance criminal cases in 2020 (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	133	88	134	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	66	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	223	679	227	75
Cyprus	317	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	72	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	64	226	36	NAP
Estonia	30	46	35	18
Finland	189	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	NA	150	113	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	54	70	46	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	498	517	356	NAP
Latvia	192	207	172	NAP
Lithuania	73	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	792	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	139	130	164	NAP
Poland	82	209	98	41
Portugal	280	317	196	80
Romania	113	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	125	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	165	540	157	90
Spain	247	430	127	NAP
Sweden	149	NA	NA	NA
Average	191	278	143	61
Median	139	209	134	75
Minimum	30	46	35	18
Maximum	792	679	356	90
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	44%	44%	33%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Variations for first instance criminal cases by case categories

Table 3.16.1: First instance courts, variation of incoming criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-1,7%	-3,4%	-11,2%	NAP
Belgium	21,0%	19,8%	21,2%	NAP
Bulgaria	2,1%	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	5,9%	8,3%	5,3%	6,5%
Cyprus	-5,0%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-2,6%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	-14,9%	-17,5%	-14,4%	NAP
Estonia	-5,0%	-8,6%	-7,6%	-1,3%
Finland	23,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	10,5%	-3,0%	NAP
Germany	-4,6%	-9,4%	1,6%	-0,7%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	22,3%	6,8%	30,5%	NAP
Ireland	1,2%	0,3%	-10,2%	NAP
Italy	8,5%	9,6%	0,0%	NAP
Latvia	-35,8%	-21,5%	-54,0%	NAP
Lithuania	-10,3%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	7,3%
Malta	4,6%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	13,5%	5,7%	33,0%	NAP
Poland	9,3%	8,9%	9,8%	9,3%
Portugal	16,3%	14,0%	43,4%	15,9%
Romania	6,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-4,5%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	-1,5%	-6,6%	-0,3%	-1,1%
Spain	15,4%	24,3%	9,6%	NAP
Sweden	1,4%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**2,7%**	2,6%	3,3%	5,1%
Median	**1,7%**	6,2%	0,8%	6,5%
Minimum	**-35,8%**	-21,5%	-54,0%	-1,3%
Maximum	**23,3%**	24,3%	43,4%	15,9%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27
% of NA	**11%**	**33%**	**33%**	26%
% of NAP	**0%**	**7%**	**7%**	48%

Table 3.16.2: First instance courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	0,4%	-3,1%	-4,2%	NAP
Belgium	27,4%	14,6%	30,4%	NAP
Bulgaria	3,7%	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	11,8%	12,6%	15,4%	4,1%
Cyprus	12,1%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,3%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	-13,6%	-4,9%	-15,1%	NAP
Estonia	-5,6%	-8,1%	-8,1%	-2,6%
Finland	34,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	-1,4%	NAP
Germany	NA	-5,2%	3,9%	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	26,1%	9,2%	35,2%	NAP
Ireland	23,0%	6,3%	31,9%	NAP
Italy	20,2%	20,6%	16,8%	NAP
Latvia	-24,3%	-7,0%	-48,0%	NAP
Lithuania	-7,2%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	1,2%	8,2%	-3,5%	5,7%
Malta	38,8%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	19,3%	4,9%	61,7%	NAP
Poland	12,0%	15,0%	13,2%	10,8%
Portugal	23,5%	22,5%	52,3%	14,5%
Romania	7,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-5,4%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	3,2%	17,3%	-1,9%	4,3%
Spain	25,1%	33,3%	19,8%	NAP
Sweden	5,2%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**10,0%**	**8,5%**	**11,7%**	6,1%
Median	**9,6%**	**8,7%**	**13,2%**	5,0%
Minimum	**-24,3%**	**-8,1%**	**-48,0%**	-2,6%
Maximum	**38,8%**	**33,3%**	**61,7%**	14,5%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27
% of NA	**11%**	**33%**	**30%**	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	**7%**	**7%**	48%

Table 3.16.3: First instance courts, variation of pending cases 31 Dec. between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-1,3%	-4,6%	-14,7%	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	1,6%	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	19,3%	10,7%	23,6%	16,3%
Cyprus	-13,1%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-14,1%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	15,5%	3,5%	28,4%	NAP
Estonia	-4,0%	0,1%	-11,5%	-0,5%
Finland	14,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	NA	-6,3%	0,2%	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	-0,8%	1,5%	-2,6%	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	-3,8%	-3,4%	-7,7%	NAP
Latvia	-24,6%	2,3%	-69,2%	NAP
Lithuania	-3,7%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	-0,8%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	-14,3%	-16,0%	-10,4%	NAP
Poland	-2,1%	-0,2%	-1,7%	-5,0%
Portugal	-1,3%	-1,9%	12,1%	-3,6%
Romania	-3,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	3,3%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	-1,3%	0,8%	1,8%	-8,3%
Spain	-1,6%	2,8%	-11,1%	NAP
Sweden	0,1%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**-1,7%**	**-0,8%**	**-4,8%**	**-0,2%**
Median	**-1,3%**	**0,1%**	**-2,6%**	**-3,6%**
Minimum	**-24,6%**	**-16,0%**	**-69,2%**	**-8,3%**
Maximum	**19,3%**	**10,7%**	**28,4%**	**16,3%**
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	44%	44%	33%
% of NAP	0%	7%	7%	48%

Table 3.16.4: First instance courts, variation of Clearence rate of criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage points (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	+2,1	+0,3	+7,7	NAP
Belgium	+5,0	-4,5	+7,0	NAP
Bulgaria	+1,5	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	+4,9	+3,5	+8,0	-2,2
Cyprus	+17,1	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	+3,0	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	+1,5	+12,8	-0,7	NAP
Estonia	-0,6	+0,6	-0,5	-1,3
Finland	+8,2	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	+1,4	NAP
Germany	NA	+4,6	+2,2	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	+3,1	+2,2	+3,5	NAP
Ireland	+13,4	+4,9	+23,9	NAP
Italy	+9,8	+9,1	+15,4	NAP
Latvia	+16,5	+17,4	+11,4	NAP
Lithuania	+3,3	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	-1,2
Malta	+21,6	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	+4,9	-0,8	+18,2	NAP
Poland	+2,5	+5,3	+3,1	+1,4
Portugal	+5,8	+6,9	+5,6	-1,2
Romania	+0,9	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-0,9	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	+4,6	+20,2	-1,7	+5,3
Spain	+8,0	+6,8	+8,9	NAP
Sweden	+3,7	NA	NA	NA
Average	**+6,1**	+6,0	+7,1	+0,1
Median	**+4,6**	+4,9	+6,3	-1,2
Minimum	**-0,9**	-4,5	-1,7	-2,2
Maximum	**+21,6**	+20,2	+23,9	+5,3
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**15%**	37%	33%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Table 3.16.5: First instance courts, variation of Disposition time of criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage (Q94)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-1,8%	-1,6%	-11,0%	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	-2,0%	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	6,7%	-1,7%	7,1%	11,7%
Cyprus	-22,5%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-14,4%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	33,6%	8,9%	51,2%	NAP
Estonia	1,6%	8,9%	-3,7%	2,2%
Finland	-15,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Germany	NA	-1,2%	-3,6%	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	-21,3%	-7,1%	-27,9%	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	-19,9%	-19,9%	-20,9%	NAP
Latvia	-0,5%	10,0%	-40,7%	NAP
Lithuania	3,8%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	-28,5%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	-28,2%	-19,9%	-44,6%	NAP
Poland	-12,6%	-13,2%	-13,2%	-14,3%
Portugal	-20,1%	-20,0%	-26,4%	-15,8%
Romania	-9,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	9,2%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	-4,3%	-14,1%	3,8%	-12,1%
Spain	-21,3%	-22,9%	-25,8%	NAP
Sweden	-4,9%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**-8,2%**	-7,2%	-12,0%	-5,7%
Median	**-9,9%**	-7,1%	-13,2%	-12,1%
Minimum	**-28,5%**	-22,9%	-44,6%	-15,8%
Maximum	**+33,6%**	+10,0%	+51,2%	+11,7%
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**22%**	44%	44%	33%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	7%	48%

Specific categories of first instance criminal cases

Robery cases

Intentional homicide cases

Table 3.16.6 (2021): First instance courts, number of cases for specific criminal case categories (robery cases and intentional homicide cases) in 2021 (Q101)

States	Robbery cases				Intentional homicide cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	2 290	2 251	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	189	466	478	177	73	85	76	82
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	12	88	80	20	8	9	8	9
Finland	366	485	491	360	19	57	59	17
France	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	4 863	NA	NA	NA	799	NA
Greece	21	97	50	34	4	86	62	12
Hungary	429	484	520	393	142	134	151	125
Ireland	NA	37 671	33 033	NA	NA	53	27	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	136	127	140	123	62	61	55	68
Lithuania	108	170	194	84	69	96	95	70
Luxembourg	NA	129	90	NA	NA	24	23	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	893	1 167	1 269	791	649	730	760	619
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	263	NA	NA	NA	54	NA
Slovenia	136	88	62	162	17	13	11	19
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	254	3 605	3 127	238	116	123	168	113
Median	136	318	371	162	62	61	59	68
Minimum	12	88	50	20	4	9	8	9
Maximum	893	37 671	33 033	791	649	730	799	619
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	67%	56%	48%	67%	67%	59%	52%	67%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.16.6 (2020): First instance courts, number of cases for specific criminal case categories (robery cases and intentional homicide cases) in 2020 (Q101)

States	Robbery cases				Intentional homicide cases			
	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.	Pending cases on 1st Jan.	Incoming cases	Resolved cases	Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	2 114	2 187	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	165	543	523	185	73	78	79	72
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	13	66	70	9	3	12	7	8
Finland	NA	NA	415	NA	NA	NA	30	NA
France	NA	NA	2 202	NA	NA	NA	399	NA
Germany	NA	NA	5 078	NA	NA	NA	761	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	363	498	432	429	105	166	129	142
Ireland	NA	35 354	23 572	NA	NA	42	29	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	119	152	135	136	59	47	44	62
Lithuania	96	257	245	108	60	108	99	69
Luxembourg	NA	95	75	NA	NA	25	16	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	983	1 445	1 535	893	657	1 206	1 214	649
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	299	NA	NA	NA	40	NA
Slovenia	122	71	56	137	15	14	13	16
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	266	4 060	2 630	271	139	189	220	145
Median	122	378	424	137	60	47	44	69
Minimum	13	66	56	9	3	12	7	8
Maximum	983	35 354	23 572	893	657	1 206	1 214	649
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	74%	63%	48%	74%	74%	67%	52%	74%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Clearance rate and Disposition time for specific categories of first instance criminal cases

Robery cases

Intentional homicide cases

Table 3.16.7 (2021): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific criminal case categories in 2021 (Q101)

States	Robbery cases		Intentional homicide cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	98,3%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	102,6%	135	89,4%	394
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	90,9%	91	88,9%	411
Finland	101,2%	268	103,5%	105
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	51,5%	248	72,1%	71
Hungary	107,4%	276	112,7%	302
Ireland	87,7%	NA	50,9%	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	110,2%	321	90,2%	451
Lithuania	114,1%	158	99,0%	269
Luxembourg	69,8%	NA	95,8%	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	108,7%	228	104,1%	297
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	70,5%	954	84,6%	630
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	92,8%	298	90,1%	326
Median	99,8%	248	90,2%	302
Minimum	51,5%	91	50,9%	71
Maximum	114,1%	954	112,7%	630
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	56%	67%	59%	67%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 3.16.7 (2020): Clearance rate and Disposition time of first instance specific criminal case categories in 2020 (Q101)

States	Robbery cases		Intentional homicide cases	
	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time	Clearance Rate	Disposition Time
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	103,5%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	96,3%	129	101,3%	333
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	106,1%	47	58,3%	417
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	86,7%	362	77,7%	402
Ireland	66,7%	NA	69,0%	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	88,8%	368	93,6%	514
Lithuania	95,3%	161	91,7%	254
Luxembourg	78,9%	NA	64,0%	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	106,2%	212	100,7%	195
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	78,9%	893	92,9%	449
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	90,7%	310	83,2%	366
Median	92,1%	212	91,7%	402
Minimum	66,7%	47	58,3%	195
Maximum	106,2%	893	101,3%	514
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	63%	74%	67%	74%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%

Variation for specific categories of first instance criminal cases

Robery cases

Intentional homicide cases

Table 3.16.8: First instance courts variation of Clearance rate (in percent points) and Disposition time (in percent) for specific case categories between 2020 and 2021 (Q101)

States	Robbery cases		Intentional homicide cases	
	Clearance Rate (p.points)	Disposition Time (%)	Clearance Rate (p.points)	Disposition Time (%)
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	-5,2	-5,0%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	6,3	6,5%	-11,9	18,4%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	-15,2	-14,3%	30,6	-1,6%
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	20,7	23,9%	35,0	-24,8%
Ireland	21,0	31,5%	-18,1	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	21,4	24,1%	-3,5	-12,3%
Lithuania	18,8	19,7%	7,3	5,7%
Luxembourg	-9,2	-11,6%	31,8	NA
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	2,5	2,4%	3,4	52,4%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	-8,4	-10,7%	-8,2	40,3%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	+5,3	+6,6%	+7,4	+11,2%
Median	+4,4	+4,4%	+3,4	+5,7%
Minimum	-15,2	-14,3%	-18,1	-24,8%
Maximum	+21,4	+31,5%	+35,0	+52,4%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	63%	63%	67%	74%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%

Second instance criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.17.1(2021): Second instance criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2021

Absolute values (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**1 534**	873	661	NAP
Belgium	**8 174**	6 607	337	1 230
Bulgaria	**1 704**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**14 446**	2 250	12 133	63
Cyprus	**245**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**1 992**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**2 251**	2 251	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**146**	139	7	NAP
Finland	**2 543**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**42 657**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	20 807	1 246	NA
Greece	**6 214**	4 270	1 939	5
Hungary	**4 549**	4 527	22	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**271 936**	268 176	3 760	NAP
Latvia	**612**	442	170	NAP
Lithuania	**807**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	**691**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**28 434**	14 428	1 178	12 828
Portugal	**3 453**	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	**7 348**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 111**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**351**	312	32	7
Spain	**7 335**	5 203	2 132	NAP
Sweden	**4 249**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**17 947**	25 407	1 968	2 827
Median	**2 543**	4 270	920	63
Minimum	**146**	139	7	5
Maximum	**271 936**	268 176	12 133	12 828
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	**27**
% of NA	**15%**	44%	44%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	11%	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Belgium: Starting from 2021 cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation) are presented separately in the "other criminal cases" category. Before, they were included in the severe criminal cases

Table 3.17.2a(2021): Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Absolute values (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	10 062	6 646	3 416	NAP
Belgium	31 279	6 666	13 038	11 575
Bulgaria	11 003	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	25 214	9 119	14 900	1 195
Cyprus	226	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	21 037	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	6 175	6 175	NAP	NAP
Estonia	1 961	1 818	143	NAP
Finland	5 574	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	45 402	NA	NA	NA
Germany	56 491	44 451	11 909	131
Greece	27 488	16 259	10 404	825
Hungary	36 997	36 477	520	NAP
Ireland	15 681	1 391	14 290	NAP
Italy	100 206	97 209	2 997	NAP
Latvia	2 546	1 557	989	NAP
Lithuania	4 276	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	384	345	39	NAP
Malta	515	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	26 513	NA	NA	NA
Poland	192 783	49 845	5 657	137 281
Portugal	9 764	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	25 164	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	8 295	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	6 426	3 590	2 453	383
Spain	56 625	37 904	18 721	NAP
Sweden	12 052	NA	NA	NA
Average	27 413	21 297	7 105	25 232
Median	12 052	6 666	4 537	1 010
Minimum	226	345	39	131
Maximum	192 783	97 209	18 721	137 281
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	37%	37%	26%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Belgium: Starting from 2021 cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation) are presented separately in the “other criminal cases” category. Before, they were included in the severe criminal cases

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.17.2b(2021): Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,11	0,07	0,04	NAP
Belgium	0,27	0,06	0,11	0,10
Bulgaria	0,16	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	0,65	0,24	0,38	0,03
Cyprus	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,20	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,11	0,11	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,15	0,14	0,01	NAP
Finland	0,10	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,07	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,07	0,05	0,01	0,00
Greece	0,26	0,15	0,10	0,01
Hungary	0,38	0,38	0,01	NAP
Ireland	0,31	0,03	0,28	NAP
Italy	0,17	0,16	0,01	NAP
Latvia	0,14	0,08	0,05	NAP
Lithuania	0,15	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,06	0,05	0,01	NAP
Malta	0,10	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,15	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,51	0,13	0,01	0,36
Portugal	0,09	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	0,13	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,15	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,30	0,17	0,12	0,02
Spain	0,12	0,08	0,04	NAP
Sweden	0,12	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,19	0,13	0,08	0,09
Median	0,15	0,11	0,04	0,02
Minimum	0,02	0,03	0,01	0,00
Maximum	0,65	0,38	0,38	0,36
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	37%	37%	26%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Belgium: Starting from 2021 cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation) are presented separately in the “other criminal cases” category. Before, they were included in the severe criminal cases

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.17.3a(2021): Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Absolute values (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	10 176	6 748	3 428	NAP
Belgium	31 509	6 962	13 067	11 480
Bulgaria	10 841	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	22 644	8 662	12 784	1 198
Cyprus	239	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	21 250	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	6 055	6 055	NAP	NAP
Estonia	1 952	1 810	142	NAP
Finland	5 269	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	43 001	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	45 215	11 903	NA
Greece	16 622	9 133	6 672	817
Hungary	36 993	36 472	521	NAP
Ireland	15 288	1 405	13 883	NAP
Italy	107 673	104 344	3 329	NAP
Latvia	2 485	1 508	977	NAP
Lithuania	4 301	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	438	381	57	NAP
Malta	487	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	28 897	NA	NA	NA
Poland	191 970	49 051	5 581	137 338
Portugal	9 618	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	24 058	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	8 267	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	5 851	3 478	1 991	382
Spain	54 157	36 386	17 771	NAP
Sweden	11 144	NA	NA	NA
Average	25 815	21 174	6 579	30 243
Median	10 993	6 962	4 505	1 198
Minimum	239	381	57	382
Maximum	191 970	104 344	17 771	137 338
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	37%	37%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Belgium: Starting from 2021 cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation) are presented separately in the “other criminal cases” category. Before, they were included in the severe criminal cases

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.17.3b(2021): Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,11	0,08	0,04	NAP
Belgium	0,27	0,06	0,11	0,10
Bulgaria	0,16	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	0,58	0,22	0,33	0,03
Cyprus	0,03	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,20	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,10	0,10	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,15	0,14	0,01	NAP
Finland	0,09	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,05	0,01	NA
Greece	0,16	0,09	0,06	0,01
Hungary	0,38	0,38	0,01	NAP
Ireland	0,30	0,03	0,27	NAP
Italy	0,18	0,18	0,01	NAP
Latvia	0,13	0,08	0,05	NAP
Lithuania	0,15	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,07	0,06	0,01	NAP
Malta	0,09	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,17	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,50	0,13	0,01	0,36
Portugal	0,09	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	0,13	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,15	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,28	0,17	0,09	0,02
Spain	0,11	0,08	0,04	NAP
Sweden	0,11	NA	NA	NA
Average	**0,18**	**0,12**	**0,08**	0,10
Median	**0,15**	**0,09**	**0,04**	0,03
Minimum	**0,03**	**0,03**	**0,01**	0,01
Maximum	**0,58**	**0,38**	**0,33**	0,36
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27
% of NA	**4%**	**37%**	**37%**	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	**7%**	**11%**	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Belgium: Starting from 2021 cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation) are presented separately in the “other criminal cases” category. Before, they were included in the severe criminal cases

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.17.4a(2021): Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2021

Absolute values (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**1 420**	771	649	NAP
Belgium	**9 058**	6 311	306	2 441
Bulgaria	**1 866**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**17 118**	2 806	14 252	60
Cyprus	**232**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**1 779**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**2 371**	2 371	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**154**	146	8	NAP
Finland	**2 848**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**45 058**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	20 039	1 251	NA
Greece	**6 567**	4 204	2 355	8
Hungary	**4 553**	4 532	21	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**264 469**	261 041	3 428	NAP
Latvia	**673**	491	182	NAP
Lithuania	**782**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	**723**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**21 500**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**29 247**	15 222	1 254	12 771
Portugal	**3 599**	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	**8 454**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 139**	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**926**	424	494	8
Spain	**11 944**	8 850	3 094	NAP
Sweden	**5 157**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**18 402**	25 170	2 275	3 058
Median	**3 224**	4 204	950	60
Minimum	**154**	146	8	8
Maximum	**264 469**	261 041	14 252	12 771
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**11%**	44%	44%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	11%	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Belgium: Starting from 2021 cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation) are presented separately in the “other criminal cases” category. Before, they were included in the severe criminal cases

Table 3.17.4b(2021): Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2021

Per 100 inhabitants (Q, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,02	0,01	0,01	NAP
Belgium	0,08	0,05	0,00	0,02
Bulgaria	0,03	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	0,44	0,07	0,37	0,00
Cyprus	0,03	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,02	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,04	0,04	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,00	NAP
Finland	0,05	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,07	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,02	0,00	NA
Greece	0,06	0,04	0,02	0,00
Hungary	0,05	0,05	0,00	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	0,45	0,44	0,01	NAP
Latvia	0,04	0,03	0,01	NAP
Lithuania	0,03	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	0,14	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,12	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,08	0,04	0,00	0,03
Portugal	0,03	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	0,04	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,02	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,04	0,02	0,02	0,00
Spain	0,03	0,02	0,01	NAP
Sweden	0,05	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,08	0,06	0,04	0,01
Median	0,04	0,04	0,01	0,00
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00
Maximum	0,45	0,44	0,37	0,03
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	44%	44%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Belgium: Starting from 2021 cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation) are presented separately in the “other criminal cases” category. Before, they were included in the severe criminal cases

Table 3.17.5(2021): Second instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2021

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases pending more than 2 years 1+2+3		Severe criminal ending more than 2 years cases 1		Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases ending more than 2 years 2		Other criminal ending more than 2 years cases 3	
	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.
Austria	**1**	**0,1%**	1	0,1%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	1 510	23,9%	124	40,5%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Croatia	**1 385**	**8,1%**	86	3,1%	1 295	9,1%	4	6,7%
Cyprus	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**21**	**1,2%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0**	**0,0%**	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Finland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**626**	**9,5%**	369	8,8%	255	10,8%	2	25,0%
Hungary	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	**121 877**	**46,1%**	121 078	46,4%	799	23,3%	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**5**	**0,7%**	5	1,0%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	**16**	**2,0%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Romania	**120**	**1,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**15**	**1,3%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**2**	**0,2%**	0	0,0%	2	0,4%	0	0,0%
Spain	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Sweden	**50**	**1,0%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	**10 343**	**6,0%**	15 381	10,4%	309	10,5%	2	10,6%
	19	**1,2%**	46	2,0%	63	4,7%	2	6,7%
Minimum	**0**	**0,0%**	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Maximum	**121 877**	**46,1%**	121 078	46,4%	1 295	40,5%	4	25,0%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**56%**	**56%**	63%	63%	59%	59%	41%	41%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	7%	7%	11%	11%	48%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal cases as well.

Belgium: Starting from 2021 cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation) are presented separately in the “other criminal cases” category. Before, they were included in the severe criminal cases

Table 3.17.1(2020): Second instance criminal cases - pending cases on 1st Jan. 2020

Absolute values (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**1 488**	820	668	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	**1 611**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**13 856**	2 484	11 311	61
Cyprus	**278**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**1 672**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**2 114**	2 114	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**136**	126	10	NAP
Finland	**2 760**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**43 287**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	20 987	1 614	NA
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	**5 360**	5 342	18	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**267 997**	263 401	4 596	NAP
Latvia	**650**	450	200	NAP
Lithuania	**759**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	**843**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**26 664**	13 996	1 141	11 527
Portugal	**3 577**	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	**7 166**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 085**	1 085	NA	NA
Slovenia	**606**	494	104	8
Spain	**8 778**	6 281	2 497	NAP
Sweden	**3 444**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**18 768**	26 465	2 216	3 865
Median	**2 114**	2 299	905	61
Minimum	**136**	126	10	8
Maximum	**267 997**	263 401	11 311	11 527
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	**27**
% of NA	**22%**	48%	52%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.17.2a(2020): Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2020

Absolute values (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**10 216**	6 752	3 464	NAP
Belgium	**26 499**	16 530	9 969	NAP
Bulgaria	**11 268**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**22 548**	8 346	13 274	928
Cyprus	**249**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**21 950**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**6 000**	6 000	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 993**	1 874	119	NAP
Finland	**4 876**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**37 811**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**57 890**	45 005	12 760	125
Greece	**18 375**	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	**33 696**	33 348	348	NAP
Ireland	**12 215**	1 405	10 810	NAP
Italy	**91 318**	88 819	2 499	NAP
Latvia	**2 736**	1 344	1 392	NAP
Lithuania	**4 466**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**418**	374	44	NAP
Malta	**311**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**26 972**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**172 048**	40 360	4 354	127 334
Portugal	**8 778**	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	**22 243**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**9 080**	9 080	NA	NA
Slovenia	**4 597**	3 297	979	321
Spain	**44 098**	30 772	13 326	NAP
Sweden	**10 765**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**24 571**	19 554	5 641	32 177
Median	**11 268**	8 346	3 464	625
Minimum	**249**	374	44	125
Maximum	**172 048**	88 819	13 326	127 334
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**0%**	37%	41%	26%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.17.2b(2020): Second instance criminal cases - incoming in 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,11	0,08	0,04	NAP
Belgium	0,23	0,14	0,09	NAP
Bulgaria	0,16	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	0,56	0,21	0,33	0,02
Cyprus	0,03	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,21	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,10	0,10	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,15	0,14	0,01	NAP
Finland	0,09	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Germany	0,07	0,05	0,02	0,00
Greece	0,17	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	0,34	0,34	0,00	NAP
Ireland	0,25	0,03	0,22	NAP
Italy	0,15	0,15	0,00	NAP
Latvia	0,14	0,07	0,07	NAP
Lithuania	0,16	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,07	0,06	0,01	NAP
Malta	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,15	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,45	0,11	0,01	0,33
Portugal	0,09	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	0,12	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,17	0,17	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,22	0,16	0,05	0,02
Spain	0,09	0,06	0,03	NAP
Sweden	0,10	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,17	0,12	0,07	0,09
Median	0,15	0,11	0,03	0,02
Minimum	0,03	0,03	0,00	0,00
Maximum	0,56	0,34	0,33	0,33
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	37%	41%	26%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.17.3a(2020): Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2020

Absolute values (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**10 170**	6 699	3 471	NAP
Belgium	**26 656**	16 644	10 012	NAP
Bulgaria	**11 174**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**30 858**	8 581	12 451	9 826
Cyprus	**270**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**21 630**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**5 857**	5 857	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**1 982**	1 860	122	NAP
Finland	**5 094**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**38 730**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	45 169	13 118	NA
Greece	**20 003**	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	**34 507**	34 163	344	NAP
Ireland	**13 293**	1 719	11 574	NAP
Italy	**85 612**	82 375	3 237	NAP
Latvia	**2 774**	1 352	1 422	NAP
Lithuania	**4 418**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**459**	398	61	NAP
Malta	**463**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**25 482**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**170 278**	39 928	4 317	126 033
Portugal	**8 894**	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	**22 061**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**9 054**	9 054	NA	NA
Slovenia	**4 852**	3 479	1 051	322
Spain	**45 415**	31 733	13 682	NAP
Sweden	**9 960**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**23 459**	19 267	5 759	45 394
Median	**10 672**	8 581	3 471	9 826
Minimum	**270**	398	61	322
Maximum	**170 278**	82 375	13 682	126 033
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**4%**	37%	41%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.17.3b(2020): Second instance criminal cases - resolved in 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,11	0,07	0,04	NAP
Belgium	0,23	0,14	0,09	NAP
Bulgaria	0,16	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	0,76	0,21	0,31	0,24
Cyprus	0,03	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,20	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,10	0,10	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,15	0,14	0,01	NAP
Finland	0,09	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,05	0,02	NA
Greece	0,19	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	0,35	0,35	0,00	NAP
Ireland	0,27	0,03	0,23	NAP
Italy	0,14	0,14	0,01	NAP
Latvia	0,15	0,07	0,08	NAP
Lithuania	0,16	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,07	0,06	0,01	NAP
Malta	0,09	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,15	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,45	0,10	0,01	0,33
Portugal	0,09	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	0,11	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,17	0,17	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,23	0,16	0,05	0,02
Spain	0,10	0,07	0,03	NAP
Sweden	0,10	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,18	0,13	0,07	0,20
Median	0,15	0,10	0,03	0,24
Minimum	0,03	0,03	0,00	0,02
Maximum	0,76	0,35	0,31	0,33
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	37%	41%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Ireland: The first and second instance criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case.

Table 3.17.4a(2020): Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Absolute values (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**1 534**	873	661	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	**1 705**	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	**14 446**	2 250	12 133	63
Cyprus	**257**	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**1 992**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**2 257**	2 257	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**146**	139	7	NAP
Finland	**2 542**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**42 368**	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	20 807	1 246	NA
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	**4 549**	4 527	22	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	**273 703**	269 845	3 858	NAP
Latvia	**612**	442	170	NAP
Lithuania	**807**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	**691**	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**24 270**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**28 434**	14 428	1 178	12 828
Portugal	**3 461**	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	**7 348**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 111**	1 111	NA	NA
Slovenia	**351**	312	32	7
Spain	**7 327**	5 196	2 131	NAP
Sweden	**4 249**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**19 280**	26 849	2 144	4 299
Median	**2 400**	2 254	920	63
Minimum	**146**	139	7	7
Maximum	**273 703**	269 845	12 133	12 828
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**19%**	48%	52%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.17.4b(2020): Second instance criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Per 100 inhabitants (Q, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,02	0,01	0,01	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	0,02	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	0,36	0,06	0,30	0,00
Cyprus	0,03	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,02	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,04	0,04	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,01	0,01	0,00	NAP
Finland	0,05	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,06	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,03	0,00	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	0,05	0,05	0,00	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	0,46	0,46	0,01	NAP
Latvia	0,03	0,02	0,01	NAP
Lithuania	0,03	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	0,13	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,14	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,07	0,04	0,00	0,03
Portugal	0,03	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	0,04	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,02	0,02	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,02	0,01	0,00	0,00
Spain	0,02	0,01	0,00	NAP
Sweden	0,04	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,08	0,06	0,03	0,01
Median	0,04	0,02	0,00	0,00
Minimum	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00
Maximum	0,46	0,46	0,30	0,03
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	48%	52%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.17.5(2020): Second instance criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2020

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal cases pending more than 2 years 1+2+3		Severe criminal ending more than 2 years cases 1		Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases ending more than 2 2		Other criminal ending more than 2 years cases 3	
	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.
Austria	**1**	**0,1%**	1	0,1%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	**NA**	**NA**	124	5,5%	NA	NA	8	12,7%
Cyprus	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	**32**	**1,6%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**0**	**0,0%**	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Finland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	**131 118**	**47,9%**	130 282	48,3%	836	21,7%	NAP	NAP
Latvia	**20**	**3,3%**	20	4,5%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	**7**	**0,9%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Romania	**107**	**1,5%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**7**	**0,6%**	7	0,6%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	**2**	**0,6%**	0	0,0%	2	6,3%	0	0,0%
Spain	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Sweden	**38**	**0,9%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	38	NA
Average	**13 133**	**5,7%**	18 633	8,4%	168	5,6%	15	6,3%
Median	**14**	**0,9%**	7	0,6%	0	0,0%	8	6,3%
Minimum	**0**	**0,0%**	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Maximum	**131 118**	**47,9%**	130 282	48,3%	836	21,7%	38	12,7%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**63%**	**63%**	67%	67%	70%	70%	41%	44%
% of NAP	**0%**	**0%**	7%	7%	11%	11%	48%	48%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal cases as well.

Clearance rate and Disposition time for second instance criminal cases

Table 3.18.1(2021): Clearance rate of second instance criminal cases in 2021 (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	101,1%	102%	100%	NAP
Belgium	100,7%	104%	100%	99,2%
Bulgaria	98,5%	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	89,8%	95%	86%	100,3%
Cyprus	105,8%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	101,0%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	98,1%	98%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	99,5%	100%	99%	NAP
Finland	94,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	94,7%	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	102%	100%	NA
Greece	60,5%	56%	64%	99,0%
Hungary	100,0%	100%	100%	NAP
Ireland	97,5%	101%	97%	NAP
Italy	107,5%	107%	111%	NAP
Latvia	97,6%	97%	99%	NAP
Lithuania	100,6%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	114,1%	110%	146%	NAP
Malta	94,6%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	109,0%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	99,6%	98%	99%	100,0%
Portugal	98,5%	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	95,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,7%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	91,1%	97%	81%	99,7%
Spain	95,6%	96%	95%	NAP
Sweden	92,5%	NA	NA	NA
Average	97,6%	97,6%	98,4%	99,6%
Median	98,5%	99,6%	99,0%	99,7%
Minimum	60,5%	56,2%	64,1%	99,0%
Maximum	114,1%	110,4%	146,2%	100,3%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	37%	37%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.18.2(2021): Disposition time (in days) of second instance criminal cases in 2021 (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	51	42	69	NAP
Belgium	105	331	9	78
Bulgaria	63	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	276	118	407	18
Cyprus	354	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	31	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	143	143	NAP	NAP
Estonia	29	29	21	NAP
Finland	197	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	382	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	162	38	NA
Greece	144	168	129	4
Hungary	45	45	15	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	897	913	376	NAP
Latvia	99	119	68	NAP
Lithuania	66	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	542	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	272	NA	NA	NA
Poland	56	113	82	34
Portugal	137	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	128	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	50	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	58	44	91	8
Spain	80	89	64	NAP
Sweden	169	NA	NA	NA
Average	182	178	114	28
Median	117	118	69	18
Minimum	29	29	9	4
Maximum	897	913	407	78
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	44%	44%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	52%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.18.1(2020): Clearance rate of second instance criminal cases in 2020 (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	99,5%	99%	100%	NAP
Belgium	100,6%	101%	100%	NAP
Bulgaria	99,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	136,9%	103%	94%	1058,8%
Cyprus	108,4%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	98,5%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	97,6%	98%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	99,4%	99%	103%	NAP
Finland	104,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	102,4%	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	100%	103%	NA
Greece	108,9%	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	102,4%	102%	99%	NAP
Ireland	108,8%	122%	107%	NAP
Italy	93,8%	93%	130%	NAP
Latvia	101,4%	101%	102%	NAP
Lithuania	98,9%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	109,8%	106%	139%	NAP
Malta	148,9%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	94,5%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	99,0%	99%	99%	99,0%
Portugal	101,3%	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	99,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,7%	100%	NA	NA
Slovenia	105,5%	106%	107%	100,3%
Spain	103,0%	103%	103%	NAP
Sweden	92,5%	NA	NA	NA
Average	104,4%	102,1%	106,6%	419,4%
Median	101,0%	100,6%	102,5%	100,3%
Minimum	92,5%	92,7%	93,8%	99,0%
Maximum	148,9%	122,3%	138,6%	1058,8%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	37%	41%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.18.2(2020): Disposition time (in days) of second instance criminal cases in 2020 (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	55	48	70	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	56	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	171	96	356	2
Cyprus	347	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	34	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	141	141	NAP	NAP
Estonia	27	27	21	NAP
Finland	182	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	399	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	168	35	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	48	48	23	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	1 167	1196	435	NAP
Latvia	81	119	44	NAP
Lithuania	67	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	545	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	348	NA	NA	NA
Poland	61	132	100	37
Portugal	142	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	122	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	45	45	NA	NA
Slovenia	26	33	11	8
Spain	59	60	57	NAP
Sweden	156	NA	NA	NA
Average	194	176	115	16
Median	101	78	50	8
Minimum	26	27	11	2
Maximum	1 167	1 196	435	37
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	48%	52%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance cases.

Variations for second instance criminal cases by case catogories

Table 3.19.1: Second instance courts, variation of incoming criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percentage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-2,0%	-2,1%	-1,9%	NAP
Belgium	17,6%	-59,8%	30,2%	NAP
Bulgaria	-1,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	16,6%	13,9%	17,0%	34,2%
Cyprus	-10,1%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-2,5%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	2,3%	2,3%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	-1,7%	-3,0%	20,1%	NAP
Finland	14,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	19,7%	NA	NA	NA
Germany	-2,5%	-1,3%	-6,8%	4,7%
Greece	50,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	12,1%	11,7%	52,5%	NAP
Ireland	24,7%	-3,8%	28,4%	NAP
Italy	10,2%	10,0%	20,5%	NAP
Latvia	-6,1%	16,9%	-28,3%	NAP
Lithuania	-4,6%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	-9,7%	-9,3%	-12,8%	NAP
Malta	65,1%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	-1,9%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	12,5%	24,0%	30,5%	8,3%
Portugal	10,6%	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	14,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-8,2%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	39,9%	9,0%	150,8%	19,4%
Spain	28,2%	22,9%	40,2%	NAP
Sweden	11,2%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**11,1%**	2,2%	26,2%	16,7%
Median	**10,6%**	5,7%	20,5%	13,8%
Minimum	**-10,1%**	-59,8%	-28,3%	4,7%
Maximum	**65,1%**	24,0%	150,8%	34,2%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27
% of NA	**0%**	**41%**	**41%**	26%
% of NAP	**0%**	**7%**	**11%**	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.19.2: Second instance courts, variation of resolved criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percantage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-0,5%	0,2%	-1,7%	NAP
Belgium	17,7%	-58,3%	30,0%	NAP
Bulgaria	-1,9%	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	-23,5%	5,2%	7,0%	-87,3%
Cyprus	-12,3%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	0,0%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	2,8%	2,8%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	-1,6%	-2,7%	16,3%	NAP
Finland	3,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	10,7%	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	0,0%	-9,4%	NA
Greece	-16,6%	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	9,4%	9,0%	54,6%	NAP
Ireland	11,7%	-20,6%	16,5%	NAP
Italy	26,4%	27,3%	3,3%	NAP
Latvia	-9,6%	12,6%	-30,7%	NAP
Lithuania	-3,0%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	-6,2%	-5,9%	-8,1%	NAP
Malta	4,9%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	13,2%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	13,2%	23,4%	29,8%	9,4%
Portugal	7,6%	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	9,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-8,3%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	20,7%	0,1%	89,6%	18,7%
Spain	19,0%	14,4%	29,6%	NAP
Sweden	11,1%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**3,8%**	**0,5%**	**17,5%**	-19,7%
Median	**4,0%**	**1,5%**	**16,3%**	9,4%
Minimum	**-23,5%**	**-58,3%**	**-30,7%**	-87,3%
Maximum	**26,4%**	**27,3%**	**89,6%**	18,7%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27
% of NA	**4%**	**41%**	**41%**	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	**7%**	**11%**	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.19.3: Second instance courts, variation of pending 31 Dec. criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percantage, per 100 inhabitants (Q1,Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-7,9%	-12,1%	-2,3%	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	10,7%	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	23,5%	30,0%	22,5%	-0,7%
Cyprus	-10,6%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-9,1%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	4,5%	4,5%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	5,4%	5,0%	14,2%	NAP
Finland	11,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	6,0%	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	-3,8%	0,3%	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	2,2%	2,2%	-2,6%	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	-2,9%	-2,8%	-10,7%	NAP
Latvia	11,0%	12,1%	8,1%	NAP
Lithuania	-3,5%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	4,3%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	-11,6%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	3,3%	5,9%	6,9%	0,0%
Portugal	3,4%	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	15,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	3,0%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	164,0%	36,0%	1445,1%	14,4%
Spain	62,7%	70,0%	44,9%	NAP
Sweden	20,5%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**13,9%**	13,4%	152,6%	4,5%
Median	**4,4%**	5,0%	7,5%	0,0%
Minimum	**-11,6%**	-12,1%	-10,7%	-0,7%
Maximum	**164,0%**	70,0%	1445,1%	14,4%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	52%	52%	30%
% of NAP	0%	7%	11%	59%

Table 3.19.4: Second instance courts, variation of Clearence rate criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percantage points (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	+1,6	+2,3	+0,1	NAP
Belgium	+0,1	+3,8	-0,2	NAP
Bulgaria	-0,6	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	-47,0	-7,8	-8,0	-958,6
Cyprus	-2,7	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	+2,5	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	+0,4	+0,4	NAP	NAP
Estonia	+0,1	+0,3	-3,2	NAP
Finland	-9,9	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	-7,7	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	+1,4	-2,9	NA
Greece	-48,4	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	-2,4	-2,5	+1,3	NAP
Ireland	-11,3	-21,3	-9,9	NAP
Italy	+13,7	+14,6	-18,5	NAP
Latvia	-3,8	-3,7	-3,4	NAP
Lithuania	+1,7	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	+4,3	+4,0	+7,5	NAP
Malta	-54,3	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	+14,5	NA	NA	NA
Poland	+0,6	-0,5	-0,5	+1,1
Portugal	-2,8	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	-3,6	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-0,1	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	-14,5	-8,6	-26,2	-0,6
Spain	-7,3	-7,1	-7,7	NAP
Sweden	-0,1	NA	NA	NA
Average	**-6,8**	-1,8	-5,5	-319,4
Median	**-1,5**	-0,1	-3,2	-0,6
Minimum	**-54,3**	-21,3	-26,2	-958,6
Maximum	**+14,5**	+14,6	+7,5	+1,1
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**4%**	41%	41%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.19.5: Second instance courts, variation of Disposition time criminal cases between 2020 and 2021

in percantage (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-7,5%	-12,3%	-0,6%	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Bulgaria	12,8%	NA	NA	NAP
Croatia	61,5%	23,5%	14,4%	681,1%
Cyprus	2,0%	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-9,1%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	1,6%	1,6%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	7,1%	7,9%	-1,8%	NAP
Finland	8,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	-4,2%	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	-3,8%	10,6%	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	-6,6%	-6,2%	-37,0%	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Italy	-23,2%	-23,6%	-13,6%	NAP
Latvia	22,8%	-0,4%	55,8%	NAP
Lithuania	-0,5%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Malta	-0,5%	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	-21,9%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-8,8%	-14,1%	-17,7%	-8,6%
Portugal	-3,8%	NA	NA	NAP
Romania	5,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	12,3%	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	118,8%	35,9%	714,9%	-3,7%
Spain	36,7%	48,5%	11,8%	NAP
Sweden	8,5%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**+9,6%**	+5,2%	+73,7%	+222,9%
Median	**+1,8%**	-0,4%	+5,0%	-3,7%
Minimum	**-23,2%**	-23,6%	-37,0%	-8,6%
Maximum	**+118,8%**	+48,5%	+714,9%	+681,1%
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**19%**	52%	52%	30%
% of NAP	**0%**	7%	11%	59%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Supreme court criminal cases by case categories and by case status

Table 3.20.1(2021): Supreme courts, number of criminal law cases - pending on 1st Jan.2021

Absolute values (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**610**	146	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**301**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**266**	215	29	22
Croatia	**704**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**150**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**33**	33	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**23**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**243**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**2 998**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**658**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**16**	0	16	NAP
Hungary	**265**	265	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**26**	26	NAP	NAP
Italy	**24 478**	21 398	550	2 530
Latvia	**177**	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	**89**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**31**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**2 318**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**1 487**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**173**	173	NAP	NAP
Romania	**134**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**278**	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**278**	266	12	NAP
Spain	**6 302**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**268**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**1 692**	2 502	152	1 276
Median	**266**	173	23	1 276
Minimum	**16**	0	12	22
Maximum	**24 478**	21 398	550	2 530
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**0%**	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	**7%**	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.2a(2021): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Absolute values (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**1 336**	741	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1 698**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**1 141**	609	68	464
Croatia	**704**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**1 383**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**49**	49	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**81**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**889**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**7 360**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**3 257**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**1 323**	1 260	63	NAP
Hungary	**1 527**	1 527	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**35**	35	NAP	NAP
Italy	**46 298**	38 544	687	7 067
Latvia	**662**	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	**303**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**50**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**3 346**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**3 915**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**986**	986	NAP	NAP
Romania	**408**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 099**	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**714**	671	43	NAP
Spain	**8 990**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**2 649**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**3 608**	4 936	215	3 766
Median	**1 141**	741	66	3 766
Minimum	**35**	35	43	464
Maximum	**46 298**	38 544	687	7 067
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**0%**	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	**7%**	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.2b(2021): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - incoming in 2021

Per 100 inhabitant (Q1, Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,015	0,008	NAP	NAP
Belgium	0,015	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	0,017	0,009	0,001	0,007
Croatia	0,018	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	0,013	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,006	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	0,016	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,011	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	0,004	NA	NA	NA
Greece	0,012	0,012	0,001	NAP
Hungary	0,016	0,016	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,078	0,065	0,001	0,012
Latvia	0,035	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	0,011	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,008	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	0,019	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,010	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,010	0,010	NAP	NAP
Romania	0,002	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,020	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	0,034	0,032	0,002	NAP
Spain	0,019	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,025	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,017	0,017	0,001	0,009
Median	0,015	0,010	0,001	0,009
Minimum	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,007
Maximum	0,078	0,065	0,002	0,012
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.3a(2021): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Absolute values (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**1 348**	709	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1 609**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**1 110**	584	74	452
Croatia	**1 133**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**1 386**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**54**	54	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**62**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**800**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**7 382**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**3 114**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**1 162**	1 106	56	NAP
Hungary	**1 378**	1 378	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**46**	46	NAP	NAP
Italy	**47 040**	39 119	758	7 163
Latvia	**604**	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	**252**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**50**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**3 417**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**4 018**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**1 006**	1 006	NAP	NAP
Romania	**399**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 061**	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**791**	754	37	NAP
Spain	**8 834**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**2 592**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**3 626**	4 973	231	3 808
Median	**1 133**	754	65	3 808
Minimum	**46**	46	37	452
Maximum	**47 040**	39 119	758	7 163
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**0%**	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	**7%**	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.3b(2021): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - resolved in 2021

Per 100 inhabitant (Q1, Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,015	0,008	NAP	NAP
Belgium	0,014	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	0,016	0,009	0,001	0,007
Croatia	0,029	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	0,013	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,005	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	0,014	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,011	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	0,004	NA	NA	NA
Greece	0,011	0,010	0,001	NAP
Hungary	0,014	0,014	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,080	0,066	0,001	0,012
Latvia	0,032	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	0,009	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,008	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	0,020	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,011	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,010	0,010	NAP	NAP
Romania	0,002	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,020	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	0,038	0,036	0,002	NAP
Spain	0,019	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,025	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,017	0,017	0,001	0,009
Median	0,014	0,010	0,001	0,009
Minimum	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,007
Maximum	0,080	0,066	0,002	0,012
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.4a(2021): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2021

Absolute values (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**598**	178	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**390**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**297**	240	23	34
Croatia	**274**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**147**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**28**	28	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**42**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**332**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**2 976**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**801**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**177**	154	23	NAP
Hungary	**414**	414	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**15**	15	NAP	NAP
Italy	**23 736**	20 823	479	2 434
Latvia	**235**	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	**140**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**31**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**2 015**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**1 384**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**153**	153	NAP	NAP
Romania	**143**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**316**	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**201**	183	18	NAP
Spain	**6 379**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**325**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**1 662**	2 465	136	1 234
Median	**297**	178	23	1 234
Minimum	**15**	15	18	34
Maximum	**23 736**	20 823	479	2 434
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**0%**	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	**7%**	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.4b(2021): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2021

Per 100 inhabitant (Q1, Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,007	0,002	NAP	NAP
Belgium	0,003	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	0,004	0,004	0,000	0,000
Croatia	0,007	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	0,001	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,000	0,000	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,003	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	0,006	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,004	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	0,001	NA	NA	NA
Greece	0,002	0,001	0,000	NAP
Hungary	0,004	0,004	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,000	0,000	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,040	0,035	0,001	0,004
Latvia	0,013	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	0,005	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,005	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	0,012	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,004	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Romania	0,001	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,006	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	0,010	0,009	0,001	NAP
Spain	0,013	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,003	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,006	0,006	0,001	0,002
Median	0,004	0,002	0,001	0,002
Minimum	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Maximum	0,040	0,035	0,001	0,004
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.5(2021): Supreme court criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2021

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal cases pending more than 2 years 1+2+3		Severe criminal ending more than 2 years cases 1		Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases ending more than 2 years 2		Other criminal ending more than 2 years cases 3	
	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.
Austria	**25**	**4,2%**	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1**	**0,3%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**5**	**1,7%**	5	2,1%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Croatia	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	**0**	**0,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**0**	**0,0%**	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	NA	NA
Hungary	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	**99**	**0,4%**	91	0,4%	4	0,8%	4	0,2%
Latvia	**0**	**0,0%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	**0**	**0,0%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	**NA**	**NA**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	**2**	**1,4%**	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**7**	**2,2%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	**5**	**2,5%**	5	2,7%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Spain	**NA**	**NA**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Sweden	**0**	**0,0%**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	**12**	**1,1%**	20	1,1%	1	0,2%	2	0,1%
Median	**2**	**0,3%**	5	0,4%	0	0,0%	2	0,1%
Minimum	**0**	**0,0%**	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Maximum	**99**	**4,2%**	91	2,7%	4	0,8%	4	0,2%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	**48%**	**48%**	52%	52%	41%	41%	26%	26%
% of NAP	**7%**	**7%**	30%	30%	44%	44%	67%	67%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal cases, as well

Table 3.20.1(2020): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - pending on 1st Jan. 2020

Absolute values (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	621	165	NAP	NAP
Belgium	380	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	293	231	22	40
Croatia	724	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	183	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	35	35	NAP	NAP
Estonia	10	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	205	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	3 302	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	784	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	325	325	NAP	NAP
Ireland	12	12	NAP	NAP
Italy	23 583	21 261	510	1 812
Latvia	141	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	93	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	39	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	2 363	NA	NA	NA
Poland	1 819	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	156	156	NAP	NAP
Romania	145	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	268	268	NA	NAP
Slovenia	303	294	9	NAP
Spain	4 373	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	188	NA	NA	NA
Average	1 681	2 527	180	926
Median	281	231	22	926
Minimum	10	12	9	40
Maximum	23 583	21 261	510	1 812
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	67%

Table 3.20.2a(2020): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - incoming in 2020

Absolute values (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**1 393**	679	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1 353**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**1 035**	525	88	422
Croatia	**2 100**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**1 410**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**60**	60	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**101**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**833**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**7 199**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**2 984**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	**1 414**	1 414	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**33**	33	NAP	NAP
Italy	**38 508**	31 695	598	6 215
Latvia	**686**	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	**261**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**42**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**3 414**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**3 226**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**959**	959	NAP	NAP
Romania	**353**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 016**	1 016	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**663**	622	42	NAP
Spain	**7 506**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**2 236**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**3 283**	4 111	243	3 319
Median	**1 194**	679	88	3 319
Minimum	**33**	33	42	422
Maximum	**38 508**	31 695	598	6 215
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**4%**	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	**7%**	26%	44%	67%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.2b(2020): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - incoming in 2020

Per 100 inhabitant (Q1, Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,016	0,008	NAP	NAP
Belgium	0,012	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	0,015	0,008	0,001	0,006
Croatia	0,052	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	0,013	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,008	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	0,015	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,011	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	0,004	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	0,014	0,014	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,065	0,053	0,001	0,010
Latvia	0,036	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	0,009	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,007	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	0,020	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,008	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,009	0,009	NAP	NAP
Romania	0,002	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,019	0,019	NA	NAP
Slovenia	0,031	0,029	0,002	NAP
Spain	0,016	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,022	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,017	0,016	0,001	0,008
Median	0,014	0,009	0,001	0,008
Minimum	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,006
Maximum	0,065	0,053	0,002	0,010
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	67%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.3a(2020): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - resolved in 2020

Absolute values (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**1 428**	698	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**1 372**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**1 062**	541	81	440
Croatia	**2 120**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**1 443**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**62**	62	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**88**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**778**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**7 503**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**3 110**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	**1 474**	1 474	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**34**	34	NAP	NAP
Italy	**37 618**	31 558	558	5 502
Latvia	**650**	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	**265**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**50**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**3 246**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**3 570**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**942**	942	NAP	NAP
Romania	**364**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**1 006**	1 006	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**688**	650	38	NAP
Spain	**5 577**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**2 156**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**3 192**	4 107	226	2 971
Median	**1 217**	698	81	2 971
Minimum	**34**	34	38	440
Maximum	**37 618**	31 558	558	5 502
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**4%**	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	**7%**	26%	44%	67%

Cyprus, Malta have a two tier system therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance cases.

Table 3.20.3b(2020): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - resolved in 2020

Per 100 inhabitant (Q1, Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,016	0,008	NAP	NAP
Belgium	0,012	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	0,015	0,008	0,001	0,006
Croatia	0,053	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	0,013	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,007	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	0,014	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,011	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	0,004	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	0,015	0,015	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,063	0,053	0,001	0,009
Latvia	0,034	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	0,009	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,008	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	0,019	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,009	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,009	0,009	NAP	NAP
Romania	0,002	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,018	0,018	NA	NAP
Slovenia	0,033	0,031	0,002	NAP
Spain	0,012	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,021	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,017	0,016	0,001	0,008
Median	0,013	0,009	0,001	0,008
Minimum	0,001	0,001	0,001	0,006
Maximum	0,063	0,053	0,002	0,009
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	67%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.4a(2020): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Absolute values (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	**586**	146	NAP	NAP
Belgium	**361**	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	**266**	215	29	22
Croatia	**704**	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	**150**	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	**33**	33	NAP	NAP
Estonia	**23**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	**260**	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	**2 998**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	**658**	NA	NA	NA
Greece	**NA**	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	**265**	265	NAP	NAP
Ireland	**11**	11	NAP	NAP
Italy	**24 473**	21 398	550	2 525
Latvia	**177**	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	**86**	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	**31**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	**NAP**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	**2 318**	NA	NA	NA
Poland	**1 475**	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	**173**	173	NAP	NAP
Romania	**134**	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	**278**	278	NA	NAP
Slovenia	**278**	266	12	NAP
Spain	**6 302**	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	**268**	NA	NA	NA
Average	**1 763**	2 532	197	1 274
Median	**267**	215	29	1 274
Minimum	**11**	11	12	22
Maximum	**24 473**	21 398	550	2 525
Nb of values	**27**	27	27	27
% of NA	**4%**	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	**7%**	26%	44%	67%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.4b(2020): Supreme courts, number of criminal cases - pending on 31 Dec. 2020

Per 100 inhabitant (Q1, Q100)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	0,007	0,002	NAP	NAP
Belgium	0,003	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	0,004	0,003	0,000	0,000
Croatia	0,017	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	0,001	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	0,001	0,001	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,002	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	0,005	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,004	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	0,001	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	0,003	0,003	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,000	0,000	NAP	NAP
Italy	0,041	0,036	0,001	0,004
Latvia	0,009	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	0,003	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,005	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	0,013	NA	NA	NA
Poland	0,004	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	0,002	0,002	NAP	NAP
Romania	0,001	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	0,005	0,005	NA	NAP
Slovenia	0,013	0,013	0,001	NAP
Spain	0,013	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,003	NA	NA	NA
Average	0,007	0,007	0,001	0,002
Median	0,004	0,003	0,001	0,002
Minimum	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Maximum	0,041	0,036	0,001	0,004
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	67%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.20.5(2020): Supreme court criminal cases - pending more than 2 years in 2020

Absolute values and as a percent (%) of the pending cases Dec 31st of the same category (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal cases pending more than 2 years 1+2+3		Severe criminal ending more than 2 years cases 1		Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases ending more than 2 2		Other criminal ending more than 2 years cases 3	
	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.	Number	As % of pending cases 31 Dec.
Austria	9	1,5%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	61	16,9%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	4	1,5%	4	1,9%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	48	0,2%	43	0,2%	5	0,9%	0	0,0%
Latvia	0	0,0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	4	3,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	2	0,7%	2	0,8%	0	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	1	0,4%	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	NA
Average	13	2,4%	12	0,7%	2	0,3%	0	0,0%
Median	3	0,5%	3	0,5%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Minimum	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%
Maximum	61	16,9%	43	1,9%	5	0,9%	1	0,0%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	56%	56%	56%	56%	44%	44%	26%	30%
% of NAP	7%	7%	30%	30%	44%	44%	63%	63%

Austria: the total number of criminal cases is higher than the sum of severe and minor criminal cases, because it includes administrative criminal cases, as well

Clearance rate and Disposition time for Supreme court criminal cases

Table 3.21.1(2021): Supreme courts, Clearance rate (in percentage) for criminal cases in 2021 (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	100,9%	95,7%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	94,8%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	97,3%	95,9%	108,8%	97,4%
Croatia	160,9%	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	100,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	110,2%	110,2%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	76,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	90,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	100,3%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	95,6%	NA	NA	NA
Greece	87,8%	87,8%	88,9%	NAP
Hungary	90,2%	90,2%	NAP	NAP
Ireland	131,4%	131,4%	NAP	NAP
Italy	101,6%	101,5%	110,3%	101,4%
Latvia	91,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	83,2%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	100,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	102,1%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	102,6%	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	102,0%	102,0%	NAP	NAP
Romania	97,8%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	96,5%	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	110,8%	112,4%	86,0%	NAP
Spain	98,3%	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	97,8%	NA	NA	NA
Average	100,8%	103,0%	98,5%	99,4%
Median	98,3%	101,5%	98,9%	99,4%
Minimum	76,5%	87,8%	86,0%	97,4%
Maximum	160,9%	131,4%	110,3%	101,4%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.21.2(2021): Supreme courts, Disposition time (in days) for criminal cases in 2021 (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	162	92	NAP	NAP
Belgium	88	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	98	150	113	27
Croatia	88	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	39	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	189	189	NAP	NAP
Estonia	247	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	151	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	147	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	94	NA	NA	NA
Greece	56	51	150	NAP
Hungary	110	110	NAP	NAP
Ireland	119	119	NAP	NAP
Italy	184	194	231	124
Latvia	142	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	203	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	226	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	215	NA	NA	NA
Poland	126	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	56	56	NAP	NAP
Romania	131	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	109	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	93	89	178	NAP
Spain	264	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	46	NA	NA	NA
Average	135	117	168	76
Median	126	110	164	76
Minimum	39	51	113	27
Maximum	264	194	231	124
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	41%	41%	22%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.21.1(2020): Supreme courts, Clearance rate (in percentage) for criminal cases in 2020 (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	102,5%	102,8%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	101,4%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	102,6%	103,0%	92,0%	104,3%
Croatia	101,0%	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	102,3%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	103,3%	103,3%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	87,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	93,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	104,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	104,2%	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	104,2%	104,2%	NAP	NAP
Ireland	103,0%	103,0%	NAP	NAP
Italy	97,7%	99,6%	93,3%	88,5%
Latvia	94,8%	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	101,5%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	119,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	95,1%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	110,7%	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	98,2%	98,2%	NAP	NAP
Romania	103,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	99,0%	99,0%	NA	NAP
Slovenia	103,8%	104,5%	90,5%	NAP
Spain	74,3%	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	96,4%	NA	NA	NA
Average	100,1%	102,0%	91,9%	96,4%
Median	101,9%	103,0%	92,0%	96,4%
Minimum	74,3%	98,2%	90,5%	88,5%
Maximum	119,0%	104,5%	93,3%	104,3%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	67%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.21.2(2020): Supreme courts, Disposition time (in days) for criminal cases in 2020 (Q100)

States	Total number of criminal cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
	1+2+3	1	2	3
Austria	150	76	NAP	NAP
Belgium	96	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	91	145	131	18
Croatia	121	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	38	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	194	194	NAP	NAP
Estonia	95	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	122	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	146	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	77	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	66	66	NAP	NAP
Ireland	118	118	NAP	NAP
Italy	237	247	360	168
Latvia	99	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	118	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	226	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	261	NA	NA	NA
Poland	151	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	67	67	NAP	NAP
Romania	134	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	101	101	NA	NAP
Slovenia	147	149	115	NAP
Spain	412	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	45	NA	NA	NA
Average	138	129	202	93
Median	120	118	131	93
Minimum	38	66	115	18
Maximum	412	247	360	168
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	41%	44%	26%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	67%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Variations for Supreme Courts criminal cases by case categories

Table 3.22.1: Supreme courts, variation (in percentage) of incoming criminal law cases per 100 inhabitants between 2020 and 2021 (Q1, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-4,6%	8,6%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	25,0%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	11,5%	17,3%	-21,9%	11,2%
Croatia	-65,1%	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-0,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	-18,8%	-18,8%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	-19,8%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	6,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	1,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	9,0%	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	10,2%	10,2%	NAP	NAP
Ireland	3,0%	3,0%	NAP	NAP
Italy	20,8%	22,2%	15,4%	14,2%
Latvia	-2,6%	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	15,7%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	17,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	-2,2%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	21,9%	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	2,3%	2,3%	NAP	NAP
Romania	16,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	8,7%	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	7,8%	8,0%	2,5%	NAP
Spain	19,5%	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	17,6%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**4,2%**	6,6%	-1,3%	12,7%
Median	**8,2%**	8,3%	2,5%	12,7%
Minimum	**-65,1%**	-18,8%	-21,9%	11,2%
Maximum	**25,0%**	22,2%	15,4%	14,2%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27
% of NA	**4%**	**44%**	**44%**	22%
% of NAP	**7%**	**26%**	**44%**	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.22.2: Supreme courts, variation (in percentage) of resolved criminal law cases per 100 inhabitants between 2020 and 2021 (Q1, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-6,1%	1,1%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	16,8%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	5,7%	9,2%	-7,6%	3,9%
Croatia	-44,3%	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-2,3%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	-13,4%	-13,4%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	-29,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	2,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	-1,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	0,0%	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	-4,6%	-4,6%	NAP	NAP
Ireland	31,4%	31,4%	NAP	NAP
Italy	25,6%	24,5%	36,5%	30,8%
Latvia	-6,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	-5,3%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	-1,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	5,1%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	13,0%	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	6,2%	6,2%	NAP	NAP
Romania	10,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	6,0%	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	15,1%	16,1%	-2,5%	NAP
Spain	58,1%	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	19,4%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**4,2%**	**8,8%**	**8,8%**	17,3%
Median	**3,8%**	**7,7%**	**-2,5%**	17,3%
Minimum	**-44,3%**	**-13,4%**	**-7,6%**	3,9%
Maximum	**58,1%**	**31,4%**	**36,5%**	30,8%
Nb of values	**27**	**27**	**27**	27
% of NA	**4%**	**44%**	**44%**	22%
% of NAP	**7%**	**26%**	**44%**	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Table 3.22.3: Supreme courts, variation (in percentage) of the pending criminal law cases on 31 Dec. per 100 inhabitants between 2020 and 2021 (Q1, Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	1,5%	21,3%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	7,6%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	12,9%	12,9%	-19,8%	56,3%
Croatia	-59,4%	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-0,3%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	-15,6%	-15,6%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	82,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	27,4%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	-1,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	21,6%	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	59,5%	59,5%	NAP	NAP
Ireland	32,5%	32,5%	NAP	NAP
Italy	-2,6%	-2,2%	-12,5%	-3,2%
Latvia	34,0%	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	62,2%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	-1,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	-13,2%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-5,8%	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	-12,0%	-12,0%	NAP	NAP
Romania	7,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	14,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	-27,6%	-31,1%	50,1%	NAP
Spain	1,0%	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	20,4%	NA	NA	NA
Average	**10,2%**	8,1%	5,9%	26,6%
Median	**4,5%**	5,3%	-12,5%	26,6%
Minimum	**-59,4%**	-31,1%	-19,8%	-3,2%
Maximum	**82,5%**	59,5%	50,1%	56,3%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	44%	44%	22%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	70%

Table 3.22.4: Supreme courts, variation of clearance rate (in percentage points) criminal cases between 2020 and 2021 (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	-1,6	-7,1	NAP	NAP
Belgium	-6,6	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	-5,3	-7,2	+16,8	-6,9
Croatia	+60,0	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-2,1	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	+6,9	+6,9	NAP	NAP
Estonia	-10,6	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	-3,4	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	-3,9	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	-8,6	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	-14,0	-14,0	NAP	NAP
Ireland	+28,4	+28,4	NAP	NAP
Italy	+3,9	+1,9	+17,0	+12,8
Latvia	-3,5	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	-18,4	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	-19,0	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	+7,0	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-8,0	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	+3,8	+3,8	NAP	NAP
Romania	-5,3	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	-2,5	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	+7,0	+7,9	-4,4	NAP
Spain	+24,0	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	+1,4	NA	NA	NA
Average	+1,2	+2,6	+9,8	+3,0
Median	-2,9	+2,9	+16,8	+3,0
Minimum	-19,0	-14,0	-4,4	-6,9
Maximum	+60,0	+28,4	+17,0	+12,8
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	44%	44%	22%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Croatia: in 2021 there has been a decrease of the incoming criminal cases at the highest instance, following the establishment of the High Criminal Court on 1st of January 2021, which took over part of the previous Supreme Court's jurisdiction

Table 3.22.5: Supreme courts, variation of disposition time (in percentage) criminal cases between 2020 and 2021 (Q98)

States	Total number of criminal law cases	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Other criminal cases
Austria	8,1%	20,0%	NAP	NAP
Belgium	-7,9%	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	6,8%	3,4%	-13,2%	50,4%
Croatia	-27,2%	NA	NA	NAP
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	2,0%	NA	NA	NAP
Denmark	-2,6%	-2,6%	NAP	NAP
Estonia	159,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	24,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	0,9%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Germany	21,6%	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	67,1%	67,1%	NAP	NAP
Ireland	0,8%	0,8%	NAP	NAP
Italy	-22,4%	-21,5%	-35,9%	-26,0%
Latvia	42,9%	NA	NA	NAP
Lithuania	71,2%	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	0,0%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	-17,4%	NA	NA	NA
Poland	-16,6%	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	-17,2%	-17,2%	NAP	NAP
Romania	-2,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	7,8%	NA	NA	NAP
Slovenia	-37,1%	-40,7%	54,1%	NAP
Spain	-36,1%	NA	NA	NAP
Sweden	0,9%	NA	NA	NA
Average	+9,4%	+1,2%	+1,7%	+12,2%
Median	+0,8%	-0,9%	-13,2%	+12,2%
Minimum	-37,1%	-40,7%	-35,9%	-26,0%
Maximum	+159,2%	+67,1%	+54,1%	+50,4%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	44%	44%	22%
% of NAP	7%	26%	44%	70%

Cyprus and Malta have a two-tier system, where the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. It was agreed to present the data for the Supreme Court in the second instance.

Indicator 3: The performance of courts at all stages of the proceedings

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 091. First instance courts: number of other than criminal law cases.
Question 092. If courts deal with "civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases", please indicate the case categories included:

Question 093. Please indicate the case categories included in the category "other cases":
Question 094. First instance courts: number of criminal law cases.
Question 097. Second instance courts (appeal): Number of "other than criminal law" cases.
Question 098. Second instance courts (appeal): Number of criminal law cases.
Question 099. Highest instance courts (Supreme Court): Number of "other than criminal law" cases:
Question 100. Highest instance courts (Supreme Court): Number of criminal law cases.
Question 101. Number of specific litigious cases received and processed by first instance courts.

Austria

Q091 (General Comment): Due to a change in calculation in the underlying statistics, the "pending cases on 1st Jan ref year" may differ compared to the "pending cases on 31st Dec" of the previous year.
Q091 (2021): "Non litigious business registry cases": Sec. 3a para. 2 of the COVID-19 act concerning corporate law ("Gesellschaftsrechtliches COVID-19-Gesetz") allows corporations to file their annual accounts and other documents, that have to be published by law, not only within 9 but within 12 months from the account date (mostly: December 31st of a year). Usually, the duty to file these reports within 9 months leads to a high number of incoming files in September. 2020 and 2021 the special rules lead to such high incoming file numbers in December and thereby to an increase in pending cases at the end of the year.

Q091 (2020): "Non litigious business registry cases": Sec. 3a para. 2 of the COVID-19 act concerning corporate law ("Gesellschaftsrechtliches COVID-19-Gesetz") allows corporations to file their annual accounts and other documents, that have to be published by law, not only within 9 but within 12 months from the account date (mostly: December 31st of a year). Usually, the duty to file these reports within 9 months leads to a high number of incoming files in September. 2020 the special rules lead to such high incoming file numbers in December and thereby to an increase in pending cases at the end of the year. "4. Other cases": The number of incoming and resolved cases surged due to an increase of "general civil proceedings, that are not allocated to other categories of cases" because the district administrative authorities (Bezirksverwaltungsbehörden) had to notify the district courts of every single person against which a quarantine measure (SARS-CoV-2) had been taken. In concerns of statistical data every such notification resulted in an incoming (and resolved) case.
Generally, no courts were closed during the lockdowns. During the first lockdown (middle of March until the end of April 2020) the number of incoming cases dropped significantly. Nearly all court hearings had to be postponed during the first lockdown. In total (all case types) in April 2020 there were 89.25 % less court hearings than in April 2019. In general litigious civil matters of first instance there were even 94.59 % less hearings. A comparison of the total number of court hearings held in the period of March 2019 to February 2020 on the one hand and of March 2020 to February 2021 on the other hand shows that there were 22.22 % less hearings since the first lockdown. The significant drop in incoming cases and held court hearings in April 2020 resulted in the opportunity to concentrate on finishing pending cases in which all hearings had already been held. The statistical data shows that the number of judgments pending more than 2 months since the final hearing declined considerably (1st of July 2020: -75 % compared to 1st of April 2020). Judges did always (even before the Covid-19 pandemic) have the opportunity to work from home. Many have made use of this option during the lockdowns. The Federal Ministry of Justice does not keep statistics on this matter (number of judges working from home) since judges are not obliged to record their working times or places.

Q091 (2019): There is a lack of horizontal consistency concerning the catgeory "general civil and commercial non-litigious cases". Figures provided by the statistical system were double checked in this respect and are correct.

Q091 (2017): Due to the absolut low numbers of pending cases on 1 Jan./31 Dec. high deviations in percentage are normal. Note to 2.1.1.: Because of an inaccuracy by analysing pending non-litigious business registry cases the count had to be corrected on 1st December 2017. Therefore the pending cases on 31.12.2016 do not comply with those of 01.01.2017.

Q091 (2016): Due to the low absolute numbers of pending cases on 1 Jan./31 Dec. high deviations in percentage are normal.

Q091 (2015): In the category litigious are counted all proceedings (in civil matters, labour and social security cases at first instance courts) which are marked as being litigious in the court register (f.e. from the second court hearing on).

Civil and commercial non-litigious cases include commence of bankruptcy proceedings, Bankruptcy proceedings, composition proceedings, non-litigious proceedings about rent, non profit cooperative association for housing, home ownership, proceedings about Lease of farm land, wardship cases in connection with administration of assets, custody and maintenance, uncontested payment orders, enforcement cases.

Category "other" includes Probate Proceedings, cases concerning the Administration of justice, Cancellation proceedings and proceedings in connection with [official] declaration of death
authentication of signatures, proceedings to render legal assistance in civil matters for other courts (also international ones), General civil proceedings, that are not allocated to other categories of cases, Some Non litigious family matters.

Q091 (2012): In 2012, a legislative reform entailed more obligations for companies to register.

Q092 (2014): For the year 2014, this category has been extended to the enforcement cases.

Q094 (General Comment): The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for the criminal courts. However, the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

Q094 (2021): The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for the ciminal courts. However the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

Q094 (2020): The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for the ciminal courts. However the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

Q094 (2018): The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for the criminal courts. However the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

Q094 (2016): Administrative criminal cases are included in misdemeanour and in total

Q097 (General Comment): From January 1st, 2014 there are 11 newly found courts for administrative law in Austria, namely 9 regional administrative courts, 1 Federal Administrative Court and 1 Federal Tax Court (all courts of first instances). Furthermore, there is also the Supreme Administrative Court (final instance). With regard to administrative law cases there is no second instance. The statistical evidence of the Federal Ministry of Justice of Austria does not distinguish between the types of second instance cases mentioned under 2.1., 2.2. and 2.3. Data regarding the general categories “litigious cases” (1.) and “non-litigious cases” (2.) is available.
The number of “Other cases” (4.) is included in the category “litigious cases” (1.).

Q097 (2021): “Civil and commercial litigious cases” – the number of incoming civil litigious cases slightly increased between 2020 and 2021. The number of resolved such cases increased but to a lesser extent than incoming cases. Accordingly, the number of pending civil litigious cases at the end of the year increased. There is no explicit explanation for these variations. It should be recalled that 2020 year was a particular year due to the pandemic. In 2021, the data are back at the level of 2019.

Q097 (2017): In the area of appeal cases concerning other than criminal law cases only the categories of general civil law, labour law and social law are gathered. The administrative cases are NAP in second instance since they are presented in first and final instance.
Q097 (2016): In the area of appeal cases concerning other than criminal law cases only the categories of general civil law, labour law and social law are gathered. The administrative cases are NAP in second instance since they are presented in first and final instance.
Q098 (2020): "Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases": compared to the previous 10 years the pending, incoming and resolved cases in this category in the year 2020 showed a slight decrease. There is no specific explanation for this circumstance.
Q098 (2016): There is significant discrepancy in the number of incomming and resolved misdemeanour cases because the administrative criminal cases of second instance are included in third instance.
Q099 (2021): Discrepancy between number of pending administrative law cases on 31 December 2020 and number for pending administrative cases on 1 January 2021: 3043 procedures adopted from previous years and 139 procedures completed in previous years and reopend in the reference year. "Administrative law cases": The COVID-19 pandemic posed significant and new challenges to international and government institutions worldwide, including the Supreme Administrative Court. Social distancing necessary to combat the pandemic required profound changes in the service of the Supreme Administrative Court to guarantee its functioning. In addition to internal organisational measures such as the possibility of remote work and new electronic communication tools, changes to the legal framework were necessary to enable the passing of resolutions via circular letter without physical contact between the members of the judicial body. These legal changes became effective in the course of 2020 and 2021. The continuing high level of new cases in asylum and aliens law is due to the numerous applications for international protection filed in Austria from 2015 onwards. The increase in staff at both the Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum and the Federal Administrative Court has led to an increase in the number of cases dealt with by these authorities and thus also in the number of cases brought before the Supreme Administrative Court, which has now been at a relatively high level for several years.

Q099 (2020): Discrepancy between number of pending administrative cases on 31 December 2019 and number fo pending administrative cases on 1 January 2020: the number of 3 064 pending administrative cases on 1 January 2020 corresponds to 2762 procedures adopted from previous years and 302 procedures completed in previous years and reopend in the reference year.
Pending administrative law cases older than 2 years: the observed increase is a consequence of the high number of cases in the field of asylum and aliens.
Q099 (2019): The reason for the increased number of incoming administrative cases and accordingly the increase in the number of pending administrative cases is related to the high number of cases in the field of asylum and aliens law characterizing the period 2016 - 2019.
Q099 (2018): The reasons for this increase of the incoming administrative cases is related to the high number of cases in the field of asylum and aliens law.
Q099 (2017): To 3.:
Because of the model of business cases installed at the Supreme Administrative Court pending cases at the begin of a reporting year have to be analysed by calculation. Incoming cases are substracted from the sum of resolved cases and of pending cases at the end of the reporting year. New applications within the same case cause a reopening of the concerned cases. Thus the number of pending cases changes. Therefore a completly consistent image of figures of pending cases from the end of previous year and those from the begin of the current year is not feasible.

Q099 (2016): The big variation is due to the fact that this cycle the administrative cases were included.
The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. After their establishment the data of the administrative courts is introduced this cycle for the first time.
Q100 (2021): The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.

Q100 (2020): The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.

Q100 (2016): The big variation is due to the fact that this cycle the administrative cases were included.
The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. After their establishment the data of the administrative courts is introduced this cycle for the first time.
Q101 (General Comment): "Employment dismissal cases": The Austrian court system knows labour law cases. These contain employment dismissal cases as well as all other disputes between employer and employee (e.g. concerning payment of wages, discrimination) and between employer and the works council. Dismissal cases are not being evaluated separately in the standard statistical tools of the Federal Ministry of Justice of Austria.

Q101 (2020): Insolvency cases: the observed decreases between 2019 and 2020 are due to the pandemic. Data on intentional homicide an robbery cases were delivered for the year 2018 due to a special evaluation that had taken place. Because of this special evaluation data for 2018 was available. The standard statistical tools do not enable enquiries to pending cases of a certain category (regarding certain criminal offences) to a specific date in the past.

Q101 (2019): The decreae in the number of incoming cases related to the right of entry and stay of aliens stems from the decline in migration flows. Accordingly, the number of pending cases at the end of 2019 decreased.

Belgium

Q091 (General Comment): Civil and commercial cases include cases from the Justices of the peace, first instance courts, civil, family and youth sections, labour courts and company courts (commercial courts). It should be noted that courts are not able to provide data on pending cases in civil, family and youth matters. Similarly, in the company courts, pending and resolved cases cannot be counted for insolvency cases because of a too low degree of reliability.
Administrative law cases are those of the Council of State acting as first instance court, the Aliens Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen. Concerning the number of administrative cases pending at the end of the year: the lack of horizontal consistency is due to the fact that the number of judgments does not necessarily correspond to the number of closed cases. For example, a judgment that closes two cases is recorded as one judgment.
Registry cases are immediate acts, which is why the number of incoming cases is equal to the number of resolved cases. Uncontested payment orders are counted as litigious cases because courts are not able to distinguish between uncontested and contested payment orders.
Insolvency cases (company courts): incoming cases - these are all cases registered based on a code “nature of the case” and that concern insolvency cases, cases that have been assigned an insolvency number, or cases entered in a specific insolvency roll. Only cases registered in the computer application of the company courts, called TCKH, are counted in these figures. There are also cases dealt with by company courts and which are solely registered in the computer application RegSol (since mid-2017) in insolvency proceedings, for example, between the curator and the juge-commissaire. Cases only registered in RegSol are not counted in these figures, which leads to an underestimation. It would therefore appear that the number of insolvency cases has decreased in recent years, whereas this is not the case. For your information, below is the number of new insolvency filings (attention: does not correspond to the number of bankruptcies pronounced) which shows a constant increase until 2019 (an impact of the coronavirus crisis is to be noted in 2020): 2016: 12,560; 2017: 13,301; 2018: 13,917; 2019: 14,567; 2020: 9516). Liquidation/dissolution, ECL, and commercial investigation cases (not resulting in bankruptcy) are not counted.

Q091 (2021): Administrative law cases are those of the Council of State, the Aliens Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen. However, the figure 1 428 (in the last column “Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court”) concerns the sole Council of State. Thus, with regard to the Councul of State, the figures are the following: 4 936; 2 191; 2 208; 4 420 and 1 428; with regard to the Aliens Litigation Council: 14 415; 14 124 (one judgment can close several cases which may result in a lack of horizontal consistency); 19 256; 9 273 and NA.
Juvenile cases are not counted in the category “other cases”. In fact, this case type includes both civil and criminal litigation.

Q091 (2020):
"The health crisis has impacted the numbers.
*Justice of the Peace: no pending cases (start + end). The way justice of the peace cases are counted has been adapted and unlike previous cycles, all dockets have also been taken into account for 2020. *Civil courts of first instance: no pending cases (start + end). The same counting method was applied as last year. Omissions as well as so-called "dormant cases" are counted in the closed cases. *Corporate courts: same counting method as last year. Only cases registered in the corporate court computer application, called TCKH, are counted in these figures. There are also corporate court cases that are only recorded in the RegSol computer application (since mid-2017) in bankruptcy proceedings, for example, between the receiver and the bankruptcy judge. Cases only registered in RegSol are not counted in these figures, which induces an underestimation. Commercial investigations (chambers of distressed companies) are not taken into account as the figures are unreliable due to the very disparate registration methods in the different company courts. No pending cases.
*As far as administrative cases are concerned, the total number of cases includes the figures for the Council of State, the Aliens Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen. However, the figure of 1489 (in the last column ""Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date on which the case is brought before the courts of first instance") concerns only the Council of State. Thus, - for the Council of State, the figures are: 4,564; 2,119; 2,019; 4,936 and 1,489; for the Conseil du Contentieux des Etrangers: 16,009; 14,238 (a judgment can close different cases hence the absence of complete horizontal logic); 15,769; 14,451 and NA.
"

Q091 (2019): Regarding the category "4. other cases" which refers to "protection cases", the statistical service does not have figures for 2019, following discussions on the counting rules between the courts. However, we kept the total for “other than criminal” cases since protection cases represent more or less 10,000 cases, or 1% of the total. Their actual number will not change the total figure significantly.
"Administrative cases pending at the end of the year": the lack of horizontal consistency is due to the fact that the number of judgments does not necessarily correspond to the number of closed cases. For example, a judgement that closes two cases is recorded as one stop

Q091 (2018): Civil and commercial cases include cases of justices of the peace, courts of first instance, civil, family and youth sections, labour courts and company courts (known as "commercial courts")
Civil and family courts: no data for pending cases. New rules for counting and recording cases mean that the statistics are not comparable to previous years. In particular, cases where there is a permanent referral are now counted as a case.
Concerning juvenile courts: no data for completed or pending cases due to the lack of uniform practice and low registration of completed cases.
Concerning registry cases: these are immediate acts, which is why the number of incoming cases is equal to the number of resolved cases. Administrative affairs: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.

Q091 (2017): The difference with the 2016 data is due to the lack of data on justices of the peace cases. In respect of justices of the peace, from July 2017 to June 2018, a deployment of new codes was carried out at the national level. The support service of the College of Courts and Tribunals is currently in the process of defining accounting rules for justices of the peace. For this reason, no figures were issued in 2018 pertaining to 2017 data.
Civil data are not included or only partially included for 5 courts; Youth courts: no data from Brussels (Dutch-speaking); no data for resolved cases and pending cases; No data for civil cases from police courts; Commercial courts: no data for pending cases + new counting rules for resolved cases. For this reason, comparison with previous data is made difficult; not all activities carried out in commercial courts are reflected in the statistics provided. Indeed, the following services are not covered: commercial investigation service, business continuity law, bankruptcy and dissolutions/liquidations.

Q091 (2016): Administrative cases: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
The sharp decrease in administrative cases is due to immigration cases. There are 5 administrative courts, two of which are at federal (national) level: the State Council and the Aliens Litigation Council. It is within the latter that there has been a decrease in the number of cases. Immigration and asylum cases are handled by the Conseil du Contentieux des Etrangers. The Aliens Litigation Council is an independent administrative court, which deals with cases "in the first instance", i.e. full substantive litigation or "in cassation", i.e. a decision "in annulment" or "suspension". The Council may be seized with appeals against decisions of the "Commissariat général aux Réfugiés et aux Apatrides", against decisions of the "Office des Etrangers" and against all other individual decisions taken pursuant to the Act of 15 December 1980 on access to the territory, residence, establishment and removal of aliens (Aliens Act).
Please also note that figures for juvenile courts as well as figures for civil cases treated by the police courts are not included in this cycle. These figure present very small number from the total number of cases.

Q091 (2015): The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included.
Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.
Q091 (2014): With regard to non-litigious business registry cases, the central register of notices of seizure, delegation, transfer, collective debt settlement and loan is managed by the National Chamber of Bailiffs. Administrative cases are handled by the State Council (except for cassationrulings), the Alien Litigation Council and the Flemish regional administrative colleges, "Raad voor verkiezingsbetwistingen, Raad voor milieuhandhaving by Raad voor vergunningenbetwistingen".

Q091 (2012): The category 1 "civil (and commercial) litigious cases" refers to cases tried by first instance courts, commercial courts and justices of peace, and civil cases dealt with by the police courts. Civil cases concerning youth are not included, as well as cases tried in second instance by courts of first instance. For 2010, there are no available data on the labour courts because the project to build a data warehouse 'Statistics labour courts' is not yet finalised. Cases from categories 1 and 2 cannot be distinguished and are all grouped in category 1.
Q094 (General Comment): "Severe criminal cases": all cases that are dealt with by first instance criminal courts; "minor criminal cases": all cases that are dealt with by the Police courts.
First instance (criminal) courts: figures for homicide have not been included as our figures include cases of attempted homicide and (attempted) manslaughter (including attempted and manslaughter). Similarly, cases involving child pornography, sexual abuse, or minors cannot be uniquely identified in the general category of sexual offenses. In camera (council chamber) cases are not included; figures for pending cases are not available.

Q094 (2021): "Severe criminal cases": all cases that are dealt with by first instance criminal courts; "Minor criminal cases": all cases that are dealt with by the Police courts. Protectional cases - youth: 9 227 incoming cases in matters of youth protection. For this case category the number of resolved cases is not available for 2021. These are protectional cases dealt with by the juvenile court (in respect of parents, situations of concern, extremely urgent situations of concern, facts classified as offences).

Q094 (2020): "The health crisis has had an impact on the numbers.
"
Q094 (2016): Severe: all cases that are dealt with at first instance by the criminal courts of first instance; Minors: all cases that are dealt with by the police court
Three sites could not provide statistics for severe cases.
Q094 (2014): Offences handled by the police court (although this court can pronounce prison sentences) are considered as minor offences.
Q097 (General Comment): Data on pending appeals against first instance decisions of the Justices of the peace and Police courts (civil cases) are not available.
Q097 (2021): Court of appeal (civil matters): Pending cases on 1/01/2021 = 29 320 ; Pending cases on 31/12/2021 = 28 507 ; Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court = 12 133. Bron: datawarehouse (date of data extraction: 01/07/2022).
Q097 (2020): *Cases in the second instance courts , labor courts and cases on appeal against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts (civil matters), at the trial level.
*Court of second instance (civil matters): Cases pending as of 1/01/2020 = 30668; Cases pending as of 12/31/2020 = 29300; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 12391. *Labor Court: Cases pending as of 1/01/2020 = 6033; Cases pending as of 12/31/2020 = 5841; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 1730. Source: datawarehouse (data extraction date: 06/16/2021)
*Civil litigation cases: for 2020, there is a decrease in the number of new cases and an even greater decrease in the number of completed cases due to the pandemic that has affected the operation of the courts

Q097 (2018): Number of cases before courts of appeal, labour courts and cases of appeal against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts, at the first instance level.
Court of Appeal (civil matters): pending cases at 1/01/2018 = 33,018; pending cases at 31/12/2018 = 32,321; pending cases for more than 2 years from the date in which the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 13,507. Labour Court: pending cases at 1/01/2018 = 6236; pending cases at 31/12/2018 = 6201; pending cases for more than 2 years from the date in which the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 1535. Bron: datawarehouse (extraction 1/09/2019)
no data on pending appeals against decisions of the justices of the peace and police courts at the first instance level.
In administrative matters, there is no second instance. The Council of State is the only supreme court.

Q097 (2017): Number of cases before courts of appeal, labour courts and appeals against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts at the first instance level.
Courts of Appeal: Justice in numbers
Q097 (2016): Number of cases before courts of appeal, labour courts and cases of appeals against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts, at first instance.

Q098 (General Comment): Severe criminal cases: cases appealed to the Appellate court (criminal matters).
Minor criminal cases: appeals before the first instance criminal courts ("jurisdictions correctionnelles") against decisions of the Police courts (thus cases dealt with by the first instance criminal courts at second instance).
Criminal law cases encompass also cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation). The latter has competence for controlling judicial investigations, namely it controls pre-trial detention, and decides on referral to the trial judge.

Q098 (2021): Protectional cases - youth: these cases have been included in point 2 "Minor criminal cases". Here are the figures: pending cases on 1/01/2021 = 337; pending cases on 31/12/2021 = 306; Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court = 124. Bron: data warehouse (data extraction date: 01/07/2022).
The category "3. Other criminal cases" corresponds to the cases dealt with by the Investigation Chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation).

Q098 (2020): "Second instance Courts (Criminal Matters): * Totals: Cases pending as of 1/01/2020 = 9434; Cases pending as of 12/31/2020 = 9317; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 2616. * Serious offenses (involves correctional and indictment division cases): Cases pending as of 1/01/2020 = 9095; Cases pending as of 12/31/2020 = 8981; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 2499.
* Minor offences: youth cases are included in the figures shown in the table (1,374 new cases and 1,377 completed cases respectively). Also noteworthy are the youth cases: Cases pending on 1/01/2020 = 339; Cases pending on 31/12/2020 = 336; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 117.
Source: datawarehouse (data extraction date: 16/06/2021)
*For 2020, there is a decrease in the number of new cases and in the number of completed cases due to the pandemic that affected court operations."

Q098 (2016): The category "Severe criminal cases" concerns appeals to the courts of appeal against the judgements of the courts of first instance ruling in criminal matters. The category "Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases" refers to appeals to the courts of first instance against decisions of police courts in criminal matters.

Q099 (General Comment):
Civil, social and tax cases at the Court of Cassation
Administrative cases - cases "in cassation" at the Council of State (Conseil d'Etat).
The lack of horizontal consistency for administrative cases is due to the fact that the number of judgments does not necessarily correspond to the number of cases closed. For example, a judgment closing two cases is recorded as one judgment.

Q099 (2021): "Civil (and commercial) litigious cases": in 2021, the Court of cassation managed to adopt a higher number of final decisions compared to 2020 (973 final decisions in 2021 compared to 853 in 2020). This is largely due to a series of 72 similar cases in which final decisions were delivered in 2021, as well as to the endeavours to increase the number of final decisions in tax matters (+30 final decisions compared to 2020). The number of incoming civil (and commercial) litigious cases in 2021 is more or less comparable to the one in 2020. In the long term, an upward general trend is to be noticed. However, more specific evolutions have been observed within this case category: in 2021, compared to 2020, the number of incoming civil cases (including commercial and administrative cases), as well as the number of incoming social cases has slightly decreased, while the number of incoming tax cases has increased. The latter is increasing from year to year.
The category "2.3 Other non-litigious cases" encompasses cases related to requests for judicial assistance introduced before and dealt with by the Court of cassation in 2021.
The category "4. Other cases", concerns disciplinary cases brought before and resolved by the Court of cassation in 2021. Incoming disciplinary cases, as well as resolved disciplinary cases are higher in 2021 compared to 2020 (+ 15 incoming cases; + 11 final judgments). Given that the Court processes a small number of disciplinary cases each year, it is not possible to draw relevant conclusions based on the observed variations.
"3. Administrative law cases": data communicated by the State Council; in respect of the number of resolved cases, there were 170 final decisions and 255 non-admission orders.

Q099 (2020): In the category '1. contentious civil (and commercial) cases' are included the C, F and S cases (civil; fiscal and social cases) that were filed/processed before the Court of Cassation in 2020.
The category '4. other cases' contains the D cases (disciplinary cases) filed before/processed by the Court of Cassation.
It should be noted that the Court of Cassation is also competent to decide on applications for legal aid. The category 3 ""administrative cases"" was provided by the highest adminsitartive Court.
(source Cour de Cassation)
With regard to the category ""administrative cases"" (Council of State), for completed cases: it should be noted that the figure of 479 covers 177 final judgments and 302 orders of non-admission. (source Council of State). It should be noted that the lack of horizontal coherence is due to the fact that the number of judgments does not necessarily correspond to the number of closed cases. For example, a judgment that closes two cases is recorded as a single judgment.
In 2020, the number of new administrative cases increased compared to 2019. However, due to the exceptional situation caused by COVID, the State Council could not keep up with the flow of cases and even though the number of completed cases increased compared to 2019, the number of pending cases at the end of 2020 increased. "

Q099 (2019): Civil, social and fiscal affairs at the supreme Court. A dministrative cases are the cases 'in cassation' at the Council of State.
Q099 (2018): Civil, social and tax cases at the Court of Cassation
Administrative affairs = cases "in cassation" at the Council of State
Q099 (2017): civil and commercial cases: cases in roles C, S and F at the Court of Cassation
administrative cases: cases before the Council of State "in cassation": Out= 221 judgments and 214 non-admission orders

Q099 (2016): Civil, social and fiscal cases at the Court of Cassation
Administrative cases ="cassation" cases in the State Council
The decrease in administrative cases is due to a reduction in referrals to the Council of State for this type of case.

Q099 (2014): 2014: The civil and commercial cases include cases of roles C (private and public law), F (tax law) and S (employment law) of the Court of cassation.
Administrative cases fall within the decisions of the Council of State in cassation.
Q100 (General Comment): "The total corresponds to the criminal law cases (roll P) of the Court of Cassation.
Source: Hof van Cassatie van België - Cour de cassation de Belgique - Kassationshof von Belgien
Justitiepaleis - Poelaertplein 1 - 1000 Brussel
Palace of Justice - Place Poelaert 1 - 1000 Brussels
Council of State
Rue de la Science 33 Wetenschapsstraat
1040 Brussels - Brussel
http://www.raadvst-consetat.be"
Q100 (2021): Remarks on the evolution of criminal cases:
While the number of incoming criminal cases brought before the Court of Cassation each year remained relatively stable between 2016 and 2020, this number increased sharply in 2021, with 345 additional units compared to 2020. This is an increase of 25.50% in one year. At present, it is not clear whether this increase is a one-off and attributable to rather occasional circumstances or whether it is the harbinger of a period of significant growth in the number of criminal cases. It goes without saying that this sudden development will have to be monitored closely in the years to come.
Of necessity, the Court of Cassation has succeeded in significantly increasing the number of final judgments handed down in criminal cases in 2021 compared to 2020 (+237 units). This is an increase of 17.27%. However, these efforts could not prevent the criminal caseload at the end of 2021 from increasing for the first time in years, especially with 89 units compared to the criminal caseload at the end of 2020.

Q100 (2016): Cases on the 'p' list of the Court of Cassation
the downward trend in the input of criminal cases is due to the tightening of access conditions: stricter time limits, obligation to serve notice of appeal, compulsory intervention by a lawyer trained in the cassation technique, abolition of immediate appeal against interlocutory judgments, abolition of the Court of Cassation's review of pre-trial detention, except for the first confirmation of the arrest warrant. To all this it must be added the introduction of a rapid and non-adversarial procedure allowing appeals that are not substantiated or manifestly inadmissible or unfounded to be refused.

Q101 (General Comment): Insolvency: the number of incoming and resolved cases includes cases of the company court concerning insolvency, as well as closed cases of the labour tribunal concerning collective debt settlement. Only figures for incoming and resolved cases are available. Incoming cases: refers to all registered cases concerning a bankruptcy "nature of case", cases to which a bankruptcy number has been assigned or cases registered on a specific bankruptcy roll.

Q101 (2021): Insolvency: the number of incoming (and resolved) cases includes cases of the company court concerning insolvency, as well as closed cases of the labour tribunal concerning collective debt settlement. In 2021, before the company court there were 37626 incoming insolvency cases, and 59074 resolved cases. Before the labour tribunal there were 8515 incoming cases related to collective debt settlement and 17659 resolved cases.

Q101 (2020):
For 2020, there is a decrease in the number of new cases and an even greater decrease in the number of completed cases due to the covid-19 pandemic.
Q101 (2019): In matters relating to asylum seekers, the line between an asylum case and a migration case is not always easy to draw. Thus, 'asylum' cases are very cyclical. The figures were communicated by the Foreigners Litigation Council.

Q101 (2018): As a result of the new rules for counting and recording cases, the number of contentious divorce cases is lower than the one in the previous years.
Bankruptcy cases do not include cases that have been managed by the Regsol system and procedure since mid-2017. The number of pending and resolved cases cannot be calculated due to the unreliability of the available data.
Cases concerning asylum seekers include asylum cases before the Aliens Litigation Council (e. g. applications for recognition of refugee status or granting of the subsidiary protection status). Cases relating to the right of entry and residence include migration cases before the Aliens Litigation Council (appeals for annulment of individual decisions taken pursuant to the Act on Access to the Territory, Residence, Establishment and Removal of Foreign Nationals).

Q101 (2017): Appeals lodged with the Aliens Litigation Council (Conseil du contentieux des Etrangers (CCE)) in the context of an asylum procedure
migration litigation.
Q101 (2016): "Justice of the peace: no data for pending cases (start + end)
civil courts of first instance and family courts: no data for pending cases (start + end)
Youth courts: no data for Eupen, Leuven, Brussels (Dutch-speaking), Tournai, Mons; no data for resolved cases, pending cases and lenght of criminal courts of first instance: no data for Turnhout, Tongeren, Hasselt, Leuven, Charleroi, Eupen; no data for durations and breakdown by type of offence; police courts : no data for civil cases: no data for new cases, pending cases and commercial court length: concerns (only) the following roles: general role (including contested claims), role of motions and role of summary proceedings. It should be noted that the number of resolved cases is only an estimation - this figure has been calculated on the basis of the last judgment and this judgment closes the case. Consequently, not all the following cases are taken into account in this calculation: cases that have been the subject of another judgement after the judgement ending the case, and cases in which no judgement has been pronounced; no data for pending cases. Insolvency (commercial courts) :
Due to unreliable data, figures for pending and resolved insolvency cases (commercial courts) cannot be provided. With regard to insolvency (commercial courts), it should be noted that: - incoming cases: cases registered with a insolvency nature, cases with a insolvency number or cases registered on a dedicated insolvency list. Cases relating to liquidations/dissolutions, business continuity law and commercial investigations (not leading to insolvency) are not recorded. Filter: nature group of the insolvency case or insolvency number or entry on the roll F, G, H, K, L, V.
Bankruptcies include business insolvency proceedings (Commercial Court) and personal insolvency proceedings (collective debt settlement with the labour court).
With regard to the "litigious divorce cases" category, the variations in the number of incoming cases and the number of resolved cases are due to the fact that, unlike the previous cycles (2014, 2015), the 2016 data do not include divorces with mutual consent. The category "insolvency cases" in 2016 encompasses insolvency proceedings of companies (Commercial Court) and personal insolvency proceedings (collective debt settlement before the Labour Court) that were not included in previous cycles."

Q101 (2015): The insolvency cases provided only include cases regarding individuals and not the ones concerning companies.

Bulgaria

Q091 (General Comment): The division by types of cases in the statistical forms published by the Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria is quite different from the CEPEJ categorisation and for that reason breakdown cannot be made. Only administrative cases are possible to differentiate due to existence of administrative courts. Furthermore, in Bulgaria registry cases are not resolved by courts. They are under the competence of the Registry agency where is the property register, the commercial register, the BULSTAD register and the Register of the Property Relations between spouses.
We should mention though that under current legislation Sofia City Court keeps a public register of political parties (https://sgs.justice.bg/bg/14755) and a public register of religious denominations having the status of legal entities. Sofia City Court is a Provincial/ Regional Court and as other regional courts acts as court of first and second instance. As far as registry cases are concerned Sofia City Court acts as first instance. So, there are some “other registry cases”, however, their number is insignificant. The special place and status of the Sofia City Court among the regional courts is determined by its competences, the most important of which are: claims for the recognition and enforcement of decisions of foreign courts, as well as requests for the recognition of a decision of a foreign court by an interested party that does not have a permanent address or seat on the territory of the Republic of Bulgaria.

Q091 (2020): As it is impossible to distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases for the present, for 2020 the following data is available as to the sum of all civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases: pending at the beginning 85 460; incoming 282 768, resolved 285 461 and pending at the end of the year 82 767. It is noteworthy that since 2020, the Unified Court Information System (UIS) has been gradually introduced in all courts, developed within the project “Creating a Model for Optimizing the Court Card of Bulgarian Courts and Prosecutor's Offices and Developing a Unified Court Information System” with the financial support of Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020. Depending on the functionalities of the system, it is possible to collect information on the next cycle according to the indicators in question 91.

Q091 (2018): The observed increase in the number of incoming administrative law cases and accordingly in the number of pending administrative law cases at the end of 2018, is a consequence of an increase characterizing the period 2016-2017. As explained in the comment accompanying 2017 data, there is no specific reason for the increase in the number of incoming administrative law cases between 2016 and 2017. During this period there was an increase in the number of cases before the administrative courts (mainly claims under the Administrative Procedure Code, Management of Resources from the European Structural and Investment Funds Act, Tax and Social Insurance Procedure Code, Competition Protection Act, etc.).

Q091 (2017): 02/11/2018 7:17:04 AM There is no specific reason for the increase in the number of incoming administrative law cases between 2016 and 2017. During this period there was an increase in the number of cases before the administrative courts (mainly claims under the Administrative Procedure Code, Management of Resources from the European Structural and Investment Funds Act, Tax and Social Insurance Procedure Code, Competition Protection Act, etc.).

Q091 (2014): The number of all civil cases (litigious and non-litigious) considered as an overall category could be obtained by extracting from the total the number of administrative cases (67 513 pending cases on 1 January 2014; 294 657 incoming cases; 300 799 resolved cases; 61 371 pending cases on 31 December 2014.
Q091 (2012): The number of pending administrative law cases on 31 December 2012 has increased because of the increase of the number of incoming cases in 2010 and 2012. Administrative courts resolved about 72% on average of the cases during the year.
Q093 (General Comment): Till 2014, the sum of all civil and commercial cases (litigious and not litigious) heard by first instance courts was represented within item “other”. However, in order to ensure better consistency of the comparative analyses of the CEPEJ, starting from 2014 exercise, even the category “other” is answered by “NA”.

Q094 (General Comment): For most of the crimes, the Bulgarian Criminal Code provides for a deprivation of liberty, which makes the distinction hard to be made. The offences could be divided into two categories: common offences and offences subject to private prosecution. For the common offences, the search of responsibility is subordinated to the common regime (there is a public interest concerned or public interest and personal goods). Such are the crimes against individuals (homicide, grievous or intermediate bodily harm, rape, fornication and etc.), crimes against the property (the list is not exhaustive). As to the offences subject to private prosecution, the criminal proceedings are initiated upon a complaint by the affected person (personal interests of the affected person, and usually the affected person and the perpetrator are close relatives). Those offences have a lower degree of public danger and affect less the rights of the concerned person. Such offences are the minor bodily injury, the insult, the slander and etc.

Q094 (2020): It should be noticed that since 2020, the Unified Court Information System (UIS) has been gradually introduced in all courts, developed within the project “Creating a Model for Optimizing the Court Card of Bulgarian Courts and Prosecutor's Offices and Developing a Unified Court Information System” with the financial support of Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020.
Depending on the functionalities of the system, it may be possible to collect information on the next cycle according to the indicators mentioned in question 94.

Q097 (General Comment): The division by types of cases in the statistical forms published by Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria is quite different from the CEPEJ categorisation and for that reason breakdown cannot be made. Only administrative cases are possible to differentiate due to existence of administrative courts. In Bulgaria registry cases are under the competence of the Registry agency where is the property register, the commercial register, the BULSTAD register and the Register of the Property Relations between spouses. We should mention though that under current legislation Sofia City Court keeps a public register of political parties (https://sgs.justice.bg/bg/14755) and a public register of religious denominations having the status of legal entities. Sofia City Court is a Provincial/ Regional Court and as other regional courts acts as court of first and second instance. As far as registry cases are concerned Sofia City Court acts as first instance. So, there are some “other registry cases”, however, their number is insignificant. The special place and status of the Sofia City Court among the regional courts is determined by its competences, the most important of which are: claims for the recognition and enforcement of decisions of foreign courts, as well as requests for the recognition of a decision of a foreign court by an interested party that does not have a permanent address or seat on the territory of the Republic of Bulgaria.

Q097 (2021): As it is impossible to distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases for the present, for 2021 the following data is available as to the sum of all civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases: pending at the beginning 16 469; incoming 41 774, resolved 41 391 and pending at the end of the year 16 852.
Q097 (2020): “Total”: the decreases in the number of pending cases is due to growth in civil and commercial cases in 2019 which continued in 2020, but at a slower pace. As it is impossible to distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases for the present, for 2020 the following data is available as to the sum of all civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases: pending at the beginning 13 612; incoming 43 927, resolved 41 070 and pending at the end of the year 16 469.

Q097 (2019): See General comments

Q097 (2018): NA

Q097 (2016): There is no particular explanation for the downward trend observed between 2014 and 2016 in respect of the number of pending cases on 1 January for the categories "total" and "administrative law cases". All the data provided is correct.
Q097 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been explained that the number of pending administrative law cases on 31 December 2012 has increased because of the increase of the number of incoming cases in 2010 and 2012.

Q098 (2020): The specified sum does not include proceedings for which no penalties are imposed (pre-trial proceedings, enforcement proceedings). These proceedings are within the competence of other bodies in the Republic of Bulgaria.

Q098 (2018): NA

Q099 (General Comment): The data on the supreme courts are provided by the Supreme Court of Cassation and the Supreme Administrative Court on the basis of the information extracted from the case management systems implemented in these courts. The software of the Supreme Court of Cassation for extraction of statistical data is made according to a methodology developed in the Supreme Court of Cassation, as the codes for the respective type of cases are formed by a working group of judges in the Supreme Court of Cassation. This software, which allows the SCC to extract the statistics needed to answer Question 99, is different from the product used for other courts.
Since 2020, the Unified Court Information System (UIS) has been gradually introduced in all courts, developed within the project “Creating a Model for Optimizing the Court Card of Bulgarian Courts and Prosecutor's Offices and Developing a Unified Court Information System” with the financial support of Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020.
Administrative law cases- When preparing the statistical data for the judicial proceedings in the Supreme Administrative Court, existing specifics in connection with the formation and administration of the cases should be taken into account, which can be used to explain the discrepancies in the data. Part of the cases that have already been recorded as closed/completed in the statistics can be reopened, for example, when a party to the proceedings submits a request to cancel an effective court act. In the court's statistics, these cases, already declared closed, are again placed in the "pending" column, although at the time of their reporting, they have not yet been scheduled for consideration in an open court session. The final /total/ number of pending cases in the statistics of the Supreme Administrative Court also changes with the addition of cases on cancellation requests.

Q099 (2021): There are also some other non-litigious cases that are not included in the data. However, their number is insignificant.
Concerning the category "Civil and commercial litigious cases": the reasons for the difference between 2020 and 2021 are twofold: the large increase in caseloads in 2021 and the critical staffing of the Supreme court of cassation. 1. There are 836 pending cases as of December 31, 2021 more compared to those at the end of 2020, as the cases received in 2021 were 1105 more than those who entered in 2020. As a result of the amendments to the Civil Procedure Law, access to cassation appeals was expanded from the beginning of 2020 in cases related to consumer disputes, which in turn caused an increase in the number of cassation cases in the Civil College/Chamber and the Commercial College/Chamber. 2. The court in 2021 is not sufficiently staffed due to delays in the competitions for the appointment of judges in the Supreme Court, as well as due to the retirement of judges in 2021 - in the Civil College/Chamber - 3 judges, and in the Commercial College/Chamber - 1 judge.

Q099 (2020): The number of pending administrative cases decreased meaningfully because of reorganization of work in the Supreme Administrative Court (SAC). By issuing an internal order The Chairman/President of the SAC increased the workload of each judge to achieve these results.
The difference of two cases in the horizontal calculation/consistensy (indicated by the SCC 3863 cases instead of 3865-Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year) is due to two cases found in 2020, which were completed in the SCC in a previous period (before 2020), but were not correctly filled in then with all the details needed by the software to report the cases as completed. The adjustment was made in 2020, which actually reduces the number of cases for consideration by two, and the number of completed cases does not increase because the cases were completed in a previous period - before 2020.

Q099 (2019): There are some non-litigious cases that are not included in the data but their number is insignificant.

Q099 (2018): There are also some other non-litigious cases that are not included in the data. However their number is insignificant.
The number of pending administrative cases older than 2 years decreased meaningfully because of reorganization of work in the Supreme Administrative Court (SAC). By issuing an internal order The Chairman/President of the SAC increased the workload of each judge to achieve these results.

Q099 (2017): The answer for 2. Non litigious cases (2.1+2.2+2.3) is NAP for previous cycles as well.

Q099 (2016): The increase in the number of pending administrative law cases (in the beginning and at the end of the year) is explained by the fact that data has been provided by different sources for 2014 and 2016.

Q100 (General Comment): The software of the Supreme Court of Cassation for extracting statistics is different from the product used for other courts. The division of criminal cases according to the criteria set out in Question 100 was made on the basis of the definitions of the CEPEJ.
In the category “other criminal cases” are included: cases with charges on corpus delicti which doesn’t have independently application; cases on Chapter XXXIII Criminal Procedure Code (re-opening of criminal cases); private cassation proceedings (change of local jurisdiction, jurisdiction disputes, proceedings on returning of cassation claim/protest etc.); procedures regarding execution of judicial acts that are entered into force; proceedings regarding administration and/or movement of cases etc.

Q100 (2021): Explanation related to all differences reported under item 2 "Misdemeanors and/or minor criminal cases" (31.8%, 22.73%, -20.69%) and item 3 "Other criminal cases" (-45 % and 54.55%.):the reasons for the differences in percentages for the above types of cases compared to 2020 are mathematical. The figures for all the listed indicators for the reference years 2020 and 2021 are small, respectively, and the differences are small as an absolute value and do not reflect a significant change in the work on criminal cases in the Supreme Court of Cassation, but are recalculated in a large percentage difference. A more detailed mathematical explanation is obtained if each of these indicators is calculated, what percentage it represents in relation to the total number of cases for examination for the corresponding year, received by the Criminal Board of the Supreme Court. In 2020, there were 1 328 cases for consideration, while in 2021 - 1 407 cases. Taking into account the total number of cases for consideration in 2020 and 2021, the difference for which an explanation is due varies in absolute value from 0.76% to -1.79%. It is too small to be an indication of a significant change in the work of the Supreme Court of Cassation in criminal cases.

Q100 (2018): The “Other cases” group are: cases where the punishment for a committed crime depends on the punishment for other crime, that is established in the main text of the Criminal Code – it could be an offence of more severe or lightly punishment; cases on procedures related to the main case; cases on claims for re-establishment of criminal case; cases on jurisdiction disputes; cases on interpretation of a judicial act; cases on rehabilitation; cases that were instituted on a private appeal, etc. Some cases which were previously counted in misdemeanour/minor are now indicated under “other” which explains the decrease in the number of misdemeanour/minor criminal cases in respect of all categories – pending, incoming and resolved cases.

Q100 (2016): Comment on question 100
Till 2015 only the Supreme Court of Cassation was hearing the requests for resumption of criminal cases. In 2015 the Criminal Procedure Code was amended with the Law For Amendment and Supplementation of Criminal Procedure Code /SG, 42/2015/. According to the amendment the request for resumption of the criminal case grounded on art. 422, par. 1, p. 5 of the Criminal Procedure Code shall be heard by the respective court of appeal, when the judgments under art. 419 of the Criminal Procedure Code were decreed by a regional or district court, except of the new verdicts.
As a result of the legislative amendment, a significant part of the requests under Chapter Thirty-three of Criminal Procedure Code are heard by the courts of appeal in the state.
The above led to reduction in the number of cases related to the resumption of criminal cases heard by the Supreme Court of Cassation. This is also the reason for the presence of more than 20% deviation from the total number of criminal cases heard by the Supreme Court of Cassation during 2016 than those from previous years.

Q100 (2014): In the annual report of the Supreme Court of Cassation in 2012 (criminal division) the cases pending at the end of the reporting period were 260. In the report for 2013 the pending cases at the beginning of the period were 602 and the pending cases at the end of the reporting period were 671. Under Table 1 of the report for 2012, there is a note that the pending cases which are not included in the number of adjourned and private proceedings were filed in December 2012 at the registry of the Supreme Court of Cassation and are scheduled for consideration in January and February 2013. As a result, the total number of pending cases in 2014 appears much higher than in 2012.

Q101 (General Comment): Since there is no centralised Case Management System, the information on number of cases was summed up on the bases of the data collected from different courts and some mistakes are possible due to non-existence of control mechanism to check all the incoming courts data and spot eventual anomalies. Accordingly, some discrepancies can appear between data communicated for different cycles.
Q101 (2021): The Supreme Judicial Council does not collect separate statistics just for employment dismissal cases, but to them are also added the claims for annulment of the imposed disciplinary sanction "reprimand" and "warnings of dismissal".

Q101 (2020): The Supreme Judicial Council does not only collect separate statistics for "Employment dismissal cases", but also adds claims for revocation of the imposed penalty "remark" and "dismissal warnings". If this overall statistic will be useful for this row in the table of Q101, then the data for it are the following:
1. Pending cases on 1 January of the reference year - 749
2. Incoming cases - 1301
3. Resolved cases - 1121
4. Pending cases on 31 December of the reference year - 929
The increased number of pending “employment dismissal cases” and “insolvency cases” could be the result of the epidemiological situation in the country related to the spread of COVID - 19, as well as to the emergency measures introduced by the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria.

Q101 (2019): "Employment dismissal cases": the Supreme Judicial Council does not collect separate statistics only for the type of cases “employment dismissal cases”, but also adds in the statistics the claims for revocation of the imposed penalty "remark" and "dismissal warnings". "Cases relating to asylum seekers": in connection with the observed significant decrease in the number of cases received in 2018 and 2019 (217 in 2018 and 98 in 2019, respectively), we note that this is probably due to the significantly reduced number of foreign nationals, who sought asylum in the Republic of Bulgaria in 2019(2536 in 2018 and 309 in 2019, respectively).

Q101 (2018): The number of dismissal cases includes: "Claims for protection against unlawful dismissal and claims for annulment of the penalty imposed" note "and" warning of dismissal ".
There is no specific explanation as to why insolvency proceedings decreased during the reference 2018. There is also no specific explanation as to why the number of employment dismissal cases decreased.
Q101 (2017): Since there is no centralised Case Management System, the information on number of cases was summed up on the bases of the data collected from different courts and some mistakes are possible due to non-existence of control mechanism to check all the incoming courts data and spot eventual anomalies. Accordingly, some discrepancies can appear between data communicated for different cycles.
Q101 (2016): There is no particular explanation in respect of the observed variations. All the data provided is correct.

Q101 (2013): The increase in the number of pending insolvency cases on 1 January 2013 is due to the overall increase in the number of incoming cases justified by macroeconomic reasons, namely the global financial crisis.

Croatia

Q091 (2021): Between 2020 and 2021, there was an increase of incoming civil and commercial cases caused by the receipt of a large number of civil cases, namely lawsuits in labor disputes due to payment based on rights arising from the collective agreement, which occurred in the first quarter of 2021 and continued, to a somewhat lesser extent, throughout the rest of the year. Also there was an increase of the number of incoming enforcement cases that courts received during the last quarter of 2021, which was caused by a change of legislative framework in September 2021.

Q091 (2020): Regarding your comment about decreased number of incoming cases (except business registry cases) shown in this table: Due to the pandemic caused by COVID-19, in 2020., court proceedings for limited period in 2020 were submitted under specific conditions and measures, which contributed to decreased number of incoming cases, as well as court hearings especially in litigious cases.
Regarding the number of incoming non-litigious business registry cases - New article added by the Act on Amendments to the Court Register Act (Official Gazette No. 40/19) which came into force at the end of 2019., stipulated the obligation of companies to submit a request for entry of at least one e-mail address to the courts managing business registry. This was the reason for temporarily increased number of requests (cases), which were all resolved by the end of January 31, 2021.

Q091 (2019): In 2019 new amendments to the Personal Bankruptcy Law came into force. That caused significant income of other than criminal cases to the municipal courts. There was an increase in the number of land registry incoming cases too. The increased number of incoming land registry cases is caused by intensified economic activities and activities on the real property market. With the same number of employees working on these cases, pending cases increased at the end of the year. Additionally, a large number of citizens started civil lawsuits against banks regarding loans in Swiss currency. These factors combined led to the increase of pending cases at the end of the year as well. The decrease in the number of civil and commercial non litigious cases is due to enforcement cases: courts solved a significant amount of these cases during 2018, while the number of incoming cases decreased as well. For that reason, at the end of 2018 /beginning of 2019 there are fewer cases than at the end of 2017/ beginning of 2018.
As regards "administrative cases", administrative courts resolved more cases during 2018. That decreased the pending stock of the cases at the end of 2018/beginning of 2019.

Q091 (2018): Decrease of the number of incoming cases (34%) in category 2.1. in comparison to previous cycle is due to the significant decrease of enforcement cases which are calculated in this category. Majority of enforcement cases are aimed at debtor’s monetary assets based on trustworthy documents – i.e. documents that make the existence of debt highly plausible (such as regular utility bills, telecom operators’ invoices, credit card invoices, unpaid installments of bank loans, etc.). Those cases were removed from jurisdiction of courts to public notaries already in 2012., and since then there is year after year decrease of enforcement cases in municipal courts - enforcement based on other types of enforcement titles (other than trustworthy document), as well as enforcement against real property.

Q091 (2017): The cases relative to the Personal Bankruptcy Act which came into force on 1st January 2016 are handled by the 1st instance Municipal Courts. The data about these cases was not available in the moment of completing the questionnaire for the Evaluation (CEPEJ study for EU Scoreboard) (data 2016) but the data is now available within the ICMS system for the year 2017 and they are incorporated in the category 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases (including litigious enforcement cases and if possible without administrative law cases, see category 3). There were 268 pending Personal Bankruptcy cases on January 1st 2017, 377 incoming cases in 2017, 281 cases resolved in 2017 and 365 pending cases on 31st December 2017.
"Registry cases": In this category there is more than 20% increase of pending cases at the beginning of reference year in comparison to the beginning 2016. The reason are land registry cases. As stated in the previous cycle, the reason for the increased number of pending land registry cases is the significant income of these cases during 2016 and the difficulty for courts to cope with this income in same amount as in 2015. This all reflects on data for 2017.
The reason for the decrease in the number of pending administrative cases at the end of the 2017 is laying in the fact that administrative courts received almost 18% less cases than in 2016. Although judges resolved less cases than in previous year, in relation to the income, it was enough to decrease the number of pending cases at the end of 2017 for more than 20%.

Q091 (2016): More land registry cases has been received in 2016 than in 2014 so the total number of registry cases has increased as well.
During the two-year period (through 2014 and 2015), administrative courts accumulated unresolved cases - they solved significantly less than they received, which led to 15024 pending cases at the beginning of 2016. By the end of 2015, a total of 5 judges were transferred to administrative courts from other legal branches, which resulted in better results in 2016 (more resolved cases).

Q091 (2015): In 2015 the reorganization of the judicial system in the Republic of Croatia, which is partly related to the reorganization of the second instance proceedings, has been carried out. Consequently, in the county courts there has been a harmonization of case registers and case codes (litigious, non-litigious and other) in a way that in 2015 courts carried out the alignment and correction of the indication of certain types of second-instance civil cases. For this reason, in 2015 the correction of the category of cases according to the new methodology of monitoring has been carried out.

The total of all categories is aligned with the continuity of previous cycle (horizontal consistency), whereas the individual categories in the column “Pending cases on Jan. 1 2015” are presented under the new revised indication of the types of cases. For example, some cases that have been categorized in previous cycles under category 'Other', the courts have categorized according to the certain types of dispute which was possible after new case registers were open (e.g. Enforcement – Security by lien on the basis of an agreement of the parties).

Q091 (2014): In 2014, a new methodology of monitoring unresolved land registry cases was introduced, in a way that regular land registry cases (i.e. registration, note, caution) are not being monitored anymore and are not presented in the total. Other land registry cases (i.e. objections, appeals, specific corrections,etc.) are still being monitored. The overall number of enforcement cases is subsumed in the category “general civil and commercial non-litigious cases”. The Municipal Civil Court undertook the harmonization of data due to data migration. After the new standardization of the audit, the Supreme Court has started to be less up-to-date since the number of received cases is far beyond the number of cases which may be resolved (priority is given to urgent and old cases).

Q091 (2013): The implementation of the ICMS system resulted in unification of data into one reporting system. The category “general civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes inheritance cases but excludes company registry cases. The increase of the incoming “civil and commercial litigious cases” was mostly due to the continuity of the negative economic situation, while the efforts of judges, as well as broadening the scope of powers of court advisors resulted in the increase of resolved cases. The implementation of the enforcement on pecuniary means carried out by the Financial Agency (FINA) led to decreases in respect of “non-litigious enforcement cases”. Since 2013, court advisors deliver a decision in land registry cases, while the judge supervises its content. The competence of other persons for issuing land registry was also established, electronic delivery of submissions and e-notice board were introduced.

Q091 (2012): Till December 2011, “administrative law cases” were adjudicated at the Administrative Court. Provided that the latter was overburdened, a two-instance administrative adjudication was introduced in January 2012. 4 regional administrative courts were established as first instance courts, while the former Administrative Court became second-instance High Administrative Court. Since 2012, there is a mandatory oral court hearing of the parties before the first-instance courts.

Q092 (2014): For 2013 and 2014, the provided examples concern only question 92: exercise of the parental care; meeting and spending time with parent; obtaining the capacity to exercise rights of minor that became parent; decision with whom the child will be living; issuing of the permit for entering into marriage before age of majority; deprivation/returning of capacity to exercise rights; deprivation/returning /prolongation of parental care; deprivation of parents’ right to live with the child and raise the child; content of court will; security of evidence; setting-up/derogation of necessary passage; setting-up of court deposit, opening of a safe; verification of a contract on life-long support; amortization of documents; trust of a child with behavioural disorder; the recognition of foreign court decisions; declaring a missing person dead; co-ownership dissolution; meetings and spending time with grandmother, grandfather, sister, brother, half-sister, step-brother; land borders; regulation of relations between co-owners; restraining a child; providing legal aid; conclusion of court settlement; inheritance statement; proof of death; regulation of co-ownership relationships; boundaries and necessary passage; determination of extramarital union; other- family non-litigious proceedings; storage of the testament; providing international legal assistance; verification; other –the rest of non-litigious proceedings; international child abduction; other - proclamation of the deceased and proof of death; the appointment of members of the companies body; the appointment of auditors, temporary/interim administrator; the safeguard of evidence; the establishment of a court deposit; opening of the safe deposit box; registry cases; previous measures; forcible establishment of lien; temporary measure; temporary and previous measures, recognition of arbitration decisions; recognition of a foreign court decision; cases entering in the scope of Article 4 point 2 of the Companies Act; court insurance by the transfer of ownership and rights.

Q092 (2013): For 2013 and 2014, the provided examples concern only question 92: exercise of the parental care; meeting and spending time with parent; obtaining the capacity to exercise rights of minor that became parent; decision with whom the child will be living; issuing of the permit for entering into marriage before age of majority; deprivation/returning of capacity to exercise rights; deprivation/returning /prolongation of parental care; deprivation of parents' right to live with the child and raise the child; content of court will; security of evidence; setting-up/derogation of necessary passage; setting-up of court deposit, opening of a safe; verification of a contract on life-long support; amortization of documents; trust of a child with behavioural disorder; the recognition of foreign court decisions; declaring a missing person dead; co-ownership dissolution; meetings and spending time with grandmother, grandfather, sister, brother, half-sister, step-brother; land borders; regulation of relations between co-owners; restraining a child; providing legal aid; conclusion of court settlement; inheritance statement; proof of death; regulation of co-ownership relationships; boundaries and necessary passage; determination of extramarital union; other- family non-litigious proceedings; storage of the testament; providing international legal assistance; verification; other –the rest of non-litigious proceedings; international child abduction; other - proclamation of the deceased and proof of death; the appointment of members of the companies body; the appointment of auditors, temporary/interim administrator; the safeguard of evidence; the establishment of a court deposit; opening of the safe deposit box; registry cases; previous measures; forcible establishment of lien; temporary measure; temporary and previous measures, recognition of arbitration decisions; recognition of a foreign court decision; cases entering in the scope of Article 4 point 2 of the Companies Act; court insurance by the transfer of ownership and rights.

Q092 (2012): For the 2012 exercise, the provided indications constitute replies to both questions 92 and 93.
The non-litigious cases were divided in the following categories:
1. Non-litigious cases referred to issues on personal status (status law): restriction, deprivation and returning of capacity to exercise rights; prolongation of parental care; deprivation and restriction of parental care; permit for entering into marriage; confession of fatherhood; detention in the institutions for mental diseases; promulgation of vanished persons dead and proving of death;
2. Non-litigious cases referred to property issues: inheritance proceedings; regulation of co-ownership relations; division of property and voluntary transmission of common property; boundary regime/regulation; amortization of decrees; conduction of different registers;
3. In the scope of non-litigious cases there have been developed special, different units: bankruptcy proceedings; liquidations and forced settlements; land registry proceedings; enforcement proceedings.

Q093 (2014): In 2013 and 2014 the reply NAP in respect of the category "other" is due to the fact that a bankruptcy registry has not been established in the Republic of Croatia.
Q093 (2013): In 2013 and 2014 the reply NAP in respect of the category "other" is due to the fact that a bankruptcy registry has not been established in the Republic of Croatia.
Q093 (2012): For the 2012 exercise, the provided indications constitute replies to both questions 92 and 93. Non-litigious cases were divided in the following categories:
1. Non-litigious cases referred to issues on personal status (status law): restriction, deprivation and returning of capacity to exercise rights; prolongation of parental care; deprivation and restriction of parental care; permit for entering into marriage; confession of fatherhood; detention in the institutions for mental diseases; promulgation of vanished persons dead and proving of death;
2. Non-litigious cases referred to property issues: inheritance proceedings; regulation of co-ownership relations; division of property and voluntary transmission of common property; boundary regime/regulation; amortization of decrees; conduction of different registers;
3. In the scope of non-litigious cases there have been developed special, different units: bankruptcy proceedings; liquidations and forced settlements; land registry proceedings; enforcement proceedings.

Q094 (2021): In category "Other cases" are included (from last cycle) cases related to criminal matters in first instance: execution of sanctions (imprisonment), investigation actions of a judge, cases connected to procedural matters (e.g. panel of judges decision about detention, about prolongation of detention, about confirmation or dismissal of indictment, etc.)

Q094 (2020): In category "Other cases" are included (from last cycle) cases related to criminal matters in first instance: execution of sanctions (imprisonment), investigation actions of a judge, cases connected to procedural matters (e.g. panel of judges decision about detention, about prolongation of detention, about confirmation or dismissal of indictment, etc.)
Regarding decreased number of resolved minor criminal cases: Due to the pandemic caused by COVID-19, in 2020., court proceedings for limited period in 2020 were submitted under specific conditions and measures, which contributed to decreased number of court hearings, also in minor criminal cases.
Regarding horizontal inconsistency: For most of the categories, the full horizontal inconsistency can not be ensured, due to some adjustments and changes in the Case Management System used by courts.

Q094 (2018): In category "Other cases" are included (from this cycle) cases related to criminal matters in first instance: execution of sanctions (imprisonment), investigation actions of a judge, cases connected to procedural matters (e.g. panel of judges decision about detention, about prolongation of detention, about confirmation or dismissal of indictment, etc.)

Q094 (2016): Starting from 1 June 2013, when the Act on Amendments to the Misdemeanours Act (OG 39/2013) entered into force, the inflow of first-instance misdemeanour cases displayed in this table continuously and significantly had been reduced. The number of resolved cases reduced as well, but due to a significant decrease in inflows, the number of unresolved cases reduced by the end of the period. This reflected also on High Misdemeanours Court, whose data is shown in this table.

Q094 (2014): The new Criminal Procedure Act entered into force in September 2011, introducing the investigation conducted by the State Attorney Offices (instead of court investigation), as well as new and wider opportunities for negotiating settlements. Besides, the decrease of the total number of misdemeanour cases at all levels was the main goal of adopting the Act on the Amendments of the Misdemeanour Act in 2013. The definition of misdemeanour act was changed, the principle of opportunity as well as the simplification of the procedure were introduced, more active role was given to the plaintiff etc. The Register of Unpaid Fines was established. There is no more suspension of the proceedings because of the statute of limitations.

Q097 (2019): Due to legal changes, the High Administrative Court of RoC started to receive more cases from 2016. With the same amount of judges, they did not manage to cope well with this income of case, therefore pending cases increased.

Q097 (2018): In category 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases there has been a decrease in the number of pending cases at the beginning of the period, received cases, resolved cases and also pending cases at the end of the year. This seems to be the trend for several years now. Although these courts are resolving less cases than in previous period, due to the reduced income, pending cases are still significantly decreased. Reduced number of received civil litigious and commercial cases on second instance do not have reason in for example law changes. Simply because less cases are resolved at first instance, less appeals are lodged to the second instance.
The increased number of pending administrative law cases at the beginning and at the end of the year as well as received cases is due to the extended jurisdiction of the High administrative court following law changes. The latter led to an increased inflow of cases and difficulty for the High administrative court to cope successfully with the income of second instance cases, especially since the number of judges remain the same as before law changes. This comment was provided also for last cycle. The rest of the categories which have increase or decrease in pending cases is just an effect of the incoming or resolved cases.

Q097 (2017): The increased number of pending administrative law cases at the beginning and at the end of the year is due to the extended jurisdiction of the High administrative court following law changes. The latter led to an increased inflow of cases and difficulty for the High administrative court to cope successfully with the income of second instance cases. This comment in more details was provided also for last cycle.
In this category there is more than 20% increase of pending cases at the beginning of reference year in comparison to the beginning 2016. The reason are land registry cases. Reason for increased number of pending land registry cases is decreased number of resolved cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (87%) during previous year (2016.) which affected results for 2017. In 2017, second instance courts also resolved less than received land registry cases.
The reason for the decreased number of pending business registry cases at the beginning of 2017 in comparison to the beginning of 2016 is the number of resolved cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (104%) during 2016. The lower number of received cases and Clearance rate of 106% lead to the decrease of the number of pending business registry cases at the end of 2017. The reason for the decreased number of pending "other non-litigious cases" at the beginning of 2017 in comparison to the beginning of 2016 is the significant number of resolved cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (185%!!) during 2016. Regarding the increased number of incoming cases of this type, there are in absolute numbers very few cases (154) and although there is an increase of more than 20% in comparison to previous year, we think that there is no significant explanation for this, which would affect the trends in following cycles. As for the decrease in the number of resolved "other non-litigious cases", there is no significant explanation for this, but we think that it will not influence the trend in future cycles.
The reason for the decrease of pending civil and commercial litigious cases older than 2 years in second instance courts lays in the fact that in 2017 second instance county courts and the High Commercial Court resolved significant amount of cases in relation to received cases (122%) with special focus on older cases. This led to a decrease of more than 17% of all pending cases and more than 30% of pending cases older than 2 years.
The reason for the decrease of pending non-litigious cases older than 2 years in second instance courts lays in the fact that in 2017 second instance county courts and the High Commercial Court resolved more cases than received (103%) with special focus on older cases. This led to decrease of more than 7% of all pending cases and more than 30% of pending cases older than 2 years (of which they have few in the beginning).The reason for the decrease of pending "general civil and commercial non-litigious cases" older than 2 years in second instance courts lays in the fact that in 2017 second instance county courts and the High Commercial Court resolved more cases than received (103%) with special focus on older cases. This led to decrease of more than 7% of al pending cases and more than 30% of pending cases older than 2 years (of which they have few in the beginning).The reason of the increase of pending registry cases older than 2 years in this category is entirely due to the increase of the number of pending land registry cases older than two years. The reason is already explained - the increase of pending cases in total is due to the difficulty of second instance courts to cope with the income of these cases. Finally, in respect of administrative law cases, due to the decrease of number of pending cases of this type in total, there is also decrease for 8 cases of pending cases older than 2 years (as stated before, we do not think that this is significant change taking into consideration absolute numbers and type of cases).

Q097 (2016): Second instance land registry cases, due to introducing separate case registers for certain type of cases on second instance courts,are now traceable as such in case management system. They have been taken out from Other non-litigious cases, where they were presented in previous cycles. The number of administrative cases, both in incoming and pending cases at the end of period is increasing. This is due to the law changes, which have extend jurisdiction of this court and consequently increase income of cases and unresolved cases at the end of period.

Q097 (2014): It is noteworthy that in 2012 and 2013, the ICMS could not recognize and divide cases into litigious or non-litigious. In 2014, the ICMS was improved as Croatia introduced updated and a very detailed code table, in order to extract more detailed case types from the system. Therefore, now the distinction between all cases in litigious and non-litigious cases as well as other types of cases can be made very accurately. This change of methodology of categorisation affected the difference between pending cases on 31 December 2013 and pending cases on 1 January 2014 which will disappear in the next cycle.

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2013 exercise it has been explained that the discrepancies that can be observed in respect of the category “total of other than criminal cases” between the number of pending cases indicated for December 2012 and the number of pending cases communicated for January 2013, result from an administrative correction of a specific small number of cases by the second instance courts after the closure of the statistic period, which the reporting system then generates as a difference concerning previously rendered data.
As to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, owing to a different methodology of presentation of data, the number of pending cases in the end of 2012 does not coincide with the number of pending cases in the beginning of 2013. The number of pending cases on 31 December 2012 included second instance-civil and commercial courts’ cases, bankruptcy cases, general non-litigious cases, enforcement cases, land registry cases and company registry cases. Since 2013, it is possible to provide data on the second-instance civil and commercial litigation cases and bankruptcy cases separately from the general non-litigious cases, enforcement cases, land registry cases and company registry cases.
The variations observed with regard to the category “total of other than non-criminal law cases” for the period 2010-2013 can be explained by the negative economic situation in Croatia, which resulted in the increase of incoming commercial and civil cases before first instance courts and consequently led to the increase of the second instance cases.

Q097 (2012): As to the variations observed in respect of the “administrative law cases”, they are justified by the reform related to the administrative justice. Basically, till December 2011, they were adjudicated at the Administrative Court of the Republic of Croatia. Provided that the latter was overburdened, the two-instance administrative adjudication was introduced in January 2012. Four regional administrative courts were established as first instance courts (Zagreb, Osijek, Rijeka and Split), and former Administrative Court became second-instance High Administrative Court (appellate court).

Q098 (2021): In category "Other cases" are included cases of execution of imprisonment sanctions on county courts in second instance.

Q098 (2018): Starting from 1 June 2013, when the Act on Amendments to the Misdemeanors Act (OG 39/2013) entered into force, the inflow of first-instance misdemeanor cases had been reduced up to the point where there was no more justification for keeping specialized courts for these types of cases. This led also to continuous decrease of second instance misdemeanor cases, which is also the case in this reporting cycle.
Category "Other cases" - category introduced in this cycle: in case of Croatia, cases calculated here are cases of execution of imprisonment sanctions on county courts in second instance.

Q098 (2016): Starting from 1 June 2013, when the Act on Amendments to the Misdemeanours Act (OG 39/2013) entered into force, the inflow of first-instance misdemeanour cases displayed in this table continuously and significantly had been reduced. The number of resolved cases reduced as well, but due to a significant decrease in inflows, the number of unresolved cases reduced by the end of the period.

Q098 (2014): According to 2014 data and pursuant to the Act on the Amendments of Misdemeanour Act which entered into force in 2013 (OG 39/13), possession of drugs for personal usage is no longer a criminal act but a misdemeanour act. That provision enabled disburdening of the county courts. Furthermore, municipal courts became competent for criminal act of unauthorized production and trafficking of drugs (which was previously in the jurisdiction of county courts and made a share of 40-50% of all cases dealt with by the county courts).

Q098 (2013): Generally speaking, the decrease of the total number of misdemeanour cases at all levels was the main goal and purpose of adopting the Act on the Amendments of the Misdemeanour Act in 2013 (OG 39/13) in which the definition of misdemeanour act was changed, the principle of opportunity as well as the simplification of the procedure were introduced, the more active role was given to the plaintiff. Moreover, specific measures were introduced: if the fine is paid when caught in committing a misdemeanour offence, it is considered as paid if the half of the amount was paid immediately, and if the deadline was prescribed, it is considered as paid if the 2/3 of the amount was paid. Moreover, the enforcement procedure conducted on monetary assets is more efficient. The Register of Unpaid Fines was established.
According to the new misdemeanour provisions, there is no suspension of the proceedings because of the statute of limitations. Every court decision is being enforced, fines are being paid, therefore strengthening the general prevention and withdraw of committing misdemeanour offences. All of the above said leads to the reduction of the number of misdemeanour cases at both courts’ instances: misdemeanour courts and High Misdemeanour Court of the Republic of Croatia

Q099 (2017): Regarding the answers in this question, cases dealt with by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, as the highest instance court in the RoC, have been presented. We are unable to show separately the required categories. The Supreme Court of the RoC is in the process of preparing the implementation of the ICMS, which will in future enable the expression of cases by types. Source for this data is published data by the Supreme Court of the RoC for year 2017 on their website.

Q099 (2016): Due to a large influx of revision proceedings and a slower solving of cases in 2014 and 2015, at the beginning of 2016 the number of pending cases continues to increase. However in 2016 the Supreme Court of the Republic od Croatia significantly resolved more cases than in previous cycle and the number of pending cases had decreased compared with 2015 althought not when compared with 2014.

Q099 (2015): In the table 99. cases dealt by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, as the highest most instance court, have been presented. We are unable to show separately the required categories. The Supreme Court is in the process of preparing the implementation of the ICMS, which will in future enable the expression of cases by types.

Q099 (2014): After the new standardization of the audit, the Supreme Court has started to be less up-to-date since the number of received cases is far beyond the number of cases which the existing judges and advisors at the Supreme Court may solve. In resolving the cases at the Supreme Court, advantage is given to urgent cases (determined by laws) and to old cases.

Q100 (2021): There has been a decrease of incoming criminal law cases between 2020 and 2021 following the establishment of the High Criminal Court on 1st of January 2021, which took over part of the previous Supreme Court’s jurisdiction.

Q100 (2018): The table shows cases under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the epublic of Croatia, as the highest judicial authority in the Republic of Croatia.

Q100 (2016): The table shows cases under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, as the highest judicial authority in the Republic of Croatia. We are not able to present the data separately for “Severe criminal cases” and “Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” due to the fact that the implementation of the Integrated Case Management System at the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia is underway. It will enable the track record of the cases by type.
The significant decrease of the number of pending cases at the beggining of 2016 in the Supreme Court is due to the fact that since beginning of 2014 this court continuously solves more cases than it receives and also because in 2015 there was a further reduction in inflow of cases.

Q100 (2014): For 2014, the table shows cases under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, as the highest judicial authority in the Republic of Croatia. Data on “severe criminal cases” and “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” could not be presented separately due to the fact that the implementation of the Integrated Case Management System at the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia is underway. It will enable the track record of the cases by type.
When comparing 2012, 2013 and 2014 data, it can be noticed a trend of decrease of the total number of incoming criminal cases, which is a result of legislative amendments, suspension of extraordinary legal remedy (request for extraordinary mitigation of penalty), as well as the decrease of the number of cases in which the decision about an appeal to investigative imprisonment needs to be decided on.

Q101 (2021): Between 2020 and 2021, there was an increase of incoming insolvency cases because from April 2020 until October 2020, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, a special law was in force (Law on intervention measures in foreclosure and bankruptcy proceedings for the duration of special circumstances) and there were no incoming bankruptcy and enforcement cases in courts.
Q101 (2019): Courts competent for "employement dismissal cases" solved more cases during 2018., which led to the decrease of pending cases at the end of 2018./beginning of 2019.
As regards insolvecies, in previous years, due to some legislative changes we had higher income of insolvency cases. The income of shortened bankruptcy procedures which was product of those changes stopped, so this is income is rather "normal" for Croatia (more or less similar to the income in years before aforementioned changes).

Q101 (2018): The reason for decreasing the number of pending insolvency cases lies in the new Bankruptcy Act, which entered into force in September 2015. Since then, and throughout the first half of 2016, many shortened bankruptcy proceedings have been initiated ex officio and finished in relatively short period (that was "unnaturally" large income of simple insolvency cases). Cycles defined in aforementioned Law of initiating these procedures by FINA finished, so 2018. actually reflects regular state of insolvency proceedings regarding income of insolvency cases.

Q101 (2017): "Litigious divorce cases" - regarding the decrease in the number of pending cases at the beginning of reference year in comparison to the beginning 2016., the reason lays in the fact that first instance municipal courts resolved significant number of cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (148%!!) during 2016., while the income of these cases, as stated in previous cycle decreased in comparison to the 2015. In 2017, courts resolved less cases than in 2016., but nevertheless more than they received which led to the decrease of pending cases at the end of 2017.
"Employment dismissal cases": Regarding the decrease in the number of pending cases at the beginning of reference year in comparison to the beginning 2016., the reason lays in the fact that first instance municipal courts resolved significant number of cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (133%!!) during 2016. Municipal courts received less cases of this type. The reason lays in the fact that in general, income of labour cases decreased in 2017. with no specific reason in sense of law changes etc. Lower number of recieved cases and Clearance rate of 137% lead to the decrease of the number of pending cases at the end of 2017.
Insolvency cases: in 2015. new Insolvency act was introduced. Significant number of companies were subject of shorened insolvency proceeding conducted by commercial court. Cycles defined in aforementioned Law of initiating these procedures by FINA finished by the mid of 2016., so 2017. reflects regular „movement“ of insolvency cases.

Q101 (2016): Regarding insolvency cases, 2015 was the year when, by introducing new Insolvency act, significant number of companies were subject of shortened insolvency proceeding conducted by commercial courts. Cycles defined in aforementioned Law of initiating these procedures by FINA finished, so 2016 actually reflects regular state of insolvency proceedings regarding income of insolvency cases. Relating the reduced number of incoming divorce cases, the number of divorces with minor children dropped in 2016. Namely, according to the new Family Law which came into force on 1 November 2015, couples with children, before initiating the court proceeding, have to undergo mandatory family mediation at social welfare centres. This fact postpones court proceedings and therefore there are fewer cases in court in 2016.

Q101 (2015): Regarding the Litigious divorce cases, the Republic of Croatia point out that in 2015 there have been amendments to the Family Act, due to which a certain number of family cases were no more resolved in a litigious, but in non-litigious proceedings. For this reason, the number of cases in this category for 2015 is presented decreased (e.g. if these cases remained within the same category, the result would be as follows: Pending at the beginning of 2015 – 4 595, Incoming – 9 253, Resolved – 8 756 and Pending at 31.12.2015 – 5 092 cases).

There is an increase of incoming insolvency cases due to the fact that on 1 September 2015 the new Insolvency Act came into force. The Act stipulates that the court will conduct an shortened insolvency proceedings regarding the legal person if the following conditions are met:
- If it has no employees
- If the FINA Register has unexecuted orders for forced payment for a continuous period of 120 days
- If preconditions for a second proceeding for deletion from the court registry are not fulfilled.

The Financial agency (FINA) is obliged, for legal persons who, on the day of the entry of the Insolvency Act into force, have had unexecuted orders for forced payment in the FINA Register for a continuous period of 120 days submit request to the court to initiate the shortened insolvency proceeding.

In view of the above provisions and the fact that at the time of the entry into force of the Insolvency Act there was more than 20.000 legal persons for which the preconditions were met to initiate the shortened insolvency proceedings, the number of incoming insolvency cases in 2015 increased significantly compared to previous years.

Q101 (2014): The increase in the number of pending bankruptcy cases on 1st January 2014 is due to the fact that many companies have gone bankrupt in 2013, thus there were a large inflow in 2013 in relation to other periods. The same reason accounts for the decrease in the number of incoming bankruptcy cases in 2014, when compared with the outlier in 2013.

Q101 (2013): The category “employment dismissal cases” includes dismissal of employment contract cases, determination of employment relationship cases and termination of employment cases.

Cyprus

Q091 (General Comment): The reason for not having data for the subcategories of cases is that there was no electronic filing system that would enable us to have statistical data on different types of cases.
Q091 (2021): In the administrative cases, the applications for international protection are included and there was an increase in these applications in 2021, as a result of more asylum seekers coming into Cyprus. From 1 January 2021, the Review authority for refugees was abolished.
Q091 (2020): In the previous cycle a big number of cases were tried together. This is the reason why number of resolved cases in 2020 might appear lower than in 2019.
Reducing delays in the disposition time is part of the reform process. The difference in the pending cases in administrative cases compared with previous year is that in this figure we included the cases filed before the Administrative court of international protection which was set up.

Q091 (2019): In the previous campaigns the number of cases filled and resolved was increased as a result of a big number of cases filed together (in one bundle) and tried together.
Q091 (2018): The increase in the number of resolved cases is a consequence of the cases tried together. For number of administrative cases, it should be taken into account that cases were consolidated and that 2724 consolidated cases were withdrawn.
Q091 (2017): The variation concerning incoming (total) and resolved (total and administrative) cases (decrease) is due to the fact that, in 2016, cases were filed and tried in a bundle but each was considered separately for statistical purposes. Put differently, cases were joined together and therefore there was an increase in the number of resolved cases. Accordingly, we can observe a decrease in the number of resolved cases between 2016 and 2017.

Q091 (2015): Variations: The increase in the number of pending cases between 2010 and 2015 is a result of the bail in Cyprus a lot of administrative cases had been filed against that decision.
The reason for the decrease in the number of resolved cases is that the bail in cases had been consolidated and was tried jointly after 31st of December 2014.

Q091 (2014): The increase in the number of pending cases is a result of the bail in Cyprus; a lot of administrative cases had been filed against that decision. The reason for the decrease in the number of resolved cases is that the bail in cases had been consolidated and was tried jointly after 31st of December 2014.

Q094 (General Comment): The reason for not having data for the subcategories of cases is that there was no electronic filing system that would enable us to have statistical data on different types of cases.
Q094 (2018): There were fewer criminal cases in 2018.

Q094 (2014): As a result of the bail in, the total number of first instance criminal pending cases on 1 January 2014 increased with 27% between 2012 and 2014.
Q097 (General Comment): The case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in this question as second instance cases, although Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court."

Q097 (2021): Increase in resolved cases: cases tried together.

Q097 (2020): Reducing delays in the disposition time is part of the reform process. In administrative cases in 2019 a big number of cases were tried together. The cases that had the same subject matter were filed individually but were consolidated and tried together but for statistical purposes they were calculated separately. This is the reason why number of resolved cases in 2020 might appear lower than in 2019. The difference in the pending cases in administrative cases compared with previous year is that in this figure we included the cases filed before the Administrative court of international protection which was set up.
The reason we do not have statistical data on subcategories of cases is that the electronic filing system was not introduced that would enable to have statistical data on such cases.

Q097 (2019): The Administrative law cases include the cases from the administrative court which was established in 2018.

Q097 (2017): appeals filed against decisions of the administrative courts which was established in 2016 should be included in the pending cases on 1.1.2017 as Other cases include family court appeals
Variation between 2016 and 2017 in administrative cases (incoming and resolved): this icludes appeals filed against decisions of the administrative court
Q097 (2016): The Supreme Court is the appeal court.

Q098 (General Comment): The case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in this question as second instance cases, although Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court."

Q098 (2020): with regard to criminal appeals less were filed.

Q098 (2016): There was an increase in the cases pending between 2014 and 2016. With regard to the increase of number of cases resolved this was due to the creation of the administrative court and therefore the Supreme court did no longer had to deal with first instance administrative cases.
Q099 (General Comment): Q99 is NAP because Cyprus has a two tier system therefore the supreme court is the second, highest and final instance court.
Q099 (2018): Cyprus only has a two tier system. The Court of Appeal is also the Supreme Court, therefore the relevant data could be found in the section on second instance cases.
Q099 (2016): The supreme court is the appeal court

Q100 (General Comment): The peculiarity of the judicial system of Cyprus is that the Supreme Court is the appeal and the final instance court.
Q100 (2020): The Supreme Court is also the appeal court

Q100 (2018): Cyprus only has a two tier system. The Court of Appeal is also the Supreme Court, therefore the relevant data could be found in the section on second instance cases.
Q100 (2016): The supreme court is the appeal court

Q101 (General Comment): Reducing delays in the disposition time is part of the reform process. Some data are missing because we did not have an electronic filing system.
The increase in the number of employment dismissal cases since 2010 is the result of the crisis.
Q101 (2021): In the previous cycle the number was higher because a bundle of cases were tried together.

Q101 (2019): The number of cases relating to asylum seekers reflects the period between June 2019 (date of establishment of the Administrative court for international protection) till December 2019.
The incoming and resolved employment dismissal cases include a bundle of 204 cases concerning overtime arrears against the Cyprus telecommunication authority.
Q101 (2017): in the litigious divorce cases 192 cases pending on 1.1.16 of the family court of Famagusta were not included
Concerning the employment dismissal cases, the variation (decrease) between 2016 and 2017 is due to the fact that in 2016 many cases were filed after companies were closed many of which were later withdrawn.

Czech Republic

Q091 (General Comment): For years 2010, 2012 and 2013, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts (question 97). On the contrary, since 2014, administrative cases, business registry cases and insolvency cases (and also some litigious cases) which are still decided by the second instance courts acting as first instance courts, are subsumed within the table of question 91 (which was already the case for the 2008 exercise). Methodology has been changed in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases. There are no further changes expected.

Q091 (2021): Business registry cases are very quickly resolved and there is quite a variance between years. The number of cases is probably affected by many factors – new laws, economic situation and much more. This is also reflected in the number of pending cases.
2.3 Other non-litigious cases - It is relatively minor and “not very important” case type. The number of cases is quite small. It follows that there is big variance in the data between years.

Q091 (2020): The registry cases are very quickly resolved and the numbers can vary between years significantly. In 2019, courts managed to resolve more cases than was the number of incoming cases, which led to decrease in pending cases. The same explanation applies to “other non-litigious cases”. The number of cases is quite small. It follows that there is big variance in the data between years. Furthermore, during 2019 courts managed to resolve significantly more cases than in 2018, no special reasons were reported other than a fact that number of cases is relatively small and the cases are not complex. This also resulted in further redaction of the number of cases at the end of 2019. In 2020, the courts again managed to resolve more cases than was the numer of incoming cases for both registry cases and other non-litigious cases.
Bussiness registry cases are very quickly resolved and there is quite a variance between years. The number of cases is probably affected by many factors – new laws, economic situation and much more.
Other cases: The number of incoming cases has grown, probably due to changes in insolvency legislation.

Q091 (2019): The registry cases are very quickly resolved and the numbers can vary between years significantly. Last year, courts managed to resolve more cases than was the number of incoming cases, which led to decrease in pending cases at 1 January of the reference year. For Other non-litigious cases the same reasons apply for the number of cases at the beginning of the year. Furthermore, during 2019 courts managed to resolve significantly more cases than last year, no special reasons were reported other than a fact that number of cases is relatively small and the cases are not hard. This also resulted in further redaction of the number of cases at the end of the reference year. For incoming Other cases, there was a legislative change in insolvency law that is probably a reason for the significant grow in the number of incoming cases.

Q091 (2018): Methodology has been changed in 2.1 and 2. (civil and commercial non-litigious cases) in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases.

Q091 (2017): Methodology has been changed in 2.1 and 2. (civil and commercial non-litigious cases) in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases. Generally the number of incoming cases is decreasing, more use of ADR.
In the previous year the number of resolved cases greatly exceeded the number of incoming cases for other non-litigious cases, which led to huge drop in pending cases and discrepancy appeared.
Non-litigious business registry cases are very easy to resolve and the variance between years in the number of cases (incoming, resolved and pending) is quite big in general. Thus the annual change could easily be (and is) greater than 25 %.
Courts have problems with resolving administrative cases. It follows that number of incoming cases was last year much bigger than number of incoming cases. Thus number of pending cases increased greatly cases and discrepancy appeared.
As to Other cases, insolvency cases are reported. This is relatively new and very specific agenda, which usually takes 5 years to resolve. There was an increase in case fillings five years ago, which resulted in growth in the number of resolved cases nowadays. On the other hand, for various reasons (including legislative changes) the number of incoming cases is decreasing.

Q091 (2016): Methodology has been changed in 2.1 and 2. (civil and commercial non-litigious cases) in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases. Generally the number of incoming cases is decreasing, more use of ADR.

Q091 (2015): Methodology has been changed in 2.1 in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases.

Civil and commercial non-litigious cases include: 2.1 - uncontested payment orders, cases of the upbringing and maintenance of a minor, declaration of admissibility of taking or keeping of a person in a medical (health care) institution, declaration of the death of a person, inheritance proceedings, judicial deposit cases

Category "other includes: insolvency cases and incidence disputes

Q091 (2014): For 2014, business register cases, administrative cases, insolvency registry cases and also some litigious cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts are subsumed within the table of question 91.

For 2014 the category “other” encompasses insolvency cases.

In 2014, the high increase of insolvency cases is due to numerous cases of personal bankruptcies as well as to an unfavourable economic situation.

Q091 (2013): For 2013, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts. In 2014, these cases (and also some litigious cases) are subsumed within the table of question 91.

For 2012, the category of enforcement cases concerns exclusively enforcement carried out by the court itself, while for 2013, this category encompasses also enforcement ensured by private executors (in this procedure, the court authorizes the private executor to proceed to the enforcement and decides about remedial measures against executor’s decision). For 2012, the category “other” includes electronic payment orders and probate proceedings, while for 2013 it encompasses only electronic payment proceedings. Moreover, in respect of the electronic payment orders, there was a switchover to another register and 174.067 cases were transferred to a new register. The discribes evolutions affect the total.

Q091 (2012): For 2012, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts. In 2014, these cases (and also some litigious cases) are subsumed within the table of question 91.

Variations between 2010 and 2012 concerning the number of pending cases on 1st January, the number of incoming cases and the number of pending cases on 31 December stem from the high number of incoming electronic payment orders in 2011. Besides, more enforcement cases are handled by private executors.

Q092 (2014): For all of the four exercises (2010, 2012, 2013 and 2014) the category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases encompasses cases of upbringing and maintenance of a minor. In 2014, it subsumes also declarations of admissibility of taking or keeping a person in a medical (health care) institution and declarations of death of persons.

Q093 (General Comment): For 2010 and 2012 the category “other” subsumes electronic payment orders and probate proceedings, while for 2013, it encompasses only electronic payment orders. By contrast, for 2014, its content covers insolvency cases. Since 2015 category "other cases" includes insolvency cases and incidence disputes.

Q094 (General Comment): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases".

Q094 (2018): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases"

Q094 (2014): Severe criminal cases are crimes in respect of which the law provides for a minimum term of imprisonment of 5 years. They are decided by regional courts acting in first instance. Minor criminal cases are tried by district courts in first instance, regional courts being the appellate courts in such matters.

Q097 (General Comment): It is noteworthy that the methodology of presentation of data has been changed since the 2014 exercise. In fact, for 2010, 2012 and 2013, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts (question 97). On the contrary, since 2014, administrative cases, business registry cases and insolvency cases (and also some litigious cases) which are still decided by the second instance courts acting as first instance courts, are subsumed within the table of question 91 (which was already the case for the 2008 exercise). However, this change is not reflected in question 46 concerning the number of second instance judges because it is very difficult to distinguish among them judges working on administrative cases, business registry cases and insolvency cases (and also some litigious cases).

Q097 (2020): In general, number of incoming cases is decreasing and it follows that the numbers of pending cases and resolved are decreasing as well (the situation is getting better). This may result in some big yearly changes and discrepancies.
Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: In general, number of incoming cases is decreasing (mostly because number of first instance cases is decreasing too) and it follows that the number of pending cases is decreasing as well (the situation is getting better). This may result in some big yearly changes and discrepancies.
Other cases: The variations are the result of changes in first instance agenda. This category includes insolvency cases and there were numerous legislative changes in last years. Also, it must be noted that the number of pending cases is relatively small, thus the variance is bigger.

Q097 (2019): In "Other cases" category, insolvency cases are reported.
In general, number of incoming cases is decreasing and it follows that the numbers of pending cases and resolved are decreasing as well (the situation is getting better). This may result in some big yearly changes and discrepancies.

Q097 (2018): In "Other cases" category, insolvency cases are reported.
In general, number of incoming cases is decreasing and it follows that the numbers of pending cases and resolved are decreasing as well (the situation is getting better). This may result in some big yearly changes and discrepancies.

Q097 (2017): In "Other cases" category, insolvency cases are reported. In this year the number of resolved insolvency cases greatly exceeded the number of incoming insolvency cases, which led to huge drop in pending cases at the end of the year and discrepancy appeared. The changes are connected to changes in first instance insolvency agenda.

Q097 (2016): Increase in the number of "other cases" in 2015 and 2016 is due to the change of methodology applied to these data.
Q097 (2015): Increases in the number of "other cases" are due to the change of methodology applied to the 2015 data.

Q097 (2014): In 2014, the high increase of insolvency cases is due to numerous cases of personal bankruptcies as well as to an unfavourable economic situation.
Q097 (2013): For the 2013 exercise, the totals do not include the number of non-litigious business registry cases which is not available.

Q097 (2012): For the 2012 exercise, the totals do not include the number of non-litigious business registry cases which is not available.

Q098 (General Comment): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases".
The data provided involves appeals and complaints (corrective measure against a resolution). Instead of "Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court" "Pending cases older than 1 year from the date the case came to the second instance court" are provided.
Q098 (2021): The number of pending cases older than 2 years is very low in second instance and thus it follows that there is a big variance in the data between years.
Q098 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 evaluation cycle, it has been specified that the total number of criminal cases includes severe criminal cases decided by second instance courts acting in first instance and appeals against decisions of the first instance courts in criminal matters. On the contrary, in 2010, the total encompassed only the number of appeals, while the number of severe criminal cases was not subsumed. Accordingly, due to the different methodology of presentation of data, the comparison between the 2010 and 2012 figures should be qualified.

Q099 (General Comment): Other cases: This category includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes.
Q099 (2021): Other cases: This category includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes.

Q099 (2020): Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: After several years of steady growth in the incoming cases, the incoming cases started to decrease in 2018. This is mainly due to legislative changes and drop in first and second-instance agenda in previous years. Thanks to this decrease the Supreme court was able to resolve part of its backlog and thus pending cases significantly decreased.
Civil (and commercial) non litigious cases: The variations should be put into perspective due to small absolute values.
Administrative cases: The Supreme court is overburdened and encounter difficulties to resolve its cases thus the number of pending cases grow quite quickly. It is connected to grow in number of administrative first-instance cases and growing tendency to fill an appeal to Supreme Administrative Court.
Other cases: This category includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes. The changes are the result of changes in second-instance agenda. Also, it must be noted that the number of pending cases is relatively small, thus the variance is bigger.

Q099 (2019): Court was overburdened last year (there was much higher number of incoming cases than it managed to resolve), so there is a big increase in the number of pending Administrative cases.
Q099 (2018): The category “other” includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes.

Q099 (2017): The category “other” includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes. This whole agenda is relatively new (since 2008) and it takes quite a long time to resolve a case (several years). Since the agenda is new, it took several years before the number of first-instance incoming cases stopped growing and reach somehow stable level. Of course, the number of appeals (second instance) and incoming case second instance cases started to grow as well, but later. For simplicity, it can be said that Supreme Court deals with appeals in final (third instance). It follows that the number of final instance cases in this agenda also started to grow and again, later than the number of incoming cases in second instance. Thus the number of incoming cases in this agenda (insolvency cases and incidence disputes) is currently growing. The court seems to be struggling to deal with this growth in number of incoming cases, yet it is difficult to understand the reasons behind it, as the growth does not seem to be very high in absolute numbers.

Q099 (2016): In 2016 the administrative cases were added and for that reason all numbers show variation. Previously the number of administrative cases on this instance was NA.

Q099 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 evaluation cycle, it was specified that the civil and other cases are within the competence of the Supreme Court, while the administrative cases are within the competence of the Supreme Administrative Court.
Q100 (General Comment): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases"
Q100 (2020): Total of criminal cases: The variations should be put into perspective due to small absolute values.

Q100 (2018): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases"
Q101 (General Comment): It is not possible to provide the data on “employment dismissal cases”, “Robbery cases” and “Intentional homicide” since the source of data we mostly use for CEPEJ reporting does not distinguish case types to such a detail. We have these (more detailed) data from other sources, which however contains only cases, where the decision is legally effective. And thus, we can provide number of cases, where the decision is legally effective, average case length etc. However, this data does not allow us to determine number of incoming cases, pending cases or resolved cases.

Q101 (2020): In last years, there were many legislative changes in insolvency law. That results in relatively big changes in the number of cases.
Q101 (2019): There was a legislative change in insolvency law. We believe that this change resulted in significant grow in the number of incoming cases. The number of resolved cases also increased. The reason might be that number of incoming cases peaked in 2013 and the length of many insolvency cases is 5 years due to legislative reasons.

Q101 (2017): This is relatively new and very specific agenda, which usually takes 5 years to resolve. There was an increase in case fillings five years ago, which resulted in growth in the number of resolved cases nowadays. On the other hand, for various reasons (including legislative changes) the number of incoming cases is decreasing.
There was an amendment of insolvency law in 2017 which introduced e. g. obligatory processing of insolvency motion by specialised entities or broadening of reasons for discontinuance of proceedings due to the lack of, or little, estate.

Q101 (2013): The increasing trend concerning the category of insolvency cases is due to the economic situation. More particularly, the number of personal bankruptcies is increasing.

Denmark

Q091 (General Comment): As concerns "non-litigious business registry cases", it is important to note that pending cases always may vary a lot as it is a residual figure when pending prior to the period, received and resolved cases are counted. Furthermore, the reason for the discrepancy is that we do not have pending figures from the Maritime and Commercial High Court. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious is encompassed in the number of “civil and commercial litigious cases”..
With regard to "non litigious land registry cases", it should be pointed out that due to the high amount of incoming and resolved cases, the residual figure of pending cases prior and after the period may vary..

Q091 (2020): 2020 was an unusual year because of the Covid-19 related close down of society, including close down of courts. It created more pending cases as the prosecution continued to forward new cases to the courts that could not deal with it. Land registration is the major source of incoming cases. It fluctuates a lot depending on interest rates, loan rescheduling etc.
2.1. General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases: The courts have successfully reduced the number of pending cases. As concerns "2.2.2. Non-litigious business registry cases", it is important that because of new regulations/laws, it is possible to start a new company with no prior capital. This causes many more companies and many more closures in some categories and also affect number of pending cases, like for non-litigious business registry cases. The courts received many extra backlogged cased from the Danish Commerce and Companies Agency reenforced closure of companies that were still backlogged in the early 2020. The courts were closed for 3 weeks except for vital cases and government assistant to companies helped them and reduced bankruptcies and closures of companies that would normally have happened.

Q091 (2019): Variation in land registration (loans etc) as market and interest rates always vary from year to year.
For non-litigious business registry cases: Received markedly fewer enforced cases re enforced closure in 2019 than in 2018; Solved many extra insolvency cases in the beginning of year 2019 received in late autumn / winter 2018; pending cases on 31 December - It is important to understand the figure, that we succeeded to include pending cases from the Maritime and Commercial court.

Q091 (2018): As concerns "non-litigious business registry cases", it is important that because of new regulations/laws, it is possible to start a new company with no prior capital. This causes many more companies and many more closures in some categories and also affect number of pending cases, like for non-litigious business registry cases. Besides from that it is important to note that pending cases always may vary a lot as it is a residual figure when pending prior to the period, received and resolved cases are counted. Furthermore, the reason for the discrepancy is that we do not have pending figures from the Maritime and Commercial High Court. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious is encompassed in the number of “civil and commercial litigious cases”.
With regard to "non litigious land registry cases", it should be pointed out that due to the high amount of incoming and resolved cases, the residual figure of pending cases prior and after the period may vary.

Q091 (2017): The figures provided in respect of this question are not fully consistent. The Maritime and Commercial Court only measures incoming and resolved insolvency cases but not pending cases. Accordingly, when the data on processed/resolved cases from this court are included, there will always be a small inconsistency. Therefore, vertical and horizontal figures are not totally consistent.
Concerning the category "land registry cases", the number of pending cases on 1 January 2017 is a residual figure from received, finalized and pending cases ultimo the year; it may deviate from pending cases ultimo 2016, but it is a residual figure. The number of pending cases on 31 December 2017 is an actual figure. Concerning the category "registry cases", it is specified that the Maritime and Commercial Court does not publish pending cases which results in a discrepancy.

Q091 (2016): As concerns "non-litigious business registry cases", it is important that because of new regulations/laws, it is possible to start a new company with no prior capital. This causes many more companies and many more closures in some categories and also affect number of pending cases, like for non-litigious business registry cases. Besides from that it is important to note that pending cases always may vary a lot as it is a residual figure when pending prior to the period, received and resolved cases are counted. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious is encompassed in the number of “civil and commercial litigious cases”.
With regard to "non litigious land registry cases", it should be pointed out that due to the high amount of incoming and resolved cases, the residual figure of pending cases prior and after the period may vary.

Q091 (2014): Due to an improved business situation, courts at all levels receive fewer cases, i.e. civil cases, enforcement cases, forced sales, insolvency cases; pending cases are also reduced thereby. Non-litigious business registry cases follow the overall tendency.
Q091 (2013): The successive decrease observed in the number of civil and commercial litigious cases stems from the possibility to reopen cases and the missing data on pending cases before the Maritime and Commercial Court. As for the land registry cases, following the digitalizing in 2009 of land registry, the number of pending cases decreased markedly.

Q092 (General Comment): Paternity, adoption, guardianship and others in the same category; cases under inquisitorial procedures..
Q093 (General Comment): Estate after a deceased person, notary, insolvency cases not included under 2.2.2. above..

Q094 (General Comment): Danish Court Administration has not worked out a statistics on pending cases older than 2 years. When we categorize cases as "severe", it does not mean that privation of liberty is the end result, but based on the category chosen by the court to deal with the case could include severe cases. Minor cases are typically fines that will never have as a result of privation of liberty. Probably there are too many cases under the category "severe" then, but that is the figures we have..

Q094 (2021): 2020 was an unusual year because of the Covid-19 pandemic, related close down of society, including close down of courts. It created more pending cases as the prosecution continued to forward new cases to the courts that could not deal with it.

Q094 (2020): 2020 was an unusual year because of the Covid-19 related close down of society, including close down of courts. It created more pending cases as the prosecution continued to forward new cases to the courts that could not deal with it.

Q094 (2018): Our statistics on criminal cases does not have data on pending cases older than 2 years. We can not differentiate pending cases according to age. When we categorize cases as "severe", it does not mean that privation of liberty is the end result, but based on the category chosen by the court to deal with the case could include severe cases. Minor cases are typically fines that will never have as a result of privation of liberty. Probably there are too many cases under the category "severe" then, but that is the figures we have.

Q094 (2016): Our statistics on criminal cases does not have data on pending cases older than 2 years. We can not differentiate pending cases according to age.
The reason pending cases per 31 December 2016 has decreased is that the courts have resolved more cases than incoming cases.

Q094 (2014): For the period 2010-2014, district courts have been able to resolve more cases than the number of incoming cases, especially concerning minor criminal cases (traffic offences etc.) which have been given a higher priority. In 2012, district courts received more minor criminal cases due to a new procedure according to which the police sent cases where citizens haven't paid their fines to courts. This was changed again in the end of 2012 where warnings were sent out first and the number of minor cases dropped therefore markedly in 2013. In 2014 the number of received minor criminal cases has gone up again following a decision of the police to step up on issuing fines for traffic offences. Besides, city courts resolved more cases through the plea guilty procedure.

Q094 (2012): The Courts of Denmark received an extraordinary appropriation in 2009 specifically to bring down backlogs. This effect can be seen in 2012, among other things in the lower number of pending cases. The increase in the number of misdemeanor and/or minor criminal cases is due to the fact that a high number of cases concerning, especially, traffic fines were handled at court level.

Q097 (General Comment): It is noteworthy that all appellate cases are considered as "litigious cases" which explains the reply NAP for all the other categories, as well as the fact that the total coincides with the number of civil and commercial litigious cases. The number of "administrative law cases" which are litigious is encompassed in the number of "civil and commercial litigious cases".
Another important remark concerns cases that are not first instance cases before the two High Courts and which are included in question 97. Cases that begin as first instance at one of the two High Courts are not included in the figures in table 97.

Q097 (2016): Pending cases may vary a lot depending on the ratio of resolved cases compared to incoming cases. We can observe a decrease of about 30 % of pending cases ultimo the 2016. This is due to this "residual" nature of pending cases. The decrease in the pending cases between 2014 and 2016 is because in both calendar years 2015 and 2016 the number of resolved cases exceed the number of incoming cases.

Q097 (2014): In the ambit of the 2014 exercise, it has been emphasized that due to an improved business situation, courts on all levels receive fewer cases, i.e. civil cases, enforcement cases, forced sales, insolvency cases. Generally speaking, pending cases are also reduced thereby.

Q098 (General Comment): All criminal cases at 2nd instance are considered severe as they would otherwise not become 2nd instance criminal cases. We can not differentiate pending cases depending on their age. There might be cases though that would not fulfil the criteria of a severe case. About one third of the cases may be smaller or bigger issues from the cases in the district courts that are appealed to one of the two High Courts before proceeding at the district courts and then finally settled in the district court. It is not possible to see if it an issue is from a severe case in the district or a case that is not severe. Then the whole case may afterwards be appealed to one of the two High Courts when the district courts have come to a final judgment.

Q098 (2020): 2020 was an unusual year because of the Covid-19 related close down of society, including close down of courts. It created more pending cases as the prosecution continued to forward new cases to the courts that could not deal with it.

Q098 (2016): All criminal cases at 2nd instance are considered severe as they would otherwise not become 2nd instance criminal cases. We can not differentiate pending cases after how old they are.

Q099 (General Comment): All cases at the Supreme Court are considered litigious.

Q099 (2021): There is no special reason explaining the increase in the number of incoming cases. It should be recalled that 2020 was a special year because of the lockdown. The Supreme court depends on the two High Courts to receive cases and they send a few more cases to the Supreme court in a year without lockdown compared with 2020.

Q099 (2019): resolved and incoming cases have not markedly changed. So it is pending cases that varies. But pending cases are residual numbers and will typically vary from year to year.
Q099 (2018): In the Danish context, non-litigious cases do not make sense. Pending cases may vary as it is residual in nature and is depending on the number of incoming and resolved cases and the ratio between those two.
it is also important, when we talk discrepancy, that there is a year between previous and present year (2016 - 2018). 2017 is missing, so data - in particular pending cases - may vary.

Q099 (2017): Pending cases primo and ultimo 2017 for the Supreme Court is found based on pending cases ultimo 2016, received cases in 2017 and resolved cases in 2017. Put differently, pending cases are now generated based on pending ultimo 2016 and cases in 2017.
Q099 (2016): In the Danish context, non-litigious cases do not make sense. Pending cases may vary as it is residual in nature and is depending on the number of incoming and resolved cases and the ratio between those two.

Q099 (2015): The number of incoming cases ("other than criminal cases") dropped between 2010 and 2015. Since the instance reform in 2007, the Supreme Court is now almost only a third instance court (instead of being partly a second instance court and partly a third instance court). Indeed, first instance pending cases at the two High Courts in 2007 have gradually already been appealed or finalised.
Q099 (2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, the attention was drawn on the fact that the number of incoming and resolved cases before the Supreme Court was still falling, since the reform of 1st January 2007. Before 2007, many cases started in one of the two High Courts and could be appealed directly to the Supreme Court as second instance. Since 2007, almost all cases start at the lowest level and consequently, much fewer cases are appealed to the Supreme Court. This effect of still fewer cases appealed to the Supreme Court following the reform could still be seen from 2012 to 2014.

Q100 (General Comment): All cases at the Supreme Court are considered severe.

Q100 (2018): Data are from the yearly report 2018 from the Supreme Court,
http://www.hoejesteret.dk/hoejesteret/embedsregnskab/Documents/Årsberetning2018.pdf

Q100 (2016): Based on the data the Danish Court Administration got, it is not possible to show pending criminal cases.

Q100 (2014): For 2014, the number of pending criminal cases was not available.
The number of received criminal cases has fallen all the years since 2010, except from 2014 where it went up with 7 cases and the same number of criminal cases were received as in 2012. It is worth mentioning that the Danish Court Administration differentiates between cases that are fully appealed and cases in respect of which a specific point is appealed (i.e. should the person being charged stay in custody while the case is on-going). The number of cases fully appealed has varied between 27 and 14 over the period 2010-2012-2013-2014 (in 2013 and 2014 there were 14 received cases). Completed “full cases” have varied between 32 and 12 cases (in 2014 there were 12 completed criminal cases). The rest of the cases were related to specific questions.
Therefore, and due to the instance reform as well, the Supreme Court has over the years dealt with fewer and fewer cases.

Q101 (General Comment): To be sure to have consistent information, pending cases prior to the period in question is calculated based on received, finalized and pending cases ultimo the period in question. It should be noticed that all cases from the District Courts regarding marriage and paternity/maternity are considered litigious divorce cases.
We have not answered the question regarding how many pending cases exceed 2 years.

Q101 (2021): To be sure to have consistent information, pending cases prior to the period in question is calculated based on received, finalized and pending cases ultimo the period in question. It should be noticed that all cases from the District Courts regarding marriage and paternity/maternity are considered litigious divorce cases.
We have not answered the question regarding how many pending cases exceed 2 years. "Pending litigious divorce cases on 31 December 2021": The reason for the high figure in 2021 is that the courts resolved 800 fewer cases than they received. A new administrative set-up to deal with divorse cases was introduced and created backlogs.

Q101 (2020): Litigious divorce cases: The reason for the discrepancies is a new system to deal with Family cases from April 2019 that gave more cases in 2020.
Insolvency cases: There was a market increase in the number of bankruptcy cases at the Maritime and Commercial Court in 2020 compared to 2018 following a number of backlogged forced closures of companies in 2019 by the Danish Commerce and Companies Agency.
Employment dismissal cases, robbery cases and intentional homicide cases are not registered under these categories in the case registration system. Employment dismissal cases are just civil cases, and the two criminal cases are registered under criminal cases.

Q101 (2019): It should be noticed that all cases from the District Courts regarding marriage and paternity/maternity are considered litigious divorce cases. From April 1, 2019 a new law addressing divorces and togetherness with children and legal housing for children was implemented. It may have had an effect in the number of cases as administrative decisions to some degree become court decisions.
There is a change of numbers of pending insolvency cases as we succeeded to include the Maritime and Commercial Court's pending insolvency cases in the overall figure. We can see over numbers of years, that there is an increasing number of bankruptcy cases. This can be seen too from 2018 to 2019 where there is an increase in the number of bankruptcy cases.

Q101 (2018): It should be noticed that all cases from the District Courts regarding marriage and paternity/maternity are considered litigious divorce cases.
There is a change of numbers of pending insolvency cases as we succeeded to include the Maritime and Commercial Court's pending insolvency cases in the overall figure.

Q101 (2016): Please note concerning insolvency: The number of cases concerning compulsory dissolution of companies has increased markedly due to new regulation where it is possible to start a company without starting capital. Accordingly, more companies are started, but more companies are also then closed. As concerns the number of pending insolvency cases, the data refers only to district courts given that data related to the Maritime and Commercial court is not available.

Q101 (2015): A decrease in the number of litigious divorce cases can be observed from 2010, it is most likely due to a change in the administrative proceedings, i.e. fewer cases end up in the courts.

Estonia

Q091 (General Comment): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

Q091 (2021): The increased number of administrative law cases pending at the end of 2021 is due to COVID-19 related cases that have taken more time to be solved.
Concerning general civil and commercial non litigious cases, it should be mentioned that during the second Covid-19 year, courts processed cases that they were not able to process during the first Covid-19 year.

Q091 (2020): MoJ
In 2020, there have been difficulties with filling the vacancies of judge positions in the biggest county court (judges going on maternity leave or retirement), which may have resulted in an increase in pending cases older than 2 years in general.

Q091 (2019): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

Q091 (2018): The variations in total and in the non litigious cases are due to the number of entrepreneurs that has grown every year, so the number of incoming case is also increasing. Furthermore, the number of real estate transactions has increased and the market is active.The number pending cases end of 2017 is different because the numbers are taken later and the data has been corrected.

Q091 (2017): There are not any particular reasons to explain variations in the number of non-litigious business registry cases, causing variations in respect of the category "registry cases" and "non-litigious cases". As regards item 2.1 “general civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, there is an important discrepancy between the number of pending cases on 31 December 2016 and the number of pending cases on 1 January 2017. The reason is related to the time the numbers have been taken out of the system (see general comment). The fifth column “pending cases older than 2 years”, includes cases that are suspended (part 9 of our Code of Civil Procedure, https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/506022018001/consolide). The proceedings may be suspended for example if the one of the parties dies or fells seriously ill; or if in order to solve the dispute the court needs a resolution of an another case.

Q091 (2016): The decrease in the number of incoming administrative court cases is due to the decrease in the number of inmate complaints. The variations in total and in the non litigious cases are due to increase of incoming business and land registry cases.

Q091 (2014): The increase in the number of incoming administrative law cases is due to a rise of complaints of prisoners. As to the decrease in the total of pending other than criminal law cases on 1 January 2014, the performance indicators of courts have justified supplementary budget resources. Agreements between the Ministry of Justice and courts are expected concerning the efforts that need to be undertaken in court to clear the backlog and accelerate proceedings. For 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases are included in the category “general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”.

Q091 (2013): As to non-litigious business registry cases and the observed decreases, in 2012 it was impossible to separate supervisory proceedings from general proceedings and therefore 2012 data included supervisory proceedings as well. The number of pending “civil and commercial litigious cases” decreased on account of the enhanced efficiency of the first instance courts, while the decrease in the number of incoming cases is due to the reestablishment of the normal case-flow after the economic crises.

Q091 (2012): The land register (together with the marital property register) and the commercial register (together with the non-profit associations and foundations register, commercial pledge register and ship register) are part of the county courts. “Land registry cases” and “business registry cases” refer to the registration procedure, including supervisory proceedings over undertakings. Disputes arising from the registration procedure are subsumed in “general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“. The dynamics of the “civil and commercial non litigious cases” is considerably influenced by the payment order proceedings that form the largest part of this category and are dealt with by only one courthouse. The 2012 data includes enforcement, land and business registry cases.

Q094 (General Comment): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

Q094 (2020): Other criminal cases: for example different enforcement and pretrial cases. The pandemic has affected the courts activity in criminal matters in general. The criminal procedure law was not as flexible when judges had to work online. The complete revision of the criminal procedure law is ongoing and will come into force next year.

Q094 (2018): Increase of incoming misdemeanor and minor criminal cases.

Q094 (2016): Misdemeanour cases can be joined and solved together in court. Cases that can lead to deprivation of liberty of less to five years are still included under severe criminal cases.
Because the distinction between severe and minor criminal cases is not the same with the CEPEJ, data for subcategories can be found below : Severe criminal cases : Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 803
Incoming cases : 7628
Resolved cases : 7463
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 824
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : 23
Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases :
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 1835
Incoming cases : 10032
Resolved cases : 10628
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 891
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : 3

Q094 (2014): The variations observed over the years 2010, 2012 and 2014 are most likely due to the fact that the Ministry of Justice and the biggest court in Estonia (Harju County court) had an agreement setting the target for eliminating backlogs.

Q094 (2012): Horizontal inconsistency within the table stems mainly from the joinder and severance of criminal matters. Following a law amendment of March 2011, claims against enforcement of misdemeanour decisions are brought before bailiffs and not before courts.

Q097 (General Comment): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

Q097 (2021): In 2021, a general increase in the case load of circuit courts is observed.

Q097 (2019): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

Q097 (2015): In respect of the civil and commercial non-litigious cases, the increase from 2013 in the number of pending cases resulted from the implementation of an efficiency-raising project in 2013 in Harju County Court. Accordingly, the efficiency of the latter increased significantly in civil cases. Owing to the fact that this court is the largest 1st instance court dealing with 1/3 of all of the cases in Estonia, it had an impact on the case-flow of the second instance courts (only 2 appeal courts competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters).
As to the administrative cases, it is noteworthy that as there are only 2 appeal courts in Estonia competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters, every change in the number of 2nd instance judges influences the statistics of the Courts of appeal. Between 2010 and 2012 there were a few vacant administrative judges’ positions in one of the appeal courts which had an impact on the number of pending cases

Q097 (2014): On the occasion of the 2014 exercise, it has been emphasized that there has been an ongoing reform concerning the court budgets and judicial performance indicators. Agreements have to be adopted on the occasion of the budget negotiations between the Ministry of Justice and the courts concerning the efforts that need to be undertaken in court to clear the backlog and accelerate proceedings.
As to the increase of the total of pending other than criminal cases (beginning and end of the year), the reason is that 1st instance courts started the project of clearing backlogs and accelerating proceeding earlier. As a result, the number of incoming cases in 2nd instance courts increased in 2013 and resulted also in an increase of the number of pending cases by the end of the year 2013.
For 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases are included in the category “general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”.

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2012 and 2013 exercises, several clarifications were provided.
Firstly, in respect of the civil and commercial litigious cases, the observed variations were deemed to be normal, as a part of the ordinary dynamics of the case-flow.
Secondly, in respect of the civil and commercial non-litigious cases, the increase in the number of pending cases resulted from the implementation of an efficiency-raising project in 2013 in Harju County Court. Accordingly, the efficiency of the latter increased significantly in civil cases. Owing to the fact that this court is the largest 1st instance court dealing with 1/3 of all of the cases in Estonia, it had an impact on the case-flow of the second instance courts (only 2 appeal courts competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters). Owing to that, in 2014 one civil judge’s position was given to the Tallinn Appeal Court in order to raise their efficiency.
As to the enforcement procedures, they are in the competence of public bailiffs who are completely independent from the judicial system but act as public authorities. The reply NA is justified by the impossibility to distinguish in the bailiffs’ information system the enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is court decision from all the other enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is for example a fine made by police, an administrative act made by the tax authority etc.
In respect of the land registry and business registry cases, it should be recalled that they are within the competence of the 1st instance courts. If the decision of the registry is appealed, it goes to the first instance court as a regular civil case.
As to the administrative cases, it is noteworthy that as there are only 2 appeal courts in Estonia competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters, every change in the number of 2nd instance judges influences the statistics of the Courts of appeal. Between 2010 and 2012 there were a few vacant administrative judges’ positions in one of the appeal courts which had an impact on the number of pending cases.

Q097 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 and 2013 exercises, several clarifications were provided.
Firstly, in respect of the civil and commercial litigious cases, the observed variations were deemed to be normal, as a part of the ordinary dynamics of the case-flow.
Secondly, in respect of the civil and commercial non-litigious cases, the increase in the number of pending cases resulted from the implementation of an efficiency-raising project in 2013 in Harju County Court. Accordingly, the efficiency of the latter increased significantly in civil cases. Owing to the fact that this court is the largest 1st instance court dealing with 1/3 of all of the cases in Estonia, it had an impact on the case-flow of the second instance courts (only 2 appeal courts competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters). Owing to that, in 2014 one civil judge’s position was given to the Tallinn Appeal Court in order to raise their efficiency.
As to the enforcement procedures, they are in the competence of public bailiffs who are completely independent from the judicial system but act as public authorities. The reply NA is justified by the impossibility to distinguish in the bailiffs’ information system the enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is court decision from all the other enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is for example a fine made by police, an administrative act made by the tax authority etc.
In respect of the land registry and business registry cases, it should be recalled that they are within the competence of the 1st instance courts. If the decision of the registry is appealed, it goes to the first instance court as a regular civil case.
As to the administrative cases, it is noteworthy that as there are only 2 appeal courts in Estonia competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters, every change in the number of 2nd instance judges influences the statistics of the Courts of appeal. Between 2010 and 2012 there were a few vacant administrative judges’ positions in one of the appeal courts which had an impact on the number of pending cases.

Q098 (General Comment): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database. Other criminal cases: The enforcement and pretrial cases do not exist in the second instance.
Q098 (2020): The pandemic has affected the courts activity in criminal matters in general. The criminal procedure law was not as flexible when judges had to work online. The complete revision of the criminal procedure law is ongoing and will come into force next year.

Q098 (2016): Discrepancies are due to the numbers being quite small. Number of incoming cases depends on the crimes being committed and the number of resolved cases depends on.
Because the distinction between severe and minor criminal cases is not the same with the CEPEJ, data for subcategories can be found below :
Severe criminal cases : Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 71
Incoming cases : 745
Resolved cases : 762
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 54
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : 0
Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases :
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 9
Incoming cases : 208
Resolved cases : 214
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 3
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : 0

Q098 (2014): The variations observed over the years 2010, 2012 and 2014 are most likely due to the fact that the Ministry of Justice and the biggest court in Estonia (Harju County court) had an agreement setting the target for eliminating backlogs.

Q099 (General Comment): It is noteworthy that the discrepancies that can be observed between the number of pending cases indicated for December of one year and the number of pending cases communicated for January of the next year, are due to the fact that the statistic system is alive and courts are entitled to modify and up-date data at any time.
Moreover, differences in the horizontal consistency may be explained by the fact that during the proceedings some cases are joined and some are disjoined.

Q099 (2016): The number of pending cases has increased because the number of cases where the Supreme Court has decided to open proceedings in the Supreme Court has increased.
Q100 (General Comment): The Supreme Court is the court of cassation, therefore only those cases are heard which have been given leave to appeal (i.e. that have been declared admissible for proceedings in the Supreme Court). The data presented shows the number of cases which have been actually heard by the Supreme Court and not the number of appeals. The Supreme Court is not required to give reasons in its ruling on the admissibility of the appeals.

Q100 (2021): The Supreme Court did not provide a specific explanation with regard to the decrease in the number of resolved criminal cases, but if we look the overall reasons, they are Covid-19 related.
Q100 (2020): The pandemic has affected the courts activity in criminal matters in general. The criminal procedure law was not as flexible when judges had to work online. the complete revision of the criminal procedure law is ongoing and will come into force next year.
Q100 (2016): Numbers are quite small. No special reason for discrepancies. Because the distinction between severe and minor criminal cases is not the same with the CEPEJ, data for subcategories can be found below :
Severe criminal cases : Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 18
Incoming cases : 82
Resolved cases : 73
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 27
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : NA
Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases :
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 6
Incoming cases : 26
Resolved cases : 29
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 3
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : NA

Q100 (2014): The variations observed in 2014 are not of importance, since the numbers are small.

Q100 (2012): In 2012, the higher number of criminal cases compared to 2010 was a result of the higher number of cases where the decision of the lower court was appealed. As regards the number of misdemeanour cases before the Supreme Court, the number of appeals was not much lower compared to 2010 but the number of cases accepted by the Supreme Court was lower (in 2010 the Supreme Court declared admissible 35% of the appeals, while in 2012 only 21% of the appeals were accepted).

Q101 (General Comment): It is noteworthy that the discrepancies that can be observed between the number of pending cases indicated for December of one year and the number of pending cases communicated for January of the next year, are due to the fact that the statistic system is alive and courts are entitled to modify and up-date data at any time.
It is possible to observe differences in the horizontal consistency since during the proceedings some cases are joined and some are disjoined.

Q101 (2019): For all the discrepancies - the numbers are so small so that's why the percentage is so significant.

Q101 (2015): The numbers of pending, incoming and resolved employment dismissal cases decreased from 2012 (compared to 2010). This variation is supposedly related to the fact that more cases are effectively resolved by the labour dispute committees, less cases arrive to the courts.
In 2014, the number of resolved litigious divorce cases increased. This is justified by the fact that courts are working more efficiently and have accelerated the proceedings.
Q101 (2014): The increase in the number of resolved litigious divorce cases in 2014 is justified by the fact that courts are working more efficiently and have accelerated the proceedings.
Q101 (2012): The decrease in the numbers of pending, incoming and resolved employment dismissal cases in 2012 is supposedly related to the fact that more cases are effectively resolved by the labour dispute committees, less cases arrive to the courts.

Finland

Q091 (General Comment): The pending cases older than two years are not collected in Finland.

Q091 (2021): Comments The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 12.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt by the administrative courts, the Market Court and the Insurance Court.

Q091 (2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available
data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases
managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts). The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt by the administrative courts, the Market Court and the Insurance Court.

Q091 (2019): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 22.1.2020 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is:
1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts). The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt by the administrative courts, the Market Court and the Insurance
Court.
The number of administrative cases increased dramatically in 2016 due to the asylum crisis. Accordingly, more judges were hired to deal with cases and make the procedure more effective. The limits in which cases have to be handled have also been shortened in order to reduce the number of pending cases. To tackle this crisis, a legislative reform decentralized the asylum cases from one administrative court (Helsinki) to three other administrative courts as well.
As to “civil and commercial litigious cases”, we can notice a very high Clearance Rate for 2016 due to the fact that in 2016 the number
of incoming civil cases decreased and courts were able to deal with pending cases. Accordingly, the number of pending cases decreased between 2016 and 2019.
“General civil and commercial non-litigious cases”: the number of pending cases at the end of 2019 increased slightly between 2018 and 2019. In this respect, it should be noticed that the partial switch to the new case management system AIPA (as for example divorce cases are already processed in this system) can be the explanation as some initial challenges in the reporting tool has been noted recently.

Q091 (2018): The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt by the administrative courts, the Market Court and the Insurance Court.
The number of administrative cases increased dramatically in 2016 due to the asylum crisis. Accordingly, more judges were hired to deal with cases and make the procedure more effective. The limits in which cases have to be handled have also been shortened in order to reduce the number of pending cases. To tackle this crisis, a legislative reform decentralized the asylum cases from one administrative court (Helsinki) to three other administrative courts as well.
As to “civil and commercial litigious cases”, we can notice a very high Clearance Rate for 2016 due to the fact that in 2016 the number of incoming civil cases decreased and courts were able to deal with pending cases. Accordingly, the number of pending cases decreased between 2016 and 2018.

Q091 (2017): 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: in 2016 the number of incoming civil cases decreased and courts were able to deal with pending cases; accordingly, the number of pending civil litigious cases at the beginning of 2017 has decreased. 2.2.1 From the beginning of the year 2010 Land register cases were transferred to National Land Survey of Finland.
3. Administrative law cases: On appeal, the administrative court reviews the legality of the decision of the authority. The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt with by Administrative Courts, Market Court and Insurance Court.
It is worth mentioning that in 2016 the number of administrative cases increased dramatically due to the asylum crisis. As a result, the number of pending administrative cases at the beginning of 2017 increased considerably. Against this background, Finland had adopted different measures to face the asylum crisis (e.g. decentralisation of the competence in respect of asylum cases from one administrative court (Helsinki) to three other administrative courts). Accordingly, the number of incoming administrative cases for 2017 decreased (28%).

Q091 (2016): In 2016 the number of incoming civil cases decreased and courts were able to deal with pending cases. The number of administrative cases increased dramatically due to the asylum crisis. Accordingly, more judges were hired to deal with cases and make the procedure more effective. The limits in which cases have to be handled have also been shortened in order to reduce the number of pending cases. To tackle this crisis, a legislative reform decentralized the asylum cases from one administrative court (Helsinki) to three other administrative courts as well. For that reason, statistics show variations as concerns the number of pending administrative law cases in 2016. The number of pending administrative law cases on 1.1.2016 was 20 4775, but due to the decentralization around 5000 cases were transferred from Helsinki to these other courts. In the statistics, these cases do not appear as pending anymore. It is not possible to say how many of them have been resolved, but they are included in the number of resolved administrative law cases.

Q091 (2014): Non-litigious enforcement cases are subsumed in the category “general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”. The enforcement is of the competence of the enforcement authorities, not of this of courts. Cases mentioned here are appeals in execution proceedings before district courts.
Q091 (2012): The increase in the number of pending civil and commercial litigious cases is the result of an exceptionally high number of incoming litigious civil cases in 2011.

Q092 (General Comment): More information here; Sum-mary civil cases: https://oikeus.fi/tuomioistuimet/en/index/asiat/riita-asiat/summarycivilcases.html# ,and di-vorces: https://oikeus.fi/tuomioistuimet/en/index/asiat/perheasiat/avioero.html# .

Q093 (General Comment): More information here on Bankruptcy, Restructuring of enterprises [yrityssaneeraus], Adjustment of the debts [velkajärjestely] and Enforcement [ulosotto]:
https://oikeus.fi/tuomioistuimet/en/index/asiat/velatkonkurssiyrityssaneeraus.html
More information on Land court cases [maaoikeusasia]: https://oikeus.fi/tuomioistuimet/en/index/asiat/riita-asiat/landcourtcases.html# More information on Labour Court: https://www.tyotuomioistuin.fi/en/index/labourcourt.html#

Q094 (General Comment): The cases are not statistically categorised in severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor cases in Finland.
"Coercive measures": these are cases that are dealt separately from a criminal case and therefore get their own case ID-number. They include telecommunications interception and electronic surveillance, confiscation, detention on remand, detention of an alien, travel ban and other coercive measures, restraint on alienation [hukkaamiskielto] and confiscation for security. When a coercive measure is dealt within an ongoing case it does not get its own case ID-number and is not counted as a separate case.
“Military trials” deal with cases of military offences (e.g. service offences, sentry offences, absence from duty offences, obedience offences, offences by a superior officer). In addition, certain crimes against soldiers are military offences as are some criminal offences stipulated in Conscription Act (Chapter 45 of the Criminal Code). The “military trial” is a case dealt with by the district courts (excluding the district court of Åland), the Court of appeal of Helsinki and the Supreme court. In a district court the case is dealt with by a judge (as a chair) and two military members. Because of this different composition of the panel, it is referred to as “military court” even though it is a composition of the district court. Similarly, the panel in the Court of appeal and the Supreme court includes two military members.

Q094 (2021): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. This year we have included military court cases and co-er-cive mea-sures which were previously not included in this number.

Q094 (2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available
data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases
managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

Q094 (2018): There is no particular explanation regarding the decreased clearance rate of criminal cases.

Q097 (2021): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Other cases are: Cases dealt in Court of Appeal as first instance, military court cases, and cases related to releasing a prisoner serving a life sentence [pitkäaikaisvankien vapauttamismenettelyasiat].

Q097 (2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases
managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

Q097 (2019): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 22.1.2020 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is:
1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts).

Q097 (2018): In 2017, the number of incoming cases has decreased for example due to some procedural changes and the courts have been
able to resolve more pending cases. Accordingly, the number of pending cases at the beginning of 2018 has decreased.

Q097 (2017): In 2016, the number of incoming cases has decreased (for example due to some procedural changes) and the courts have been able to resolve more pending cases. Accordingly, the number of pending cases at the beginning of 2017 has decreased.
Q097 (2016): The number of incoming cases has decreased (for example due to some procedural changes) and the courts have been able to resolve more pending cases.
Q097 (2013): The category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases includes petitions for the 2012 exercise, divorce cases and petitions (without cases included in the other sub-categories) for the 2013 exercise. As for the category “other”, according to the provided comments, in 2012 it encompasses cases, which Appeal Courts resolve as 1st instance, military justice cases and cases concerning prisoners. In 2013 it subsumes temporary procedural remedy cases, adjustment of the debts of a private individual - cases, restructuring of enterprises cases and bankruptcy cases and complaints.

Q097 (2012): The category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases includes petitions for the 2012 exercise, divorce cases and petitions (without cases included in the other sub-categories) for the 2013 exercise. As for the category “other”, according to the provided comments, in 2012 it encompasses cases, which Appeal Courts resolve as 1st instance, military justice cases and cases concerning prisoners. In 2013 it subsumes temporary procedural remedy cases, adjustment of the debts of a private individual - cases, restructuring of enterprises cases and bankruptcy cases and complaints.

Q098 (General Comment): The cases are not statistically catecorised in severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor cases in Finland.
Q098 (2021): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ.

Q098 (2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases
managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

Q099 (General Comment): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. The "other" referes to insurance cases, land law cases, petitions (for example, reversals of final judgements) and pardons in the Supreme Court.

Q099 (2021): The number of incoming administrative cases has been on the decline for the last years.
Variations observed in respect of "civil and commercial litigious cases" are due to yearly fluctuations.
Q099 (2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ.

Q099 (2019): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 22.1.2020 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is:
1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

Q099 (2018): The total of incoming other than criminal cases decreased slightly in 2018 compared to 2017. The number of administrative law cases decreased slighty in 2018 but is still high. The general increase is mostly a consequence of the asylum crisis and the fact that cases from the administrative courts have reached the highest instance in 2017 and 2018.

Q099 (2017): The total of incoming other than criminal cases increased for the period 2016-2017. This increase is mostly due to the increase in the number of administrative law cases as a consequence of the asylum crisis and the fact that cases from the administrative courts have reached the highest instance in 2017 (which was not the case in 2016).

Q099 (2016): Courts were able to resolve more cases because the number of incoming cases decreased. The Supreme Administrative court got more resourses and personnel due to the asylum crisis, but cases from the administrative courts have still not reached the highest instance.
Q099 (2014): In respect of the variations observed between 2012 and 2014 data, it is noteworthy that the statistics system has changed. Data is not received any more from the Central Statistical Office of Finland. Instead, the Ministry of Justice receives information directly from processing systems. This method of compilation of statistics does not quite support answering the question, as the information is run periodically and not daily. As a result, some discrepancies occur. As the system does not provide the numbers for 1 January 2014, it is necessary to calculate them separately from the correct data obtained on a later date.

Q100 (General Comment): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ.

Q100 (2021): Variations observed in respect of criminal cases are due to yearly fluctuations.

Q100 (2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ.

Q101 (2021): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. At this point only cases registered as murder offences have been included in the statistical year of 2020. Cases from the statistical year of 2021, in addition to murder offences, include the following offences: murder, manslaughter, homicide and infanticide made with terrorist intent.

Q101 (2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

Q101 (2019): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 22.1.2020 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is:
1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts). According to Finnish Immigration Service the number of asylum seekers arriving to Finland continued to be low (see, for example, https://tilastot.migri.fi/#decisions/23330?l=en&start=588&end=599)
“Cases relating to the right of entry and stay of aliens”: the number of resolved cases increased considerably between 2018 and 2019 resulting in a decrease in the number of pending cases at the end of 2019. In this regard, it should be noticed that courts have reorganized their resources internally. They have allocated more resources to these types of cases, and this way keep reasonable the time the case is pending in the court. Also, in 2019 the administrative courts got 119 more staff as follows: 65 judges, 27 referendaries and 27 clerical staff.

Q101 (2018): In 2016, the number of incoming cases relating to asylum seekers increased dramatically due to the asylum crisis. In 2018, the number of incoming cases relating to asylum seekers was considerably lower than in 2016.
For the decreased number of resolved cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens, the only explanation is the general bigger case load in the administrative courts.

Q101 (2017): Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens: includes the cases conserning deportation, permits of residence and
removing from the country.
Cases related to Asylum seekers: the number of pending cases at the beginning of 2017 increased drastically as a consequence of the important number of incoming cases in 2016; the number of incoming cases in 2017 decreased compared to 2016 which allowed courts to better deal with pending cases (the number of resolved cases increased considerably in 2017, while the number of pending cases at the end of 2017 decreased).

Q101 (2016): The number of resolved cases pertaining to intentional homicide has decreased for the period 2014 - 2016. The category "Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens" includes cases concerning deportation, permits of residence and removing from the country.

Q101 (2013): The category “insolvency cases” includes only bankruptcy cases dealt with by District Courts and not restructuring of enterprises cases.

France

Q091 (2021): Source SDSE
Source Council of State

Q091 (2020): Comments on volumes.
Completed cases are down more than new cases, both civil/2019 and felonies/2018 (contravention are surprisingly up / 2018). The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer misdemeanors committed, fewer cases brought to court). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly affected the TAs.
Commentary provided by the highest adminsitrative Court concerning the administrative order: the measures derogating from the ordinary law of contentious administrative procedure adopted to respond to the situation arising from the health crisis caused by the Covid-19 epidemic were provided for by order no. 2020-305 of March 25, 2020, then by order no. 2020-1402 of November 18, 2020, and decree no. 2020-1406 of the same day. I - Concerning the rules relating to the organization or holding of hearings 1°) Use of audiovisual or any other means of electronic communication
The two orders of March 25 and November 18, 2020 provided for the possibility of using an audiovisual means of telecommunication for the holding of hearings or any other means of electronic communication.
When this device was used, it was used, in almost all the jurisdictions that had recourse to it, for less than 10% of the cases judged in collegiality during the same period.
The most common configuration used was that in which one or more members of the panel were at a distance and the president, the other members of the panel, and the parties and their counsel were in the courtroom (approximately 75% of the courts that used videoconferencing chose this configuration and 53% of them used it for less than 10% of the cases tried by the panel). Very few courts have used video-conferencing with remote parties. The reasons for which the courts have used video-conferencing are linked to the constraints linked to the health crisis, in particular the difficulties encountered by lawyers to travel, especially in overseas territories, and the isolation imposed on certain people (judges or lawyers) declared to be in contact or recognized as fragile.
As regards single judges, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions allowing the use of an audiovisual means of telecommunication, since only 6 administrative courts out of 35 have indicated that they have used it. The administrative courts indicated that they had used videoconferencing, as a single judge, for the processing of emergency proceedings in matters concerning foreigners, particularly in cases where the foreigner was in administrative detention. Finally, 15 administrative courts indicated that they held summary proceedings by videoconference. For almost all of these courts, the summary proceedings judge was in the courtroom and the parties were at a distance, and less than 10% of summary proceedings cases were judged in this configuration. Travel difficulties were the main reasons why the courts of first instance held summary proceedings by videoconference. The texts applicable during the state of health emergency allowed the use of any means of electronic communication, other than videoconferencing, in case of impossibility to use it. Only a few TAs used this procedure and for less than 10% of the cases in the courts that used it.
Generally speaking, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions of the orders allowing hearings to be held by videoconference and this use was justified by the constraints and difficulties linked to the health crisis. 2°) The provisions allowing to limit the number of persons attending the hearing were applied by a large number of courts and in a frequent manner. On the other hand, the provisions allowing the president of the court to decide that the hearing will be held without the presence of the public have been used very little. 3°) The dispensation of the public rapporteur's conclusions has

Q091 (2019): Administrative law cases pending for more than 2 years: in contrast with previous cycle, 2019 data are expressed in net figures, excluding serial cases presenting the same legal issue for trial.

Q091 (2018): With regard to the reduction of the number of non-contentious cases, this corresponds both to the impossibility of including data relating to adults under protection in 2018, due to a technical problem, and to the abolition of the approval of over-indebtedness plans by the judge of the Court of First Instance, the proceedings before which are processed by the Over-indebtedness Commission, as from 1 January 2018. Act No. 2016-1547 of 18 November 2016 on the modernization of 21st century justice, known as the "Justice 21 Act" and the Act of 9 December 2016, abolished judicial approval of the measures recommended by the over-indebtedness commission. As a reminder, divorces by mutual consent no longer fall within the competence of the family court.

Q091 (2016): The important increase in the number of pending non-litigious cases is due to the increased number of requests for ending unions - 60% (especially in 2016) and the increased number of pending cases before execution judges within the TGI in respect of a third party (without significant increase in the number of incoming cases, but a regular increase, namely for the last two years in the number of cases under consideration).

Q091 (2014): In civil litigation, cases relating to the activity of the liberty and custody judge amount to 98 300 cases in 2014 and have increased by 6.8% compared to 2013. These cases have significantly increased in 2012 (+ 65.5%), due to the law No. 2011-803 of July 2011 on the rights and protection of persons under psychiatric care. The reform systematised the control of psychiatric hospitalisations without the consent of the liberty and custody judge.

Q092 (2014): In 2014, the category civil cases (and commercial) non-litigious are also included in non-litigious cases relating to enforcement.

Q094 (2021): source SDSE

Q094 (2020):

"Comments on volumes.
Closed cases are down more than incoming cases cases, both civil/2019 and felonies/2018 (contravention are surprisingly up / 2018).
The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer misdemeanors committed, fewer cases brought to court). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and transportation strike had mostly affected TAs.

Q097 (2021): Source Council of State and SDSE
Administrative law cases: regarding the ageing of the stock, the output of the Administrative Courts of Appeal (CAA) fell sharply in 2020 (-10%) because of the COVID-19. When the situation returned to normal, the CAAs gave priority to foreigners' litigation, which accounts for almost 50% of their entries, and the stock therefore aged mechanically.

Q097 (2020): "The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (by reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to trial). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly affected the TAs.
Commentary provided by the highest administrative Court : As a reminder, the measures derogating from the ordinary law of contentious administrative procedure adopted to respond to the situation arising from the health crisis caused by the Covid-19 epidemic were provided for by Ordinance no. 2020-305 of March 25, 2020, and then by Ordinance no. 2020-1402 of November 18, 2020, and Decree no. 2020-1406 of the same day. I - Concerning the rules relating to the organization or holding of hearings 1°) Use of audiovisual or any other means of electronic communication
The two orders of March 25 and November 18, 2020 provided for the possibility of using an audiovisual means of telecommunication for the holding of hearings or any other means of electronic communication.
When this device was used, it was used, in almost all the jurisdictions that had recourse to it, for less than 10% of the cases judged in collegiality during the same period.
The most common configuration used was that in which one or more members of the panel were at a distance and the president, the other members of the panel, and the parties and their counsel were in the courtroom (approximately 75% of the courts that used videoconferencing chose this configuration, and 53% of them used it for less than 10% of the cases heard by the panel). Very few courts have used video-conferencing with remote parties. The reasons for which the courts have used video-conferencing are linked to the constraints linked to the health crisis, in particular the difficulties encountered by lawyers to travel, especially in overseas territories, and the isolation imposed on certain people (judges or lawyers) declared to be in contact or recognized as fragile.
In the case of single-judge hearings, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions allowing the use of an audiovisual means of telecommunication, since only 6 administrative courts out of 35 have indicated that they have used it. The administrative courts indicated that they had used videoconferencing, as a single judge, for the processing of emergency proceedings in matters concerning foreigners, particularly in cases where the foreigner was in administrative detention. Finally, 15 administrative courts indicated that they held summary proceedings by videoconference. For almost all of these courts, the summary proceedings judge was in the courtroom and the parties were at a distance, and less than 10% of summary proceedings cases were judged in this configuration. Travel difficulties were the main reasons why the courts of first instance held summary proceedings by videoconference. The texts applicable during the state of health emergency allowed the use of any means of electronic communication, other than videoconferencing, in case of impossibility to use it. Only a few TAs used this procedure and for less than 10% of the cases in the courts that used it.
Generally speaking, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions of the orders allowing hearings to be held by videoconference and this use was justified by the constraints and difficulties linked to the health crisis. 2°) The provisions allowing to limit the number of persons attending the hearing were applied by a large number of courts and in a frequent manner. On the other hand, the provisions allowing the president of the court to decide that the hearing will be held without the presence of the public have been used very little. 3°) The dispensation of the public rapporteur's conclusions has been used very little by the courts. This dispensation was applied because of the vulnerable state of the public rapporteur or to limit the length of the hearings (in these cases the dispensation was granted for cases that did not present any difficulty).

Q097 (2017): As regards administrative law cases, the Council of State report indicates that it is a coincidence to have the same number for incoming and resolved cases.

Q097 (2013): 2012, 2013: The 'non-litigious matters relating to the implementation' (which answer is NA) exist but are included in the category 'non-litigious civil cases'.
Q097 (2012): 2012, 2013: The 'non-litigious matters relating to the implementation' (which answer is NA) exist but are included in the category 'non-litigious civil cases'.
Q098 (2021): Source SDSE

Q098 (2020): "The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (by reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to trial). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and transportation strike had mostly affected TAs.
"

Q099 (2021): source SDSE and Council of State

Q099 (2020): "The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (by reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to trial). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly affected the TAs.
Commentary provided by the Conseil d'Etat: As a reminder, the measures derogating from the ordinary law of contentious administrative procedure adopted to respond to the situation arising from the health crisis caused by the Covid-19 epidemic were provided for by Ordinance no. 2020-305 of March 25, 2020, and then by Ordinance no. 2020-1402 of November 18, 2020, and Decree no. 2020-1406 of the same day. I - Concerning the rules relating to the organization or holding of hearings 1°) Use of audiovisual or any other means of electronic communication
The two orders of March 25 and November 18, 2020 provided for the possibility of using an audiovisual means of telecommunication for the holding of hearings or any other means of electronic communication.
When this device was used, it was used, in almost all the jurisdictions that had recourse to it, for less than 10% of the cases judged in collegiality during the same period.
The most common configuration used was that in which one or more members of the panel were at a distance and the president, the other members of the panel, and the parties and their counsel were in the courtroom (approximately 75% of the courts that used videoconferencing chose this configuration, and 53% of them used it for less than 10% of the cases heard by the panel). Very few courts have used video-conferencing with remote parties. The reasons for which the courts have used video-conferencing are linked to the constraints linked to the health crisis, in particular the difficulties encountered by lawyers to travel, especially in overseas territories, and the isolation imposed on certain people (judges or lawyers) declared to be in contact or recognized as fragile.
In the case of single-judge hearings, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions allowing the use of an audiovisual means of telecommunication, since only 6 administrative courts out of 35 have indicated that they have used it. The administrative courts indicated that they had used videoconferencing, as a single judge, for the processing of emergency proceedings in matters concerning foreigners, particularly in cases where the foreigner was in administrative detention. Finally, 15 administrative courts indicated that they held summary proceedings by videoconference. For almost all of these courts, the summary proceedings judge was in the courtroom and the parties were at a distance, and less than 10% of summary proceedings cases were judged in this configuration. Travel difficulties were the main reasons why the courts of first instance held summary proceedings by videoconference. The texts applicable during the state of health emergency allowed the use of any means of electronic communication, other than videoconferencing, in case of impossibility to use it. Only a few TAs used this procedure and for less than 10% of the cases in the courts that used it.
Generally speaking, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions of the orders allowing hearings to be held by videoconference and this use was justified by the constraints and difficulties linked to the health crisis. 2°) The provisions allowing to limit the number of persons attending the hearing were applied by a large number of courts and in a frequent manner. On the other hand, the provisions allowing the president of the court to decide that the hearing will be held without the presence of the public have been used very little. 3°) The dispensation of the public rapporteur's conclusions has been used very little by the courts. This dispensation was applied because of the vulnerable state of the public rapporteur or to limit the length of the hearings (in these cases the dispensation was granted for cases that did not present any difficulty).
Q099 (2014): 2014: The statistics of the Court of Cassation are not based on the same information system as the ones of courts of first instance and appeal courts. If discontinued cases of the category non-litigious cases may be subject to an appeal, it is not possible to identify them, they are included in the figure given for civil litigious cases. Thus, the total figure is the one retained.

Q100 (General Comment): The total number of resolved cases corresponds to judgments of cassation, cassation without referral and dismissal of the appeal. The other judgments handed down by the criminal chamber of the Court of Cassation are not counted. It is not possible to distinguish the litigation of the Court of Cassation by type of offence. The item "serious criminal cases" includes all appeals before the Court of cassation. It should be noted that the appeals mainly concern crimes and offences. The share of minor criminal cases is residual. The data are taken from the annual activity report of the Court of Cassation. Priority questions of constitutionality are not taken into account.

Q100 (2021): Source SDSE

Q100 (2020): The health crisis and the lockdown may have had an impact on TAs (completed cases) (by reducing the capacity of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to court). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly influenced TAs.

Q101 (2021): Source SDSE

Q101 (2020): The health crisis and the lockdown may have had an impact on TAs (resolved cases) (by reducing the capacity of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (incoming cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to court). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly influenced TAs.

Q101 (2019): Problems related to data feedback make it impossible to have information on robberies and intentional homicides.

Concerning cases relating to asylum seekers, the 2019 activity report of the National Asylum Court states that: "The year 2019 was marked by sustained activity: while the number of incoming cases stabilised in 2019 at 59,091 cases, an increase of less than 1% compared to 2018, the number of decisions handed down reached an all-time high of 66,464 cases, an increase of 40.5% compared to the previous year. This result was made possible thanks to the mobilisation of all the permanent judges, temporary judges and agents, as well as to the significant reinforcements that the Court benefited from this year. The court was thus able to create a sixth section and five new chambers in the space of a few weeks, open six new courtrooms and recruit, train and integrate more than 87 new judges on a temporary basis (“vacataires”) and 175 new staff, including 91 rapporteurs”.

Q101 (2018): The particular context of asylum applications in France and the sustained activity of the French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons (OFPRA) explain the high number of applications before the National Court of Asylum. Indeed, the CNDA's exclusive mission is to rule on appeals against decisions taken by OFPRA that do not satisfy asylum seekers. In addition, the number of appeals has tended to increase over the past ten years, increasing by a factor of 2.7 between 2008 and 2018.

Asylum seekers: National Court of Asylum

Data on the right of entry and residence of foreigners: data provided by the report of the Council of State on the number of proceedings processed by the administrative courts

For bankruptcies, business bankruptcies were used. The decrease in redundancies is explained by the increase in the number of contractual breaches of employment contracts.

Q101 (2017): With regard to cases concerning asylum seekers and cases concerning the right of entry and residence of foreigners, migratory phenomena explain this evolution.

Q101 (2016): The category “insolvency” refers to business bankruptcies (opening of receivership proceedings, opening of immediate judicial liquidation, recovery plans pronounced after protection, judicial liquidation pronounced after protection) have been taken into account. 2016 data on asylum seekers: National Court of Asylum at the State Council (Conseil d’Etat); 2016 data on the right of entry and residence of foreigners: Judge of freedoms and detention.

Germany

Q091 (General Comment): General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys only count the number of received cases.
2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases: The figure represents the number of non-litigious enforcement cases. In the monthly survey for the statistics of the civil courts, these cases fall into the category of "other caseload". This is the reason why only the number of incoming cases is available.
2.2.1. Non litigious land registry cases: The figure represents the number of incoming requests with regard to entries, change of entries or deletion of entries in the land registry. This data is not part of the statistics of the civil courts but was taken from the statistics on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction (according to the Act on Proceedings in Family Matters and in Matters of Non-contentious Jurisdiction - FamFG). The number of pending and resolved land registry cases is not collected within the framework of this statistic.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistencies with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occur in the statistics published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this is, that courts submit count corrections for the monthly surveys at the end of the year.

Q091 (2021): 2.2.2: data represents - the number of registrations in the business registry (Handelsregister) at the end of the previous year
- the number of new registrations during the reference year
- the number of deleted registrations during the reference year
- the number of registrations at the end of the reference year
"other cases" include: family and labour law cases

Q091 (2020): There is no special reason explaining the slight decrease in the number of incoming administrative law cases.

Q091 (2019): The horizontal consistency in the table is not ensured because the data are continuously checked.

Q091 (2018): The high number of administrative pending cases on January 1st and December 31st is a result from the numerous unresolved cases in 2017 due to the rise of asylum seekers since 2015.
Cases of guardianship law in 2018 are not included in the "other cases " category, because changeover of data collections by the Lander.

Q091 (2017): Source: Federal Statistical Office (DESTATIS)
No. 4 - Other cases: Cases of guardianship law in 2017 are not included, because changeover of data collections by the Länder.

Q091 (2016): Source: Federal Statistical Office (DESTATIS)

Q091 (2015): For civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office for 2015. As for the category “other”, it refers to the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and encompasses information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. However, some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding this category. Accordingly, the information for this category remains incomplete.
The category "other" refers to: local court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

Q091 (2014): For civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office for 2014. As for the category “other”, it refers to the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and encompasses information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. However, some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding this category. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable. The category "other" includes: local court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

Q091 (2013): Two Lander did not provide data with regard to the number of other than criminal law cases, while one Land did not provide information about the number of non-litigious land registry cases.The information is incomplete and the following legal cases were not taken into account: Incoming cases - payment order procedure (civil courts: 4 751 355 cases; labour courts: 56 053 cases), insolvency cases (143 662), cases concerning the civil registry office, wills, estates, accommodations, agriculture, escrow, and public notice proceedings (1 469 273); Pending legal cases on 31 December 2013 - guardianship and curator cases (12 795); insolvency cases (303 654).

Q091 (2012): The data was not available for 1 Land and remained incomplete for 4 Lander.

Q092 (2012): In 2012, the value entered was calculated by deducting the contentious judgments from of all sets of proceedings that were resolved before the Local and the Regional Court in civil cases (not including those passed on within the court). Those sets of proceedings that are resolved other than by contentious judgment were particularly resolved by default, acknowledgement or waiver judgments, settlements, withdrawal of the charge or of the motion, staying of the proceedings or non-pursuance and orders in accordance with section 91a of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Q093 (2014): For the 2013 and 2014 exercises, the category “other” includes: Local Court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

Q093 (2013): For the 2013 and 2014 exercises, the category “other” includes: Local Court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

Q093 (2012): In the ambit of the 2012 exercise the category “other” includes: family-court jurisdiction, labour courts (proceedings leading to a judgment or a decision) as well as guardianship and custodianship courts. The figures do not include 1 426 805 new legal matters related to payment proceedings before labour courts, registry office cases, inheritance cases, custody, agriculture, legal aid, deposit cases and public notice proceedings with regard to which resolution or the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of the year are not recorded. The figures also do not include 202 106 new legal cases related to insolvency proceedings with regard to which only resolution is recorded (292 821).

Q094 (General Comment): General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys only count the number of received cases.
The category “severe criminal cases” includes criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistencies with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occur in the statistics published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this is, that courts submit count corrections for the monthly surveys at the end of the year.

Q094 (2021): The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” subsumes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
“Other criminal cases” include:
- proceedings at the penal execution chambers (concerning suspension of execution of the remainder of a sentence of life imprisonment or concerning suspension of execution of placement in a psychiatric hospital or in preventive detention, determinate custodial sentences, proceedings under sections 109, 110, 138 of the Prison Act (Strafvollzugsgesetz, StVollzG), proceedings under Part IV of the Act on International Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (Gesetz über die internationale Rechtshilfe in Strafsachen, IRG) and section 71 (4) of Part II)
- proceedings regarding supervision of conduct
- complaints about costs/fees - complaints against search/seizure orders - complaints in economic cases and tax cases
- complaints in matters concerning detention - cases in matters falling within the Regulatory Offences Act (Ordnungswidrigkeitengesetz, OWiG) registered in the complaints register - other complaints - subsequent or reserved preventive detention
- proceedings regarding the order of subsequent or reserved preventive detention - proceedings regarding the suspension of execution of a sentence where the court has reserved the order of preventive detention, in the cases covered by section 462a (2), third sentence, of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Strafprozessordnung, StPO)
- proceedings before the judicial service court
- proceedings regarding health professionals, tax consultants, agents in tax matters, patent lawyers or architects
- other disciplinary proceedings - proceedings regarding legal remedies in matters of enforcement of youth custody, youth detention and remand detention
With regard to "other criminal cases", only the number of incoming cases is recorded (exception: proceedings concerning supervision of conduct).

Q094 (2018): As only the number of resolved “other cases” is available, these will not be included in the total.

Q094 (2014): The information provided in the frame of the 2014 evaluation refers to 2013 data (the 2014 data is not available).

Q097 (General Comment): General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys generally only count the number of received cases, claims, etc..
In the monthly surveys of a court, a statistical record with regard to the stage of appeal exists for the proceedings covered by the procedural surveys, while the case count for "other caseload" generally only exists for the whole court.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistencies with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occur in the statistics published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this is, that courts submit count corrections for the monthly surveys at the end of the year.

Q097 (2021): "Other": family cases at Higher Regional Courts, appeal and complaint proceedings at Regional Labour Courts
Pending civil and commercial litigious cases on 31 Dec: The discrepancy stems from a rise in pending cases at the Higher Regional Courts (approx. 33% compared to 2020). While the number of pending cases at the Higher Regional Courts has risen in all Länder, the discrepancy is especially high in Baden-Württemberg (rise of approx. 88%). The reason for this is most likely the flood of lawsuits brought against car manufracturers in connection with the "diesel emission scandal". The Higher Regional Court of Stuttgart, where a large manufracturer has its main offices, has seen a rise in pending cases of more than 100% compared to 2020.

Q097 (2020): family cases at Higher Regional Courts, appeal and complaint proceedings at Regional Labour Courts

Q097 (2019): The horizontal consistency in the table is not ensured because the data are continuously checked.

Q097 (2015): A substancial number of the Länder was unable to provide information, meaning that any amount cited would not be meaningful in substantive terms.
Q097 (2014): The 2014 data are the same as those that have been provided in 2013. No update was available.

Q097 (2013): For 2013, two Landers did not provide any information.
The category “other “ includes proceedings on complaints on appeal in family cases at the Higher Regional Courts and appellate proceedings on fact and law and proceedings on complaints on appeal at the Regional Labour Courts. In addition, given a lack of complete data, a total of 164 272 new legal cases or proceedings on complaints on appeal (in custodianship, accommodation, insolvency, estate, and costs cases, along with other complaints on appeal) were not considered in the category “other”.
Regarding the slight horizontal inconsistency for the category “administrative law cases”, it can partly be explained by the federal State structure of Germany. Moreover, data regarding incoming administrative law cases also reflected the number of appeals against decisions to grant provisional legal protection in the higher administrative regional courts and in the higher social courts; and appeals in matters of legal aid and other proceedings. In comparison with the previous years, the 2013 data are more accurate. The same applies regarding resolved cases even though no data was available for the appeals in matters of legal aid and other proceedings.
With regard to the sub-category “civil and commercial litigious cases” and the meaningful increase of the number of resolved cases, it should be noticed that in the frame of the 2013 exercise, the indicated figure encompassed the number of resolved civil and commercial litigious and not-litigious cases. For this cycle, it was impossible to distinguish between these two sub-categories.

Q097 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 evaluation it was stressed that the values regarding questions 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108 corresponded to data of the year 2011.
Q098 (General Comment): General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys generally only count the number of received cases, claims, etc..
In the monthly surveys of a court, a statistical record with regard to the stage of appeal exists for the proceedings covered by the procedural surveys, while the case count for "other caseload" generally only exists for the whole court.
The answer to Q98 includes the cases that appear in the monthly surveys of the Higher Regional Courts as "other caseload" and that can definitely be identified as second instance cases due to their subject (complaints and objections in regulatory fining proceedings). However, some second instance cases are also included under "other cases" in Q94.
The category "other cases" in Q94 includes the cases that appear in the monthly surveys of the Regional Courts as "other caseload", which means that these cases are actually first and second instance cases. Due to the above mentioned structure of data collection, a distinction between 1st and 2nd instance cases ist unfortunately not possible for these cases.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistencies with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occur in the statistics published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this is, that courts submit count corrections for the monthly surveys at the end of the year.

Q098 (2021): "Other": complaints in regulatory fining proceedings at the Higher Regional Courts (according to Section 80 of the Act on Regulatory Offences), objections in regulatory fining proceedings according to the Competition Act
With regard to these cases, only the number of incoming cases is recorded. Pending minor criminal cases on 1 Jan: The number of incoming cases was lower in 2020 than in 2019 and the number of resolved cases higher, resulting in a lower number of pending cases at the end of 2020. A reason for this development could not be identified.

Q098 (2020): complaints in regulatory fining proceedings at the Higher Regional Courts (according to Section 80 of the Act on Regulatory Offences), objections in regulatory fining proceedings according to the Competition Act

Q098 (2016): The category “severe criminal cases" (line 2) includes criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code (Strafgesetzbuch, StGB) and ancillary criminal laws. The category “minor criminal cases” (line 3) includes regulatory fine proceedings before the criminal courts.

Q098 (2014): According to 2014 data, the category “severe criminal cases” included criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” subsumed regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
The information provided in the frame of the 2014 evaluation refers to 2013 data (the 2014 data is not available).

Q098 (2012): According to 2012 data, the category “severe criminal cases” included criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” subsumed regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.

Q099 (2021): The statistics of the Federal Court of Justice do not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases. The data given under Nr. 1 represents all appeal cases in civil matters at the Federal Court of Justice (including family matters).
"Other Cases": Data represents labour law cases at the Federal Labour Court.
The annual report of the Federal Labour Court doesn't provide an explanation for the decrease in incoming cases and resolved cases. According to press reports, the decrease in incoming cases might be due to the good economic situation prior to the pandemic (less dismissal cases). The decrease in resolved cases might be due to a rising number of cases, in which an involvement of the European Court of Justice is necessary.

Q099 (2015): The data provided date from 2014. At present, no data are available for 2015.
It is not possible to distinguish between litigious civil cases, respectively commercial cases, and those that are non-litigious. Accordingly, number 1 of the answer to question 99 includes all appeals on points of law brought in the civil matters before the Federal Court of Justice (Senates for civil matters including family law matters). However, the number of proceedings dealt with and concluded by litigious rulings in 2014 amounts to 600.

Q099 (2014): The 2014 data are the same as those that have been provided in 2013. No update was available.

Q099 (2013): For 2013, two Landers did not provide any information. Data provided for the civil (and commercial) litigious cases include all appeals lodged encompassing litigious and non-litigious cases as well as family law cases.

Q099 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 evaluation it was stressed that the values regarding questions 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108 corresponded to data of the year 2011.

Q100 (2021): It is not possible to differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" (NA). The total number of cases represents the number of appeals, including referrals and regulatory offences pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences (OWiG) as well as regulatory offences pursuant to the Act Against Restraints of Competition (GWB) and the Energy Act (EnBW) before the criminal panels (including antitrust panel).
There were more incoming cases in 2021 than 2020 and also more pending cases at the beginning of the year 2021 than 2020. As a result, the number of pending criminal cases on 31 December 2021 increased. No special reason could be identified for this development. The annual report of the Federal Court of Justice doesn't provide any information on this matter.

Q100 (2020): It is not possible to differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" (NA). The total number of cases means the number of appeals on points of law, including referrals and regulatory offences pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences (OWiG) as well as regulatory offences pursuant to the Act Against Restraints of Competition (GWB) and the Energy Act (EnBW) before the criminal panels (including antitrust panel).

Q100 (2018): It is not possible to differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" (NA). The total number of cases means the number of appeals on points of law, including referrals and regulatory offences pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences (OWiG) as well as regulatory offences pursuant to the Act Against Restraints of Competition (GWB) and the Energy Act (EnBW) before the criminal panels (including antitrust panel).

Q100 (2016): It is not possible to differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" (NA). The total number of cases means the number of appeals on points of law, including referrals and regulatory offences pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences (OWiG) as well as regulatory offences pursuant to the Act Against Restraints of Competition (GWB) and the Energy Act (EnBW) before the criminal panels (including antitrust panel).

Q100 (2014): The 2014 data reflects an overview of the case workflow processed by the Senates for Criminal Matters of the Federal Court of Justice (statistics for the year 2014). For 2014, it was not possible to distinguish between categories of “severe criminal cases” and “minor criminal cases”. The total number of criminal proceedings concerns appeals on points of law, including matters submitted to the Federal Court of Justice for its review of the principle of the matter and misdemeanour cases pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences. It also includes misdemeanours pursuant to the Act on Restraints of Competition that are pending before the Senates for Criminal Matters of the Federal Court of Justice (including the Senate for Anti-Trust Matters).
It is noteworthy that as there were only very few “minor criminal cases” in the previous cycles, the figures remain comparable for the last three evaluations.

Q101 (General Comment): Litigious divorce cases, employment dismissal cases, insolvency cases:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys only count the number of received cases.
2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases: The figure represents the number of non-litigious enforcement cases. In the monthly survey for the statistics of the civil courts, these cases fall into the category of "other caseload". This is the reason why only the number of incoming cases is available.
The number of incoming cases and pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a year is unavailable because the statistics do not break down those numbers with regard to specific case types such as litigious divorce cases and employment dismissal cases. For the insolvency cases only the number of incoming cases is available because these cases fall into the category of "other cases" on the monthly surveys. With regard to the insolvency cases (but not for other case types in this category), the monthly surveys also collect the number of pending cases at the end of the month.
The number of robbery and intentional homicide cases is taken from the criminal prosecution statistics that is also published by the Federal Statistical Office and basically collects data on final convictions issued by the criminal courts. As this statistic focusses on the verdicts more than the procceding it does not include any information on caseload (incoming, pending) or timeframes.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.

Q101 (2021): Insolvency cases: The number of insolvency cases was unusually low in 2020. Due to the pandemic, the duty to file an insolvency petition was suspended (business insolvencies). Additionally, in the last quarter of 2020 a new law on the discharge of residual debt was passed. The new law aims to facilitate a financial restart after an insolvency proceeding (consumer insolvencies). It is possible that a number of consumers decided to file for insolvency in 2021 in anticipation of the new law. The suspention of the duty to file an insolvency petition for businesses ended on 30 April 2021.
Robbery cases and intentional homicide cases (resolved cases): As of 15 November 2022, data for 2021 was not yet available.

Q101 (2020): Business insolvencies: due to the Corona crisis, the duty to file an insolvency petition was suspended until 31 December 2020; Consumer insolvencies: in the last quarter of 2020 a new law on the discharge of residual debt was passed. The new law aims to facilitate a financial restart after an insolvency proceeding: it is possible that a number of consumers decided to file for insolvency at a later point in anticipation of the new law.

Q101 (2019): 2017 was the peak of cases at the administratition courts regards asylum-seeker. The cases decrease constantly since then:
(2015: 50 422 / 2016: 141 046 / 2017: 260 160 / 2018: 108 917 / 2019: 82 598)

Q101 (2018): Regarding the number of cases relating to asylum seekers, there were many unresolved cases in 2017 (see Scoreboard data 2017 (rise of asylum seekers since 2015)). Schleswig-Holstein: With regard to this question, no data are available for 2018 for Employment dismissal cases for pending cases on 31 Dec ref. year. The data from 2017 have therefore been included.
With regard for all Länder, no data are available for 2018 for the cases of Robbery and Intentional homicide (resolved cases) yet. The data from 2017 have therefore been included.

Q101 (2017): Cases relating to asylum seekers: there is an important increase due to the rise of asylum seekers since 2015.
Pending cases on 31 Dec ref - Insolvency:
With regard to this question, no data are available for 2017 from Bavaria, Bremen and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. The data from 2016 have therefore been included.
Hamburg
The figures show the number of insolvency proceedings at the end of the reporting period in terms of natural and legal persons (IN) and according to foreign law (IE) but excluding consumer insolvency proceedings (IK), Source: judicial statistics
Hesse
Total number of insolvency proceedings as of 31 December 2017, not broken down into proceedings that have already been opened or into IN/IK/IE proceedings. The data were taken from table Z1.4 “Civil matters before the local courts” provided by the Hesse Statistics Office (serial numbers 161.00, 161.50, 162.00 und 163.00).

Q101 (2016): Employment dismissal cases: The variation between this cycle and the previous cycle for resolved cases is not explained.

Q101 (2015): A substancial number of the Länder was unable to provide information, meaning that any amount cited would not be meaningful in substantive terms.

Q101 (2014): The 2014 data are the same as those that have been provided in 2013. No update was available.

Q101 (2013): For 2013, two Lander did not communicate any reply. As to dispute divorce cases only the number of conclusions by way of an order of divorce was provided. As to divorce proceedings (2013) overall, the following data were available: pending on 1 January 2013: 85 780; incoming: 119 123; resolved: 156 951; pending on 31 December 2013: 85 124. As to insolvency cases, only data on incoming cases was provided as well as on legal cases still pending at year end. Nevertheless, not all Lander were able to give information on both of these points. To this extent the information is incomplete.

Q101 (2012): The number of resolved litigious divorce cases refers to resolution by divorce decree only. However, the data in respect of the total number of divorce cases (2011) are complete: pending on 1 January 2011: 63 363; incoming: 66 194; resolved: 215 769 (of which 190 258 by divorce decree); pending on 31 December 2011: 58 773.

Greece

Q091 (2021): The data has been collected from the 63/63 First Instance courts of Greece.

Q091 (2020): The courts from March 2020 due to Covid 2019 operated under special conditions and dealt with priority mainly criminal cases, this is the reason for the differentiation of pending cases of civil and administrative nature.
Civil cases are answered NA, because not all courts could provide the data.

Q091 (2019): The Council of State did not provide the Ministry of Justice with data regarding the Administrative law cases

Q091 (2018): -

Q091 (2017): The divergence between 31.12.2016 and 1.1.2017 regarding the Civil and Commercial cases (First column of this year's data) is mainly due to the recent operation of the NEW system (integrated Civil and Criminal Court case management system -OSDDY PP) in the Court of First Instance of Pireaus (1587 more cases on 1.1.2017 than those on 31.12.2016). In 2017, the number of “incoming” and “resolved” civil and commercial litigious cases at first instance courts increased due to the fact that in 2017 the function of the courts was not affected by the strike of lawyers, which took place in 2016. The horizontal consistency of the table is not ensured with regard to civil and commercial litigious cases because in 2017 some of the courts which do not yet have an automated system had to make minor adjustments in the statistical data provided to the MoJ. Concerning administrative law cases, any deviations from the 2016 figures, regarding the number of cases on 31.12.2016 and of 1.1.2017 (240650) are due to a number of factors that the General Commission of the State is trying to track down and gradually eliminate. A slight deviation has been noticed for the 2017 data of the administrative first instance courts of Athens and Piraeus, which is due to the data migration to a new information technology (IT) system called "Integrated Court Management System for the Administrative Justice (OSDDY-DD)". This deviation that has already been taken into account by the Central Organizational Committee for the due implementation of OSDDY-DD, is expected to lapse gradually within the next years. Furthermore, deviations have also emerged from the new way of collecting statistical data that the central Organizational Committee is trying to establish in order to ensure the uniform input of data by each court and from recent verifications of relevant numerical data that were subsequently sent by the courts. Finally, discrepancies are also due to errors of the information system itself, for which an effort is being made to identify and inform about, the contractor of the system. The deviation regarding the Number of resolved cases of 2017 from 2016 is due to the fact that in 2017 the function of the courts was not affected by the strike of the lawyers, which took place in 2016. Regarding the new integrated court management system, for administrative cases it has been implemented at all court levels since autumn 2016 and for civil and commercial cases and more especially in the Court of First Instance of Piraeus, the integrated court management system was gradually implemented from March 2016 resulting to an accurate calculation of pending cases of 1/1/2017.

Q091 (2016): Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics. In fact, in 2016, a working group was set up to update and simplify the content of the statistical data requested by the judicial services of the country. The working group created tables followed by detailed instructions and training in relation to the requested information. According to the instructions given to the courts, some procedures they handle, in those which there is no participation of a judge, are not included in the data collected. In addition, in 2016 a long-term abstention by the lawyers of the country took place, resulting in reduction in the number of cases (especially civil and commercial litigious cases).
The number 79.872 of resolved administrative law cases does not include joint cases, i.e. decisions that refer to more than one case. Furthermore, for the 2016 data of the administrative First Instance Courts of Athens and Piraeus a slight deviation has been noted which is due to the data migration to a new information technology (IT) system called “Integrated Court Management System for Administrative Justice (OSDDY-DD)”. This deviation that has already been taken into account by the Central Organizational Committee for the due implementation of OSDDY – DD is expected to lapse gradually within the next years.
As concerns the category "civil and commercial litigious cases" - incoming and resolved - in 2016 a long-term abstention by the lawyers of the country took place, resulting in reduction of numbers regarding the cases.

Q091 (2014): The significant increase in the number of pending cases on 1 January for the total of “other than criminal law cases” is due to lawyers’ abstention in the years 2013 and 2014.
Q091 (2012): The system of collecting data does not comply with the CEPEJ methodology. Besides, recent law changes have altered the jurisdiction of courts, so the figures communicated for 2012 could not be compared with these provided for the previous evaluation cycles.
Q094 (2021): The courts’ function in cooperation with the prosecution's offices. For example, postponed cases get to the prosecutor offices and then to the courts, in repeat 2-3 times, during the period (year). The definition of the pending cases included postponed cases or the cases the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn’t been determined during the year. The data has been collected from 63 out of 63 First instance courts in Greece.

Q094 (2020): To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor’s Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A’, which was completed in March 2019 for 41 courts of the State, an integrated information system is implemented, which includes individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data.

Q094 (2018): To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor's Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A', which was completed in March 2019 for 41 courts of the State, an integrated information system is implemented, which includes individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data.

Q094 (2016): Filling in the requested information regarding the criminal procedure is not possible at the moment. To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor's Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A', which is expected to be completed by November 2018, an integrated information system will be implemented, which will include individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data. For 2016 the available data regarding the criminal procedure are as follows: Courts of First Instance: Criminal Cases Discussed: 473.457, Convictions/Acquittals: 206.311, Postponements: 262.433, Courts of Appeal: Criminal Cases Discussed: 59.643, Convictions/Acquittals: 24.995, Postponements: 33.601

Q097 (2021): The data are from the Statistical Service of the Ministry of Justice.
The data has been collected from the 19 out of 19 Courts of Appeal in Greece.
Business registry cases do not belong anymore to the case of the courts, there is new department of a different Ministry.

Q097 (2020): Due to the pandemic, pending cases have accumulated in the courts of first instance, with the result that the courts of second instance have fewer cases to handle.
The data given for questions 97 and 98 are collected from all second instance courts. However, many fields are answered NA as only few data were collected from the second instance Courts.

Q097 (2019): The Council of State did not provide the Ministry of Justice with data regarding the Administrative law cases

Q097 (2017): Concerning Civil and Commercial litigious cases but also administrative law cases, the numbers are different from those provided in the 2016 questionnaire due to the recent operation of the OSDDY-PP and OSDDY-DD Integrated Management Systems (please see the comments provided for Q91).
Variations in the number of resolved cases are explained by the fact that in 2017 the function of the courts was not affected by the strike of the lawyers, which took place in 2016.

Q097 (2016): Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics. In fact, in 2016, a working group was set up to update and simplify the content of the statistical data requested by the judicial services of the country. The working group created tables followed by detailed instructions and training in relation to the requested information. According to the instructions given to the courts, some procedures they handle, in those which there is no participation of a judge, are not included in the data collected. In addition, in 2016 a long-term abstention by the lawyers of the country took place, resulting in reduction of numbers regarding the cases.

Q097 (2012): In the ambit of the 2012 exercise, it has been stressed that, as far as the statistical information provided by the courts is concerned (e.g. replies to questions 91 and 97), the system of collecting data could not comply with the CEPEJ methodology because it was planned having altogether different national needs in mind. Thus, schematically, a case brought into the Greek judicial system gets an initial reference number. However, in the process of being tried, it gets more than one reference number according to the laws. As a result the numbers of incoming and resolved cases do not match.
Moreover, the Ministry of Justice, Transparency and Human Rights was not able to verify the accuracy of the replies, due to the lack of IT system.
Besides, recent law changes have altered the jurisdiction of courts, so the figures communicated for 2012 could not be compared with these provided for the previous evaluation cycles.

Q098 (2021): The data are from the Statistical Service of the Ministry of Justice. The courts function in cooperation with the prosecutions offices. For example, postponed cases get to the prosecutor offices and then to the courts, in repeat 2-3 times, during the period (year). The definition of the pending cases included postponed cases or the cases for which the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn't been determined during the year. The data has been collected from 19 out of 19 Courts of Appeal in Greece.

Q098 (2020): Due to the pandemic, pending cases have accumulated in the courts of first instance, with the result that the courts of second instance have fewer cases to handle.
The data given for questions 97 and 98 are collected from all second instance courts. However, many fields are answered NA as only few data were collected from the second instance Courts.

Q098 (2018): To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor's Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A', which was completed in March 2019 for 41 courts of the State, an integrated information system is implemented, which includes individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data.

Q098 (2016): Filling in the requested information regarding the criminal procedure is not possible at the moment. To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor's Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A', which is expected to be completed by November 2018, an integrated information system will be implemented, which will include individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data. For 2016 the available data regarding the criminal procedure are as follows: Courts of First Instance: Criminal Cases Discussed: 473.457, Convictions/Acquittals: 206.311, Postponements: 262.433, Courts of Appeal: Criminal Cases Discussed: 59.643, Convictions/Acquittals: 24.995, Postponements: 33.601

Q099 (2021): The fact is that Supreme Court couldn't split the number of civil cases on each category provided in the table. The correct numbers for Categories 1+2 are the following: 2300 pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year, 2 644 incoming cases, 2 262 resolved cases and 2 682 Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year.

Q099 (2020): No data were collected from Supreme Courts regarding incoming and resolved cases. Therefore, we were unable to provide the relevant evaluable data.

Q099 (2018): "the discrepancy between the number of the resolved cases of 2017 and of 2018 for administrative law cases is due to the combination of the following factors:
-in 2018 a number of difficult cases, that had to do with the system of social insurance, was about to be completed
-lawyers become familiar with the filters regarding the cassation and its strict prerequisites, which lead to less rejections of cases as inadmissible and subsequently to a higher number of cases being discussed as far as their real facts are concerned.
-for the abovementioned reason the fast procedure provided for by the relevant code of procedure is not so often implemented
-there are still vacant places of councellors of state, i.e. of the highest rank."

Q099 (2017): "Administrative law cases": the number of incoming cases decreased in mainly two sections of the Council of State (i.e. section b for tax issues (-239 cases) and section d for general issues (-692)).

Q099 (2016): Previous data concerning the total did not include administrative law cases.

Q100 (2021): There are no Other criminal cases at the level of the Supreme Court, these proceedings appear only at First instance and Appeals courts and prosecutors' offices, therefore category 3. should be NAP.

Q100 (2020): There were no data collected for this question.

Q100 (2016): With regard to the category "pending cases on 1 January 2016", the abnormality of the figures is due to the fact that the postponed cases because of the abstention of the lawyers in 2015 were not considered as pending to the backlog of the court.
In 2016 a long-term abstention by the lawyers of the country took place, resulting in reduction of the number of resolved criminal law cases. Accordingly, the number of pending criminal law cases increased.

Q101 (General Comment): In criminal matters, the justice system in Greece presents the following peculiarity: postponed cases get to the prosecutor offices and then to the courts, in repeat 2-3 times, during the period (year). The definition of the pending cases includes postponed cases or the cases for which the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn't been determined during the year. Accordingly, there are horizontal discrepancies in the table.

Q101 (2021): In criminal matters, the justice system in Greece presents the following peculiarity: postponed cases get to the prosecutor offices and then to the courts, in repeat 2-3 times, during the period (year). The definition of the pending cases includes postponed cases or the cases for which the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn't been determined during the year. Accordingly, there are horizontal discrepancies in the table.

Q101 (2020): Evidence has been provided by different courts, but not by their totality, so there is not enough data to give a full answer.

Q101 (2019): Competent Authorities and Courts did not provide us with the relevant data

Q101 (2017): "cases relating to asylum seekers": the number of incoming cases and the number of resolved cases increased compared to 2016 due to an increased inflow of cases. As regards the number of pending cases at the end of the year: the deviation between the respective data of 2016 is due to the transition of the data from hard copy to a new information (IT) system called "Integrated Court Management System for the Administrative Justice (OSDDY-DD)". This deviation that has already been taken into account by the Central Organizational Committee for the due implementation of OSDDY-DD, is expected to lapse gradually within the next years. Furthermore, deviations have also emerged from the new way of collecting statistical data that the central Organizational Committee is trying to establish in order to ensure the uniform input of data by each court and from recent verifications of relevant numerical data that were subsequently sent by the courts. Finally, discrepancies are also due to errors of the information system itself, for which an effort is being made to identify and inform about, the contractor of the system. Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens: the number of acts of removal/expulsion of foreigners has been reduced, since most of them who are now entering the county, seek asylum, something that explains the respective increase in asylum cases within 2017.

Q101 (2016): Except for the categories "cases relating to asylum seekers (refugee status under the 1951 Geneva Convention)" and "cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens", the relevant data are not available electronically for the moment, therefore their extraction is not possible.

Hungary

Q091 (2021): The number of incoming cases decreased in general and the situation was the same for administrative cases. As the number of incoming cases decreased and the courts were able to finish more cases than the number of the "new" cases, the backlog was reduced.

Q091 (2020): The pandemic situation had a huge effect on the case flow of the courts on every level of the court system. Special regulations were adopted by the legislator to promote videoconferencing and the courts were "closed between the 16th of March and the 31th of March (during this period no procedural events could be performed at the courts). Although the courts carried out their main activities, many cases were prolonged e.g. because the parties were not able to attend the hearings. Regarding administrative cases the re-organization of administrative jurisdiction also could have an effect on the case-flow.

Q091 (2018): One of the reasons of the decreasing number of incoming cases is the new civil procedural code coming into force on the 1st of January 2018. This resulted that many of those parties (especially those who were represented by lawyer) who had the chance to do so, filed their petition before the end of 2017 under the scope of the old and well-known procedural code. Regarding the discrepancy between 2017 and 2018 in the number of registry cases, it is due to the fact that for the first time in 2018, the number of non-litigious business registry cases is available.

Q091 (2017): Regarding the categories "2.1 general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases", and "4. other cases" the number of pending cases on 1st of January differ from the closing number of the previous year because of data collection problems at certain regional courts.
In the category "registry cases" the higher number of incoming and resolved cases in 2016 was the result of a large number of involuntary dissolution cases. As the courts finished these cases and backlog cases from previous years the number of resolved cases in 2016 was higher than incoming cases in contrast with 2017.

Q091 (2016): In category "4. other cases" there is a difference between the number of pending cases on 31 December 2015 and the number of pending cases on 1 January 2016. The cause of this difference is the change of the IT system and the cleansing of the database.
2.1 General civil and commercial non-litigious cases: there was a change in the statistical methodology at the largest regional court that caused a difference in the figures pertaining to pending cases on 1 January 2016.
2.2.3. “other registry cases” include registration of civil societies.
The increase in the number of general civil (commercial) non litigious cases pending on 1 January 2016 is due to the change in the statistical methodology at the largest regional court that caused a difference in the figures.
The number of incoming “other registry cases” increased between 2014 and 2016 because of the increasing number of registry cases of civil societies. Accordingly, the number of resolved “other registry cases” increased also for the same period. With regard to the category “other non-litigious cases”, the increased numbers characterizing the period 2014-2016 are the consequence of the increasing number of court mediation cases and non-litigious labour cases.

Q091 (2015): There is a difference between the number of pending cases on 31 December 2014 and the number of pending cases on 1 January 2015. The cause of this difference is the change of the calculation method at some regional courts.

The category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes all cases that are not concluded through the rules of the civil procedure, but through a more or less simplified procedure. Thus, there is a very wide range of related categories set forth by the Civil Procedure Code or other acts. For example, a reference was made to: exclusion of a judge; preliminary verification; issuance of a restraining order and review of that; declaration of dead; declaration of missing; revision of the medical care of mentally disordered patients, deposit at the court; company registration procedures; registration of associations, foundations etc.

The category “other registry cases” include registration of civil societies.

The category “other non-litigious cases” include court mediation and non-litigious labour cases.

The category "other" include Insolvency cases and labour cases.

Q091 (2014): In 2014, in contrast with the 2013 evaluation, some registration cases as well as non-litigious enforcement cases were also included within the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”. The item “other registry cases” includes registration of civil societies. The item “other non-litigious cases” includes court mediation and non-litigious labour cases. Before 2013, non-litigious administrative law cases were counted as “non-litigious civil and commercial cases”. Since 2013, non-litigious and litigious administrative law cases are provided together. The increased number of investigations conducted by administrative authorities (e.g. tax authorities) resulted in an increased number of reviews against these decisions.

Q091 (2013): Till 2013, the data-provider for non-litigious enforcement cases was the Ministry of Justice. Since 2013, the data-collecting system of courts covers also this group of cases (general non-litigious cases). Before 2013, non-litigious administrative law cases were counted as “non-litigious civil and commercial cases”. Since 2013, non-litigious and litigious administrative law cases are provided together. As for the subcategory “civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, it encompasses different categories of cases for 2012 and 2013.
Q093 (2013): In 2010, 2012 and 2014 the category “other” encompasses insolvency registry cases and labour litigious cases. In 2012, additionally it includes misdemeanour cases. In 2013, the category subsumes insolvency cases and non-litigious labour cases.

Q094 (General Comment): Criminal offences are severe or minor crimes. Severe crimes (bűntett) are committed intentionally and are punishable with at least two years of imprisonment. All other criminal offences are minor crimes (vétség). Crimes that are not committed intentionally are always considered as minor crimes, despite the possible punishment.
Misdemeanours (szabálysértés) are not considered as criminal offences, but are unlawful acts that are endangering the society. The authorities intervening in their respect are the police, the district office, or the National Tax and Customs Office. Their decisions can be reviewed by the relevant section of the respective district court upon request of the accused person. Generally, the court rules without oral hearings, based upon the available documents. However, it can set a hearing if it finds it necessary or if the person charged by a misdemeanor requests it. The judgment is a final and enforceable decision.
It is noteworthy that the Hungarian law identifies also the category of civil offences encompassing offences mainly against public administration. However some criminal offenses, such as property crimes involving objects of small value (under 50000 HUF), are classified in this category as well. Civil offences fall under the jurisdiction of various administrative agencies, local governments or traffic police, but not the courts.
Concerning the methodology of presentation of data, as according to the Hungarian Criminal Code not only severe crimes (bűntett), but also almost every minor crime (vétség) are punishable with imprisonment, both categories were included into the category “severe criminal cases”. Thus misdemeanors (szabálysértés) were included into the category “minor criminal cases”.

Q094 (2021): New types of misdemeanours were introduced into the legal system in accordance with the measures taken against the COVID-19 pandemic. As the number of incoming cases increased the number of resolved cases increased as well.

Q094 (2018): Criminal offences are severe or minor crimes. Severe crimes are commited intenitionally and are punishable with at least two years of imprisonment. All other criminal offences are minor crimes.
Misdemanours are not considered as criminal offences, but are unlawful acts that are endangering the society.

Q094 (2014): The increase in the number of incoming misdemeanour cases in 2012 and 2014 is the consequence of an amendment of the relevant legislation. This increase resulted also in higher numbers of resolved and pending cases.

Q094 (2012): For 2012, not all types of misdemeanour cases were included in the respective category. The increase in the number of incoming misdemeanour cases stems from legislative amendments. This increase resulted also in higher numbers of resolved and pending cases.
Q097 (2021): As of 1 April 2020, a significant change was introduced concerning the competence of the Administrative Chamber. As a result of this change, all legal remedies sought for in administrative disputes were decided by the Curia after 1 April 2020. Other cases: second instance labour cases and those second instance insolvency cases that are not included in category 2.1.
Q097 (2020): The pandemic situation had a huge effect on the case flow of the courts on every level of the court system. Special regulations were adopted by the legislator to promote videoconferencing and the courts were "closed between the 16th of March and the 31th of March (during this period no procedural events could be performed at the courts). Although the courts carried out their main activities, many cases were prolonged e.g. because the parties were not able to attend the hearings. Regarding administrative cases the re-organization of administrative jurisdiction also could have an effect on the case-flow.

Q097 (2019): No specific reason was pointed out in respect of decreases observed for the period 2018 - 2019 with regard to "4. other cases".
Q097 (2017): With regard to variations observed in the numbers of “registry cases” and “other registry cases”, it is noteworthy that the content of these categories is the same for the last four cycles. As the legislation on civil societies was amended in 2014 this resulted in an increased number of registry cases, but since then the number of incoming cases is decreasing.

Q097 (2016): With regard to the pending cases, it is noteworthy specifying that the decrease of the “backlog” of the courts is an overall trend in the Hungarian judiciary.
As for the other variations observed within the frame of question 97, the “raw” figures in most of the categories can be considered as relatively low figures (e.g. some hundreds in the whole country), so even a not so huge increase or decrease result in a large percentage change.

Q097 (2014): In 2014, in contrast with the 2013 evaluation, some registration cases were also included within the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”. The item “other registry cases” includes registration of civil societies. The item “other non-litigious cases” includes court mediation and non-litigious labour cases.
The category “other” encompasses insolvency cases and labour cases.
Q098 (2021): As it was mentioned at the first instance, the introduction of new types of misdemeanours resulted in a higher number of incoming cases. As a result of the increase of incoming cases the number of resolved cases was also higher.

Q098 (2014): The increases over the period 2010-2014 regarding misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases, is due to the constant increase of incoming and resolved first instance cases starting from 2010, which led to the increase in the number of second instance incoming cases.

Q099 (2021): Other cases: insolvency cases, review procedures in labour cases, uniformity complaints
Administrative Chamber
As of 1 April 2020, a significant change was introduced concerning the competence of the Administrative Chamber. As a result of this change, all legal remedies sought for in administrative disputes were decided by the Curia after 1 April 2020. This caused a significant increase in the caseload which was substantially higher than any number of incoming cases in the previous years, regarding the year 2021 as a whole. The change in the competences had an impact for the whole year 2021, due to which administrative legal remedy cases accounted for almost half of the total number of incoming cases at the Curia. Because of the change, the number of administrative judges was increased, and the increased judicial staff managed to resolve the surplus in a timely manner.
Civil Chamber
In comparison to 2020 data, the increase in the number of incoming civil and commercial litigious (line 1) can be explained by the fact that the incoming appeal (second instance) cases were higher by almost 40%. Regarding the appeal cases, the Curia experienced a temporary fallback in 2020; however, as the pandemic situation got better, lower courts could resolve more cases. So, the increase experienced in 2021 is explained by the low base value in 2020, as well as by the improvement in the COVID-19 pandemic situation.
The increase in the number of incoming general civil non-litigious cases (line 2.2.1) can be explained by the increase of cases initiated for the designation of the competent court to two and a half times. Despite the fact that the Civil Division of the Civil Chamber had resolved two times more cases than in the previous year, still there was a significant number of 'designation cases' remained pending.
2.1. Civil and commercial non-litigious cases referred to the Curia through an appeal or a petition for review, cases concerning recusal of judges, cases concerning the designation of the competent court, cases concerning an objection filed because of allegedly excessive duration of the proceedings.
2.2. This is an aggregate of the numbers reported under lines 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3.
2.2.2. Business registry cases referred to the Curia through an appeal or a petition for review.
2.2.3. Review proceedings concerning the registry of civil organizations and other non-profit organizations.
2.3. Review proceedings initiated in non-litigious labour cases, as well as non-litigious proceedings related to labour litigation, initiated for the designation of the competent court.

Q099 (2020): The pandemic situation had a huge effect on the case flow of the courts on every level of the court system. Special regulations were adopted by the legislator to promote videoconferencing and the courts were "closed between the 16th of March and the 31th of March (during this period no procedural events could be performed at the courts). Although the courts carried out their main activities, many cases were prolonged e.g. because the parties were not able to attend the hearings. Regarding administrative cases the re-organization of administrative jurisdiction also could have an effect on the case-flow.

Q099 (2017): The number of incoming cases decreased in most of the observed categories at the Supreme Court. This also resulted in a decrease in the number of resolved cases thus the number of pending cases increased.

Q099 (2016): Generally, the increase in the number of incoming cases at the Kúria (Hungarian Supreme Court) for 2016 is the result of the increasing use of extraordinary remedies by the parties. As the number of incoming cases increased, it resulted in an increase in the other categories as well.
Q099 (2014): In 2014, in contrast with the 2013 evaluation, some registration cases were also included within the category "civil and commercial non-litigious cases". The item "other registry cases" includes registration of civil societies. The item "other non-litigious cases" includes court mediation and non-litigious labour cases.
The category "other" encompasses insolvency cases and labour cases.
On the occasion of the 2014 exercise, it has been stressed that one of the main aims of the judicial reform of January 1, 2012 was that the President of the Supreme Court (Kúria) and the Supreme Court itself should focus more on the quality of judicial work. As the President of the Supreme Court was released from the burden of the central administration of the court system, the Kúria was able to reduce its backlog as well as to focus more on the consistency of the national jurisdiction.

Q100 (2021): In case of severe criminal cases, the fallback of the clearance rate can be explained on one hand by the pandemic situation; on the other hand, by the fact that in years 2020 and 2021, almost 50% of the judges of the Criminal Chamber retired. The vacant judicial positions were already filled. The increase in the number of motions for review can be explained by an increased activity of defendants and their defence counsels. Any objective reason for that increased activity cannot be established.

Q101 (2020): The pandemic situation had a huge effect on the case flow of the courts on every level of the court system. Special regulations were adopted by the legislator to promote videoconferencing and the courts were "closed between the 16th of March and the 31th of March (during this period no procedural events could be performed at the courts). Although the courts carried out their main activities, many cases were prolonged e.g. because the parties were not able to attend the hearings. The increase of the number of incoming and resolved Employment dismissal cases is the result of technical changes and transfer of responsibilities from the Administrative and Labour Courts to the Regional Courts. In March 2020, the Administrative and Labour Courts were dismissed, and the pending cases were transferred to the Regional Courts, which deal with these cases on first instance since April 1, 2020. As a result, these cases were technically administered as "incoming" cases at the Regional Court and as "resolved" cases at the Administrative and Labour Courts.

Q101 (2017): Regarding the categories “insolvency”, "robbery" and "intentional homicide" the number of pending cases on 1st of January differ from the closing number of the previous year because of data collection problems at certain regional courts.

Q101 (2016): With regard to the category “employment dismissal cases”, as the number of incoming cases decreased it resulted in a decrease in the other categories as well. The reason of the decrease in the number of incoming cases might be outside of the court system. With regard to the category “insolvency cases”, the methodology of data collection changed from the year 2015 to 2016. Accordingly, there is a discrepancy between the number of insolvency cases pending on 31 December 2015 and the number of insolvency cases pending on 1 January 2016.
With regard to "robbery cases" and "intentional homicide", currently the database contains some invalid data for these categories, so before solving this problem no valid data may be given.

Q101 (2015): Regarding the category "litigious divorce cases", the data provided for 2015 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed. As a result of an amendment of the code of civil procedure, litigious divorce cases were included in a new statistical category. This resulted in a starting number of "0" litigious divorce case at the beginning of the year 2015.
Q101 (2014): The decrease in the number of pending employment dismissal cases on 31 December over the period 2012-2014 is a consequence of the decrease in the number of incoming cases. Another reason was the establishment of 20 Administrative and Labour courts and 6 Regional Administrative and Labour Divisions in January 2013. The former are specialized first instance courts dealing with cases concerning the review of administrative decisions and employment relationships. The latter are special departments that coordinate the professional work of Administrative and Labour Courts, providing a professional platform for judges to discuss actual issues in administrative and labour matters.

Ireland

Q091 (General Comment): Historically, the number of pending civil cases has not been recorded in caseload data, as many cases initiated before the Irish courts either settle out of court or are not proceeded with by the plaintiff/applicant without there being any procedural requirement that the parties inform the court of either a settlement or an intention not to proceed with the case. Civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases include proceedings not resolved inter partes, such as undefended pecuniary claims, deed poll applications, probate (grants of representation), wardship proceedings, registrations of enduring powers of attorney, appointment of care representatives, unopposed personal and corporate insolvency proceedings, liquor licencing applications and marriage notice exemption applications.
Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Q091 (2021): As the Courts Service is not in a position to confirm to increase or decrease, we can note the following: There was a decrease in over 2,500 in personal injuries cases, recovery of debt cases overall decreased by about 1,500 cases and small claims decreased by 40 percent to 2,134, licensing was down 18 percent to 10,764. We can say it is very likely that ongoing covid restrictions contributed to this in licensing.
Q091 (2020): Reduction in non-litigious cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. This included domestic violence and criminal proceedings. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie.
Attendance at Court offices was by appointment only to ensure that footfall could be safely managed.

Q091 (2017): We are not in a position to offer further comment on the figure for resolved Civil (and commercial) litigious cases. We are not in a position to offer further comment on variations in the number of incoming and resolved "other" cases.

Q091 (2016): The decrease in the number of incoming and resolved "other cases" observed for the period 2014 - 2016 is due to a sharp reduction on taxations of legal costs since 2014.
Q091 (2015): Category "other" includes: Taxation of bills of costs.

Q091 (2014): A substantial number of cases which have been completed (through settlement or non-pursuit of the case by the plaintiff without notice to the court) are not recorded and counted as completed. Consequently, the clearance rate appearing from the case flow data provided is considered to understate significantly the actual case clearance rate.

Q091 (2013): The number of enforcement cases has been reported for the first time. The Courts Service has sought to create a category of cases under the Irish system that would be equivalent to non-litigious enforcement cases under other justice systems. The figure consists of the following steps leading to enforcement measures by court judgments and orders: Execution orders, Registered Judgments, Judgment Mortgage Certificates.

Q092 (2014): Starting 2014 the category: “Appointment of care representatives” was added to the “Civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”
Q093 (2014): From 2014, the range of 'Other cases' has been revised to incorporate the category 'certificates of taxation of legal costs issued'. This can explain the fact that different elements have been included in the category 'other' in 2013 and 2014.
Q094 (General Comment): Except for the Supreme Court, criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case due to the various ICT systems used. This is due to data collection/ ICT systems that are in use by the Court Service.
Akin to question 91, the number of pending criminal law cases cannot be provided within the frame of question 94, provided that it is not recorded in caseload data.
Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases include all cases triable summarily (e.g. common assault, public order offences, burglary or theft in other that aggravated circumstances).

Q094 (2021): Severe criminal cases are taken to mean indictable offences that are dealt with in the Circuit and High Court. Misdemeanour is taken to mean minor offences and indictable offences dealt with summarily in the District Court. The number of incoming cases will never equal the number of resolved cases. It is worth noting that the number of resolved cases in 2021 was a significant increase in the resolved cases from 2020. It is also worth noting that not all offences are proceeded with by the prosecutor, particularly minor offences.
Criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case due to the various ICT systems used
Q094 (2020): Misdemeanour and minor criminal cases are cases heard in the District Court. There were fewer such cases incoming and resolved because of Covid-19.
Q094 (2018): From 2016 extra judicial resources were applied by Senior Judiciary to the Courts dealing with some of the most serious criminal matters, which explains the increase of the number of resolved severe cases.

Q094 (2016): With regard to the number of resolved severe criminal cases, there is no particular reason explaining the observed discrepancy between 2014 and 2016, except for the fact that in 2014 figures were exceptionally high.

Q094 (2014): The previous data in respect of severe criminal cases were presented by reference to the defendant rather than to the offence(s) charged, whereas the data for 2014 reflects offence(s) charged, to align with the unit of measurement for minor criminal cases.
Q094 (2012): There were substantial reductions in the number of recorded traffic and public order offences between 2010 and 2012, and these categories of offences make up a significant proportion of the minor criminal cases that come before the courts.
Q097 (General Comment): Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Q097 (2020): Reduced cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. This included domestic violence and criminal proceedings. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie.
Attendance at Court offices was by appointment only to ensure that footfall could be safely managed.
The Court of Appeal quickly adopted the use of video technology and made greater use of electronic documentation to facilitate its work. Procedures were introduced to ensure that justice was administered in public. Judgments were delivered electronically. Waiting times for a hearing were improved, to a certain extent, by a net reduction in the numbers of new cases coming into the list from other jurisdictions. By year end, there was a net improvement in the numbers of cases waiting to be dealt with compared to 2019.

Q097 (2017): The number of resolved civil and commercial litigious cases reflects a significant reduction in disposal of second instance appeals by comparison with that returned in the previous reporting cycle.
Q097 (2016): As concerns the number of resolved "Civil and commercial litigious cases", 2016 data reflects a significant increase in disposal of second instance appeals over that in the previous reporting cycle. Accordingly, the total of resolved cases is affected.
Q098 (General Comment): Except for the Supreme Court, criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case due to the various ICT systems used. This is due to data collection/ ICT systems that are in use by the Court Service.

Q098 (2020): Reduced misdemeanour/minor cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. This included domestic violence and criminal proceedings. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie. Attendance at Court offices was by appointment only to ensure that footfall could be safely managed.
The Court of Appeal quickly adopted the use of video technology and made greater use of electronic documentation to facilitate its work. Procedures were introduced to ensure that justice was administered in public. Judgments were delivered electronically. Waiting times for a hearing were improved, to a certain extent, by a net reduction in the numbers of new cases coming into the list from other jurisdictions. By year end, there was a net improvement in the numbers of cases waiting to be dealt with compared to 2019.
Offences are counted here rather than number of cases. There were 260 appeals in respect of 1,405 offences lodged in the Court of Appeal (Criminal) in 2020. The Court disposed of 367 appeals in respect of 1,719 offences.

Q098 (2018): With regard to the category "resolved cases", the figures reflect a continuing increase in disposal of second instance appeals disposed of over that in the previous reporting cycle (2016 data) due to the establishment of the Court of Appeal.
Q098 (2016): Data on resolved cases reflect a significant increase in disposal of second instance appeals due to the establishment of the Court of Appeal. Concerning the number of incoming severe criminal cases, 2016 data reflects the receipt by the Court of Appeal of a substantial number of pending appeals following its establishment.

Q098 (2014): The increase of 161% between 2012 and 2014 in the number of incoming cases and the increase of 101% in the number of resolved cases are due to a change in the unit of measurement for criminal cases from a defendant related unit to an offence related unit.
Q099 (General Comment): Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Q099 (2020): Reduced cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie.
Both the Supreme Court and Court of Appeal quickly adopted the use of video technology and made greater use of electronic documentation to facilitate their continued work. Procedures were introduced to ensure that justice was administered in public. Both jurisdictions delivered their judgments electronically. Waiting times for a hearing in both Courts were improved, to a certain extent, by a net reduction in the numbers of new cases coming into their lists from other jurisdictions. By year end in both Courts, there was a net improvement in the numbers of cases waiting to be dealt with compared to 2019.

Q099 (2019): There has been an overall increase in the appeals in civil matters to the Supreme Court from 2016 and it is expected at this stage that this trend will continue into next year.
Q099 (2018): There has been an overall increase in the appeals in civil matters to the Supreme Court from 2016 and it is expected at this stage that this trend will continue into 2019.
Q099 (2017): Since the establishment of the Court of Appeal in 2014, the number of pending cases at third instance has fallen. However, the number of incoming cases at third instance has slightly increased between 2016 (164) and 2017 (190).

Q099 (2016): The reduced number of incoming and resolved cases reflects the consequences of the establishment of the new Court of Appeal which came into operation in October 2014.

Q099 (2015): The reduction in the number of incoming cases to the Supreme Court substantially reflects the change in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court from that of a second instance appeal court to an appeal court which is primarily third instance in nature
Q099 (2014): 2014: Variation: The significant increase in the number of resolved civil (and commercial) litigious cases between 2012 and 2014 reflects a significant exercise undertaken by the Supreme Court in reviewing its caseload in preparation for the establishment in 2014 of the new Court of Appeal (which has assumed the previous second instance jurisdiction of the Supreme Court), which resulted in the striking out or withdrawal of a significant number of appeals then pending before the Supreme Court.
Q100 (2020): Reduced cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie.
Both the Supreme Court and Court of Appeal quickly adopted the use of video technology and made greater use of electronic documentation to facilitate their continued work. Procedures were introduced to ensure that justice was administered in public. Both jurisdictions delivered their judgments electronically. Waiting times for a hearing in both Courts were improved, to a certain extent, by a net reduction in the numbers of new cases coming into their lists from other jurisdictions. By year end in both Courts, there was a net improvement in the numbers of cases waiting to be dealt with compared to 2019.

Q100 (2018): The increase in incoming and resolved caseload reflects arrangements on foot of the establishment of the Court of Appeal and the new appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.
Q100 (2016): The increase in incoming and resolved caseload reflects arrangements on foot of the establishment of the Court of Appeal and the new appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.
Q101 (General Comment): Under the Insolvency category above the figures reflect both corporate and personal insolvency cases. Insolvency figures include both litigious and non-litigious cases.
Q101 (2021): For serious crimes, our systems include robbery cases with fraud and other crimes of dishonesty and therefore we cannot provide a number of robbery cases disposed of. The numbers are correct and no explanation of the discrepancies can be provided.
Q101 (2020): We have no explanation as to why more of litigious divorce and insolvency cases were received. We have validated the figures and they are correct. There was a significant decrease in the number of resolved robberies in 2020. Covid-19 had a significant effect across the Courts.

Q101 (2019): There was a decrease in bankruptcy and alternative personal insolvency application by debtors and to bankruptcy as a remedy by creditors in 2019. The overall amount of personal insolvency cases fell from 2,909 in 2016 to 1,496 in 2019
Q101 (2018): There was a decrease in bankruptcy and alternative personal insolvency application by debtors and to bankruptcy as a remedy by creditors in 2018. The overall amount of personal insolvency cases fell from 2,909 in 2016 to 1,526 in 2018"
Q101 (2017): The entered under "Cases relating to asylum seekers (refugee status under the 1951 Geneva Convention)" represent judicial review applications relating to asylum cases generally. We are not in a position to provide definitive data on the specific case category indicated on "Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens ".
"Employment dismissal cases": we regret that we cannot definitively explain the reason for the decrease: there is no necessary connection between improvement in the economy and the number of disputes arising from employment dismissal.

Q101 (2016): With regard to the category "insolvency cases", 2016 data on incoming and resolved cases reflect a significant increase in recourse to personal insolvency procedures by debtors (there were 2730 personal insolvency and bankruptcy proceedings in 2016 compared to 941 in 2014).
Q101 (2015): 2015 figure should be 2368. The large increase is substantially due to a large increase in the number of applications for Debt Relief notices, Debt Settlement Arrangements and Personal Insolvency Arrangements

Q101 (2014): The significant increase in the number of incoming and resolved insolvency cases between 2013 and 2014 reflects the introduction of a new range of statutory personal insolvency remedies.

Italy

Q091 (General Comment): A different methodology of classification of civil cases is used since 2012. The result is an improved classification and a better split between litigious and non-litigious cases. For 2010, 2012 and 2013, the category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases has an identical content, namely: separation and divorce by mutual consent, interdiction and incapacitation, protective measures for underage, guardianship and trusteeship etc. Since 2014, it subsumes uncontested payment orders, uncontested divorces, technical appraisals, judicial interdiction and incapacitation, hereditament, etc.
Q091 (2020): In 2020 the case flow was highly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent temporary shutdown of courts. This had an impact on both incoming and resolved cases, which fell quite considerably compared to 2019. However, the fall in the number of resolved cases was less drastic than that of incoming cases, resulting in a clearance rate (CR) higher than 100% and, hence, in a reduction in the number of the unresolved cases (i.e. the pending cases at the end of the period). The COVID-19 pandemic also had a strong impact on the disposition time (DT). The number of pending older than 2 years is not available because figures include the activity of both tribunals and justice of peace offices and for the latter this information is not available.

Q091 (2019): Number of "pending cases older than 2 years" is not available because it refers to first instance causes which also include the activity of Justice of peace offices, for which this information is no available.
Q091 (2018): Administrative cases. – It should be noted that fast-track simplified proceedings are available for dispute resolution in important areas of administrative law, such as public procurement (“rito appalti”). In 2018, the disposition time for such disputes was 237 days in the first instance and 274 days before the Consiglio di Stato (CDS). Furthermore, requests of interim measures are frequent in administrative law cases (about one third of the cases in first instance and half of the cases before the CDS). They provide fast legal protection of the claimant’s rights, often anticipating the final judgment on the merits.

Q091 (2015): Figures at Q.91 (points 1 and 2) have been extracted from a new IT system called “Civil Data warehouse”. This new system allows us to get in-depth information on single proceedings. Before the implementation of such data warehouse, statistics were based on aggregated variables that only partially could distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases.

As far as figures at Q.91 (point 3), please consider that Administrative Justice doesn’t fall under the umbrella of the Ministry of Justice as it is administered by the Council of State (Consiglio di Stato). However, figures at Q.91 (point 3) were not provided by the Council of State, they were rather taken from a public document available online at https://www.giustizia-amministrativa.it/cdsintra/cdsintra/Notiziasingola/index.html?p=NSIGA_3826149
Since the administrative cases (Q.91 point 3) refers to a different administration, it wouldn’t be reasonable to compare these numbers against the number of judges provided at Q.46.

Civil and commercial non-litigious cases include: Uncontested payment orders, uncontested divorces, technical appraisals, judicial interdiction and incapacitation, hereditament, etc.

Q091 (2014): In 2014, figures for the category “administrative law cases” have been submitted for the first time. The administrative justice doesn’t fall under the umbrella of the Ministry of Justice as it is a completely different administration.

Q091 (2013): In 2013 and 2014, the Italian judicial system has gone through a historical geographic reorganization with the closing of almost 1000 courts. Thus, the statistics regarding flows of cases at the end of 2013 may show some anomalies that will be adjusted with the following data gathering. A constant reduction in the incoming civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases is observed from the end of 2009. The number of ADR cases is constantly increasing with a filter effect on the litigious incoming files.

Q093 (2014): In the ambit of the 2014 exercise, the category “other” encompasses the number of enforcement cases.

Q094 (2021): In Italy there is no formal definition of minor criminal cases. For the purposes of this exercise, are considered as minor criminal cases those proceedings dealt with by the Justice of Peace Offices.
Q094 (2018): The reduction in the number of resolved first instance criminal cases, and consequently the increase in the Disposition Time, between 2018 and 2016 comes from the decriminalization measures introduced in 2016 that led to a sharp increase in the number of case dismissals in that year. Indeed, the data for 2017 are:
Incoming: 1.311.900
Resolved: 1.293.054
Pending: 1.282.406
Disposition time: 362 days
These figures show a positive trend of the DT between 2014 and 2017, maintained in 2018.

Q097 (General Comment): · Non-litigious enforcement cases are not in the competence of the Courts of Appeal.
· With regard to the administrative cases (which number is provided only since 2014), the appeals are dealt with by the Council of State (Consiglio di Stato) which is a legal-administrative consultative body ensuring the legality of public administration in Italy. The Council has jurisdiction on acts of all administrative authorities, except when these authorities lack discretionary power, in which case the dispute is considered to be one of civil law. Figures referring to the activity of the Council of State are inserted in the frame of question 99 and not question 97.

Q097 (2021): There are no "other cases"
Figures in 2020 were hugely affected by the pandemic
Q097 (2020): In 2020 the case flow was highly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent temporary shutdown of courts. This had an impact on both incoming and resolved cases, which fell quite considerably compared to 2019. However, the fall in the number of resolved cases was less drastic than that of incoming cases, resulting in a clearance rate (CR) higher than 100% and, hence, in a reduction in the number of the unresolved cases (i.e. the pending cases at the end of the period). The COVID-19 pandemic also had a strong impact on the disposition time (DT).

Q097 (2018): -

Q097 (2017): The number of pending “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, older than 2 years, decreased between 2016 and 2017. Generally speaking, pending cases older than 2 year have priority. However, in this specific case, the important reduction (in %) is mainly due to the fact that the numbers are small.

Q097 (2016): As regards the variations concerning the category "general civil (and commercial) non litigious cases", it should be noted that the Ministry of Justice has recently implemented a data warehouse system that can collect a huge number of data and events pertaining to millions of civil cases. The new DWGC (Data Warehouse for Civil Justice) is now fully operational and it represents a major improvement in terms of statistics and quality. Since 2015, data pertaining to Q.97 is extracted from the above Datawarehouse and it is to be considered more accurate than the figures provided in the past.
It should be noted that in 2014 for many cases it was not possible to distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases because they were coming together in a bundle. With the data warehouse it is possible to tell whether any given procedure has either litigious or non-litigious nature. Besides, when comparing pending cases on 31 Dec 2014 with pending cases on 1 Jan 2016, the variations are less important.

Q097 (2015): The appeal of administrative case is dealt by the Council of State (Consiglio di Stato) which is a legal-administrative consultative body that ensures the legality of public administration in Italy. The council has jurisdiction on acts of all administrative authorities, except when these authorities lack discretionary power, in which case the dispute is considered to be one of civil law.

Figures referring to the activity of the Council of State (second instance of administrative justice) have been submited to Q.99 rather than Q.97.

Figures on Q.97 (points 1 and 2) have been extracted from a new IT system called “Civil Data warehouse”. This new system allows us to get in-depth information on single proceedings. Before the implementation of such data warehouse, statistics were based on aggregated variables that only partially could distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases.
All cases dealt by the Supreme Court of Cassation has always a litigious nature.

Q098 (General Comment): In Italy there is no formal definition of “minor criminal cases”. For the purposes of this exercise are considered as minor criminal cases those proceedings dealt with by the Justice of Peace Offices which have been appealed (to Tribunal).
Q098 (2021): Figures in 2020 were hugely affected by the pandemic

Q098 (2018): -

Q098 (2016): With regard to second instance criminal cases, in 2014-2015 a new case management system was introduced. This has negatively affected the statistics for those two years. Statistics for 2016 are definitely more robust and consistent. Besides, when comparing pending cases on 31 Dec 2014 with pending cases on 1 Jan 2016, the variations are less important.

Q099 (General Comment): · With regard to the administrative cases (which number is provided only since 2014), the appeals are dealt with by the Council of State (Consiglio di Stato) which is a legal-administrative consultative body ensuring the legality of public administration in Italy. The Council has jurisdiction on acts of all administrative authorities, except when these authorities lack discretionary power, in which case the dispute is considered to be one of civil law. Figures referring to the activity of the Council of State are inserted in the frame of question 99 and not question 97. · In Italy, non-litigious enforcement cases are not heard by the highest instance court. The latter only hears litigious enforcement cases.

Q099 (2021): "Other cases" represent residual cases, such as those concerning the competence or jurisdiction of the courts, or those concerning the correction of the so-called material errors committed by the Supreme Court.

Q099 (2019): Other cases represent residual cases, such as cases regarding the competence or jurisdiction of the courts, correction of material errors.
Q099 (2018): The increase of the incoming civil litigious cases is ascribed to proceedings related to immigration matters. There is no specific explanation for the increase of resolved administrative cases. Other cases represent residual cases, such as cases regarding the competence or jurisdiction of the courts, correction of material errors.

Q099 (2017): The category "other cases” at Q.99 (Supreme Court) represents residual cases such as cases regarding the competence/jurisdiction of the court, corrections of material errors, etc. The 25% variation (in terms of number of resolved cases) has no particular explanation. Please also note that this category do not exist at first and second instance.

Q099 (2016): "Other cases” represent residual cases such as cases regarding the competence/jurisdiction of the court, corrections of material errors, etc. In respect of this category, the numbers are small and the observed variations should be put into perspective.

Q099 (2014): · In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been indicated that figures subsumed within the category “other” represent really residual cases (such as cases regarding the competence/jurisdiction of the court, corrections of material errors, etc.).
· As to the increases observed in respect of the “total of other than criminal law cases” with regard to all the items (pending, incoming, resolved cases), it is noteworthy that in 2014 for the first time “administrative law cases” dealt with by the Council of State were considered. If looking only to “civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, the differences are not that big. In general terms the Supreme Court of Cassation resolves fewer cases than incoming cases.

Q099 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been specified that non-litigious enforcement cases are not heard by the highest instance court which hears only litigious enforcement cases. Before 2012, only litigious enforcement cases have been provided. For 2012, data related to litigious enforcement cases are the following: initially pending: 1090; incoming: 221; resolved: 413; finally pending: 898.
Q100 (General Comment): Under "minor criminal cases" fall cases against justice of peace's decisions and cases against first and second instance decisions regarding minor offences which are punished with fines.
“Other cases” represent proceedings regarding jurisdiction or competence conflicts, proceedings pending in other countries (rogatory) or procedures regarding the correction of the so-called material errors committed by the Supreme Court.

Q100 (2021): * Most discrepancies between 2021 and 2021 data are due to the fact that in 2020 the activity of the courts was hugely affected by the pandemic.
**Moreover, small number often lead to large percentage variations.
Q100 (2020): 2."minor criminal cases" represent cases against justice of peace's decisions and cases against first and second instance judges’ decisions, regarding minor offences that are punished with fines. 3. “Other cases” Can be related to procedures pending in first or second instances (jurisdiction or competence conflicts between other courts), or pending in other countries (rogatory or capture instances); “Other cases” can be also related to decisions regarding the execution of imposed punishments (for example regarding the end or a change (home detention) of the imprisonment), or can be related to the correction of material errors on Highest Court’s sentences.

Q100 (2018): Following the introduction of the new item “other” at Q100, the Supreme Court has revised and ameliorated their classification of cases. The misdemeanour category now includes not only the proceedings coming from the justice of peace offices but also all those minor offences which are punished with fines. “Other cases” (point 3) can be related to procedures pending in first or second instances (jurisdiction or competence conflicts between other courts), or pending in other countries (rogatory or capture instances); “Other cases” can be also related to decisions regarding the execution of imposed punishments (for example regarding the end or a change (home detection) of the imprisonment), or related to the correction of material errors on Highest Court’s sentences.

Q100 (2016): In respect of minor criminal cases, the numbers are small and the observed variations should be put into perspective.
Q101 (General Comment): With regard to the insolvency cases, the peculiarity of the Italian system consists in distinguishing between “insolvency applications” and “insolvency cases”. The former category concerns the litigious part of the proceeding where creditors and debtors have different goals (dispute). The latter category concerns the part of the proceeding where the judge has already established the insolvency / bankruptcy of the debtor and the case is all about the management of the assets and proceeds of the debtor. Figures at questions 101 and 102 refer to “insolvency applications” rather than “insolvency cases”.
Q101 (2021): The decrease in the number of incoming employment dismissal cases might partially be explained by the extension of the ban on dismissal which was initially intended to address the covid emergency. Therefore, the decrease in the number of pending cases is the result of the decrease of incoming cases.
Q101 (2018): Employment dismissal cases are strongly correlated with the economic trend. The number of employment dismissal cases used to be very high when the economic crisis was at its peak. Now the economy is getting better and therefore the number of these cases is going down.
The strong increase of cases related to asylum seekers was even addressed by the president of the Supreme Court during his speech on the occasion of the inauguration of the judicial year. The reason of such increase depends on the immigration flow. Cases related to the right of entry and stay for aliens are dealt by the administrative justice and for this reason they were not considered in 2016.
Q101 (2017): Asylum seekers cases represent a growing phenomenon. For this reason, a new piece of legislation (L.46/2017) which came into force in 2017, introduced a series of procedures with the aim of speeding up this kind of proceedings. In particular, the main innovations of the above regulatory intervention include the establishment of specialized sections within the courts. Such specialized sections deal exclusively with immigration and international protection cases. The Italian courts are not involved in the activities concerning the right of entry and stay of aliens. The competent body is the Ministry of internal affairs. For further information about this topic please visit http://poliziadistato.it/articolo/10618-Entering_Italy

Q101 (2016): With the introduction of the data warehouse system we can now identify specific types of proceedings (e.g. employment dismissal cases) more precisely.
The figures provided for both litigious divorce and insolvency cases (year 2016) are correct but there is no particular reason explaining the observed variations. With regard to the insolvency cases, the peculiarity of the Italian system consists in distinguishing between “insolvency applications” and “insolvency cases”. The former category concerns the litigious part of the proceeding where creditors and debtors have different goals (dispute). The latter category concerns the part of the proceeding where the judge has already established the insolvency / bankruptcy of the debtor and the case is all about the management of the assets and proceeds of the debtor. The figures at questions 101 and 102 refer to “insolvency applications” (the litigious part of this kind of proceedings) rather than “insolvency cases”.

Q101 (2015): Litigious divorce case in 2015 have been extracted from the “Civil Data warehouse”. While in 2014 they were taken from the previous system. To harmonise the data between the cycles the 2014 was updated with the values derived from the data warehouse too

Q101 (2014): The project called “Civil Datawharehouse” supposed to enable to look at each single procedure individually, has been implemented. However, the output is still under “test phase”.
Q101 (2012): The number of litigious divorce cases, has been affected by the implementation of a different classification of civil cases.

Latvia

Q091 (General Comment): Data from the first and appeal instance courts are compiled by the Court Administration, and the Court Information System is a living database that allows data to be corrected, so changes between previous periods are possible.
Within the Court Information System, submissions received in the previous year but registered the next year are considered as incoming cases for the new year. “Non-litigious enforcement cases” and “non-litigious business registry cases” are not defined in the Civil Code and both are not within the competence of courts in the first instance (similar to “non-litigious land registry cases”).
The category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” encompasses: applications for securing claim prior to initiation of the matter in a court; applications for securing of evidence prior to initiation of the matter in a court; applications for execution of obligations through the court; undisputed compulsory execution of obligations; execution of obligations in accordance with warning procedures; voluntary sale of immovable property at auction through the court; submitting the subject-matter of an obligation for safekeeping in the court; applications for Commercial Court adjudication execution procedures; applications for arbitrary court decision compulsory execution; applications for property protection if there is no inheritance case; applications concerning execution of court adjudications.

Q091 (2021): The number of pending cases on January differs from pending cases on December, 2020 registered data due the living Court information system database. The number of pending cases on Jan. is higher than previous year due high number of pending non-litigious cases. See comments from previous campaigns. Every year from 2019, a significant increase in the number of non-litigious civil cases has been observed. Compared to the previous period, the number of cases increases by 25%. According to the Civil Procedure Law, judge should examine application within seven days. The consideration time determined by the law also affects the amount of resolved cases, and accordingly indicates a direct connection with the amount of incoming cases.
Administrative cases: At the end of 2021, the number of cases received, (which were directed against the Covid-19 restrictive measure - mandatory vaccination), increased significantly, and it was not possible to resolve these cases until the end of the year
The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has decreased. The reduction of pending cases is related to the increased interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending civil and administrative cases.

Q091 (2020): The number of resolved and incoming cases of general civil (commercial) non litigious cases are higher because there was significant increase on applications for the undisputed enforcements. Usually, cases on the undisputed enforcement are submitted electronically and solved in written procedure. The increment of such cases are probably closely connected with activities of creditors` intensity.
We cannot find the main reason why pending cases older than 2 years are resolved more than in previous years.
Representatives of courts point out the effect of Covid19 restrictions because many old cases were re-classified from oral to written procedure if it was possible and if parties of case agreed to that.

Q091 (2019): In 2018 there were several stages of court system reform. Several District courts were merged, and The Land Register offices appended to the District courts. Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – unresolved. The reform of the judiciary could also have affected the backlog of cases pending for more than 2 years, as it is undoubtedly that when transferring a backlog from one court to another, another judge needs extra time to go into the case file. However, the methodology for processing statistical data must also be taken into account, i.e. the functionality of the database, that the period of suspension of proceedings is taken into account during the proceedings and other external economic factors could have affected the number of long-standing civil cases. Taking into account also the peculiarities of litigation in our country, for example, that commercial cases are not separated from civil cases and that one civil case may contain several claims which are considered in one procedure, this generally means that the case takes longer to process.

Q091 (2018): In 2018 there were several stages of court system reform. Several District courts were merged, and The Land Register offices appended to the District courts. Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – unresolved.

Q091 (2017): Data updated after court reorganisation in 2018.

Q091 (2016): Data updated after court reorganisation in 2018.

Q091 (2014): Variations concerning administrative law cases over the period 2012-2014 are due to a change in the legislation. Namely, from July2012, appealed administrative decisions of institutions are handed to District courts.

Q091 (2013): Amendments to the Civil Procedure Law introduce new long-pending forms for insolvency cases such as judicial protection proceedings, insolvency proceedings for individuals, etc., whose proportion increased. The insolvency process begins with a court ruling but the case cannot be closed until the end of the insolvency process. Besides, quick pending cases have been transferred from courts to the Land Registry offices from January 2012. The micro-enterprise development opportunities have increased the number of long-pending insolvency cases in the court. From July 2012, appealed administrative decisions of institutions are handed to District courts.

Q091 (2012): Decreases in the values are due to external (socio-economic) and internal (court system) factors: the gradual exit from the economic crisis; transfer of the majority of the non-litigious civil cases (land registry, business registry and non-litigious enforcement cases) from first instance courts to the competent Land Registry Department; transfer of the appealed decisions against administrative authorities from the Administrative court to the Regional courts of general jurisdiction (thus, only cases of the special jurisdiction of the administrative courts are counted).

Q094 (General Comment): Data from the first and appeal instance courts are compiled by the Court Administration, and the Court Information System is a living database that allows data to be corrected, so changes between previous periods are possible.
According to 2014 data and pursuant to the Criminal Law, criminal offences are divided into criminal violations and crimes distinguished by their nature, degree of the harm and the threat to the interests of a person or the society. A criminal violation is an offence for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding fifteen days, but not exceeding three months (temporary deprivation of liberty), or a type of lesser punishment. Crimes are classified in the following way: less serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three months but not exceeding three years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term up to eight years); serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three years but not exceeding eight years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years); especially serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years or a life imprisonment.

Q094 (2021): Pending cases: The number of pending cases in January differs from pending cases in December 2020 registered data due the living Court information system database
Severe criminal cases include all criminal cases according to the Criminal law - it includes all cases where a harmful offense (act or failure to act) committed deliberately (intentionally) or through negligence, provided for the Criminal Law, and for the commission of which criminal punishment is set out shall be considered a criminal offense. Misdemeanor and / or minor criminal cases includes all administrative infringement cases according to the Law on Administrative liability about administrative offence of a person for which administrative liability is provided for in a law or binding regulations of local governments.
Criminal cases, which are assessed according to the Latvian Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure Law, are decreasing. The reduction from 2020 was influenced by changes in legislation. However, the tendency of the decrease in the number of criminal cases has been observed for a longer period of time, and it cannot be explained by the activities of the courts, but by assumptions about the general development trends of society.
In the summer of 2020, amendments to the Criminal Procedure Law entered into force, which stipulated that the case for minor violations of the criminal law is not referred for initiation of criminal proceedings (Section 373 An investigator with a consent of a prosecutor or a prosecutor may refuse to initiate criminal proceedings, if a misdemeanor has been committed), which affected the the total number of criminal law cases received in court. A decrease in the number of criminal cases received has been observed since 2020.
In the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming cases significantly. According to the law, if the person intends to use his right to appeal a decision, he/she needs to address the complain to the higher official from institution which has made this decision, but if there is no higher official, a decision may be appealed to a district (city) court. This is the main reason for decrease of incoming cases. The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly decreased. The reduction of pending cases is related to the increased interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending criminal cases. In 2021, courts of first instance resolved more criminal cases than in previous periods, which is related to the court's ability to adapt to resolve cases in the restrictive conditions of the Covid-19.
Data of 2020 for minor criminal cases are revised for incoming and resolved cases: 5 755 incoming cases and 6 631 resolved cases.

Q094 (2020): Data on resolved severe criminal cases is decreased because of Covid-19 restrictions. We have already pointed out the limitations of court work: written procedure, prohibition of face-to-face meetings, cancellation of court hearings etc.

Q094 (2018): There may be some change in data due to court system reform.

Q094 (2016): Severe criminal cases - All sections of The Criminal Law
Misdemeanor and / or minor criminal cases - All sections of Latvian Administrative Violations Code
Q094 (2014): According to 2014 data and pursuant to the Criminal Law, criminal offences are divided into criminal violations and crimes distinguished by their nature, degree of the harm and the threat to the interests of a person or the society. A criminal violation is an offence for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding fifteen days, but not exceeding three months (temporary deprivation of liberty), or a type of lesser punishment. Crimes are classified in the following way: less serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three months but not exceeding three years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term up to eight years); serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three years but not exceeding eight years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years); especially serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years or a life imprisonment.

Q094 (2012): According to 2012 data and pursuant to the Criminal Law, criminal offences are divided into criminal violations and crimes distinguished by their nature, degree of the harm and the threat to the interests of a person or the society. A criminal violation is an offence for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding fifteen days, but not exceeding three months (temporary deprivation of liberty), or a type of lesser punishment. Crimes are classified in the following way: less serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three months but not exceeding three years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term up to eight years); serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three years but not exceeding eight years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years); especially serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years or a life imprisonment.

Q097 (General Comment): Data from the first and appeal instance courts are compiled by the Court Administration, and the Court Information System is a living database that allows data to be corrected, so changes between previous periods are possible.
In accordance with the provisions related to data gathering, all information must be recorded in the Court Information System within 3 days. However, the Court Information System functionality for the statistical reports provides in the System recorded figures at the end of the year. Consequently, submissions received in the previous year but registered the next year are considered as incoming cases for the new year.
Justice statistics do not distinguish between “non-litigious enforcement cases” and “non-litigious business registry cases” because such types of cases are not defined in the Civil Code. Accordingly, the reply in their respect is NAP. At any rate, both of these sub-categories of cases are not within the competence of courts neither in first instance (similar to the “non-litigious land registry cases”), nor in second instance. By contrast, the “non-litigious land registry cases” are dealt with by the regional courts in second instance and they are within the competence of the Land Registry Office only in first instance.

Q097 (2021): Comparing to the previous period, the number of pending civil cases on 1 Jan is lower due the restriction measures of the Covid-19 spreading in 2019 and 2020. However indicator of pending administrative law cases on the beginning of year is lower than previous period due the high CR in 2020.
The reduction of pending cases is related to the increased interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending cases.
Q097 (2020): Data on civil (commercial) litigious cases (number of resolved and incoming cases) is lower due to the Covid19 pandemic. On March 14 2020 there was the state of emergency that affected the work of courts. In order to mitigate potential risks of virus, oral proceedings that did not involve serious violations of rights were cancelled. This restriction directly affected the number of resolved cases. Also, there were restrictions on appearance of persons in the court, that affected the number of new claims or request - incoming cases. The first state of emergency lasted till June 2020. The second state of emergency started in November 2020.
Number on civil (commercial) non - litigious cases include the data like in the first instance. Mainly there are cases on undisputed enforcement. Usually, non-litigious cases are resolved in written (not oral) process, and during State of emergency oral processes were not allowed, but there were no restriction on written process. According to this the number of non-litigious cases are higher.
Number on incoming administrative cases are lower. It is connected with restrictions of state emergency situation when representatives from institutions could not check, revise, visit companies (individuals) in the face-to-face meetings.

Q097 (2019): Decrease of pending administrative cases us due to many result cases in previous period
The number of Non-litigious civil cases is very low, that's why percentage isn't good qualifier
Q097 (2018): Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – pending. Data on court statistics are being calculated by automated systems and records on changes that affect data in database are not available. Any changes to the Court Information System can affect the data.
Q097 (2017): As regards the decrease from 2016 in administrative law cases pending on 1 Jan, it can be explained as there were much more resolved cases than incoming in previous cycle. As regards the decrease in the total of other than criminal pending cases, it can be explained as there was a change of pending civil law cases in second instance. This might be an issue due to reclassifying the starting moment of a court case. Also, much more resolved cases than incoming cases has decreased the amount of unresolved cases on 31 Dec.

Q097 (2016): The increase in pending civil cases is due to fewer resolved cases in 2015. Decrease in pending Administrative cases is due to more resolved cases in 2015.
Q097 (2014): In the frame of the 2013 and 2014 exercises it has been indicated that the category “other” includes the following types of cases from the Supreme Court : cases related to moral and physical damages; copyright related cases; family relationship; deprivation of citizenship; labour law cases; cases in respect of inheritance rights.

Q097 (2013): In the frame of the 2013 and 2014 exercises it has been indicated that the category “other” includes the following types of cases from the Supreme Court : cases related to moral and physical damages; copyright related cases; family relationship; deprivation of citizenship; labour law cases; cases in respect of inheritance rights.

Q097 (2012): The decreases observed in 2012 with regard to the totals in respect of the different items (pending, incoming and resolved cases) are the consequence of the evolutions noticed for each of the sub-categories in respect of the number of incoming cases. The decrease of the latter and the improvement of the judicial efficiency resulted in a decrease of the number of pending cases. The end of the economic crisis and the strengthening of the courts' capacity are general factors which have to be taken into account when analysing this positive trend.
As to the sub-category "civil and commercial litigious cases", the increase of the number of pending cases on 1 January 2012 is due to the increase of the number of incoming cases in different categories of cases such as different types of bankruptcy cases which know a long processing time. The duration of these special types of bankruptcy cases cannot be shortened by improving the efficiency of the judiciary. The increase of the number of resolved cases can be explained by the improvement of the work capacity of courts.
As to the sub-category "civil and commercial non-litigious cases", the decrease of the number of resolved cases and pending cases on 1 January 2012 and 31 December 2012 can be explained by the transfer of a part of the cases from the first instance courts to the Land Registry Department, following the legislative reform of 1 January 2012. The number of incoming cases has decreased essentially due to external (socio-economic) factors, namely the gradual exit from the economic crisis during 2010-2013.
As to the sub-category "non-litigious land registry cases", the increase of the number of resolved cases between 2010 and 2012 can be explained by the courts work reviewing a large number of cases in the law limited time because of external factors causing an increase of the number of incoming cases before the entry into force of the new provisions of the Civil Procedure Law on 1 January 2012.
As to the sub-category "administrative law cases", the decrease of the number of pending cases on 1 January 2012 can be explained by the courts work, namely the improvement of the judicial capacity and the decrease of the number of incoming cases due to external factors as public activity resubmission to the Administrative Court and internal factors. The decrease of the number of resolved cases can be explained by the limited capacity of courts work, the complexity of the cases, the parties' failure to appear for court hearings, etc. The decrease of the number of pending cases on 31 December can be explained by the improvement of the judicial capacity of courts and decrease of incoming cases due to external factors.
There are no cases in the sub-category "other". All cases are distributed among the mentioned categories No.1, No.2 and No.6.
The decreases observed with regard to the totals in respect of the different items (pending, incoming, resolved cases) are the consequence of the evolutions noticed for each of the sub-categories in respect of the number of incoming cases. The decrease of the latter and the improvement of the judicial efficiency resulted in a decrease of the number of pending cases on 1 January and 31 December. The end of the economic crisis and the strengthening of the courts' capacity are general factors which have to be taken into account when analysing this positive trend.
As to the sub-category "civil and commercial non-litigious cases", the increase of the number of resolved cases between 2012 and 2013 can be explained by the long pending backlog of complex cases before the courts of the second instance.

Q098 (General Comment): Data from the first and appeal instance courts are compiled by the Court Administration, and the Court Information System is a living database that allows data to be corrected, so changes between previous periods are possible. The figures reflect data of second instance courts and the Supreme Court Criminal chamber. The latter is the appellate body in respect of cases decided by regional courts acting as courts of first instance. Statistics related to the Supreme Court are mentioned only within the total, because till 2009 the statistics were compiled by a specially hired expert.

Q098 (2021): In the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming cases significantly in the first instance courts. According to the law, if the person intends to use his right to appeal a decision, he/she needs to address the complain to the higher official from institution which has made this decision, but if there is no higher official, a decision may be appealed to a district (city) court. This is the main reason for decrease of incoming cases in the first instance courts and in appeal courts as well.
The reduction of pending cases is related to the increased interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending criminal cases.

Q098 (2020): In 2020 there was changes in Administrative Procedure Law, that might affect the amount of resolved cases. Furthermore, number of misdemeanour and / or minor cases are higher in the appeal courts because in last years the Constitutional court has declared several norms on administrative infringements are not incompatible with the Constitution of Latvia. This led to an increase of incoming administrative cases.

Q098 (2018): Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – pending. Data on court statistics are being calculated by automated systems and records on changes that affect data in database are not available. Any changes to the Court Information System can affect the data.

Q098 (2014): In 2014, the statistics of the Supreme Court Criminal Chamber were the following: pending cases on 01.01.2014: 139; incoming cases: 19; resolved cases: 73; pending cases on 31.12.2014: 0.
Due to a court reform, the Chamber of Criminal Cases of the Supreme Court has been liquidated as from 1 January 2015. All cases, which were not resolved on 31 December 2014, were transferred to regional courts.

Q099 (2021): Total number of incoming administrative cases and civil cases has decreased significantly; taken measures to handle backlog of administrative cases has resulted in increased turnover, this has resulted in falling numbers of pending cases. To handle backlog of administrative cases, two additional posts of judges were created for the years 2021 and 2022. For some type of listed cases the total numbers are so small, that even 2-3 cases give discrepancy ratio of 100 % or even more.

Q099 (2020): There has been gradual decrease of incoming cases: civil cases 1336 (2018), 1164 (2019), 1127 (2020) and administrative cases 850 (2018), 844 (2019), 826 (2020). There has been increase of examined cases per judge of the Administrative chamber (+4) and there was additional judge from the Civil chamber allocated to deal with administrative cases (February-September 2019) and substitute judge working at the Supreme Court (September-December 2020). As result the clearance rate for administrative cases in 2019 was 113% and in 2020 was 114%.
The clearance rate for civil cases (Civil chamber) was 120% which is explained by decrease of incoming cases and high number of examined cases per judge (97 cases). Decrease of non-litigious land registry cases is explained, first, by decrease of total numbers of transaction, for example according to the statistics published by the State Cadastre, total number of transaction of land with buildings was 21619 in 2019 and 18616 in 2020. And, second, because majority of land registry cases of previous years concerned aspects of transformation of property rights (privatization and restitution) and economic activity before economic crises of 2008/2009 which are solved by now. Starting from 2019 the Supreme Court uses the same categories of cases as it is used in the first and second instance courts. Therefore previously used category „other cases" disappears.

Q099 (2019): Starting from 2019 the Supreme Court has changed system of classification of cases under different categories for civil cases. During this change we encountered problem of reclassification of cases registered during previous years. This reclassification had as objective to introduce the detailed classification used for first and second instance courts. Statistics for the reference year 2019 encompasses results from both categories. Since 2015 number of unresolved administrative cases increased. During year 2018 additional recourses were allocated to the Administrative department (chamber) of the Supreme Court, including additional judges. As the result, number of resolved cases in 2019 increased. For next coming two years there are two additional judges envisaged for the Administrative department.
Other non-litigious cases (2.3) are specific enforcement procedures which are regarded as uncontested for our civil procedure. These have been received via the specific procedure of a protest submitted by the Prosecutors General Office. The number became available as the result of introduction of the detailed classification regime.

Q099 (2018): Supreme Court does not rely only on data in the Court Information System, they keep separate sheet for statistics
Q099 (2017): Supreme court has provided data for questions 1 & 2. As regards the decrease of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases, there was a major performance raise in 2016. Also, the Supreme court has only recently begun to collect statistics on their work performance and thus there was and still are some NA answers for CEPEJ questionnaire

Q099 (2016): Supreme court had accumulated too many unresolved cases and 1/3 of those ar older than 2 years so they have have made some changes and acheaved progess.
Q099 (2015): An explanation for the rather large difference in case count for general civil and commercial non-litigious cases are changes in civil proceedings - while in 2014 undisputed compulsory execution cases were also heared by Supreme Court, in 2015 it was tasked with hearing decisions from Land registry, sworn baillifs and notaries only.

Q099 (2012): In 2012, the decrease of the total of cases before the higher instance courts correlates with the general decrease of the number of civil cases.
Q100 (2021): Total number of pending cases has significantly increased. Measures to handle this problem have been adopted and are under implementation. There are amendments to the Criminal Procedure Law adopted (https://likumi.lv/ta/id/336542-grozijumi-kriminalprocesa-likuma , in force since 3.11.2022.) to transfer competence to review specific agreement process cases to the regional courts. Some internal case management arrangements have been put into action.

Q100 (2020): During last two years 3 out of 8 judges (after increase of number of judges – 9 judges) have retired. Some additional time was needed to replace them (competition and appointment). There was significant decrease of examined cases in 2020 (clearance rate was 102% in 2019 and 95% in 2020) and increase of received cases in 2019: 734 (2018), 764 (2019) and 686 (2020).
Q100 (2018): Supreme Court does not rely only on data in the Court Information System, they keep separate sheet for statistics

Q101 (2021): Limiting the spread of COVID-19 and mitigating the economic difficulties that may arise with restrictions, in March 2021 the Saeima adopted the Law on the Suppression of Consequences of the Spread of COVID-19 Infection, Section 22 of which stipulated that Until 1 September 2021, the creditor are prohibited from submitting an application for insolvency proceedings of a legal person if any of the features of insolvency proceedings of a legal person referred to in Section 57, Paragraph one, Clause 1, 2, 3, or 4 of the Insolvency Law exists, which affected the number of cases received in court. In 2021, there was a decrease in resolved insolvency cases, which was related to the restrictive measures in the field of insolvency process due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
In 2021, the number of received and resolved cases of the intentional homicide has returned to the level of previous years, and the decrease in the number of cases found in 2020 is no longer observable.
The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly increased for litigious divorce cases, robbery cases and intentional homicide cases. The changes are related to the decisions taken in previous years to limit the spread of the COVID-19: resolving cases in the written procedure if it was possible. However, the types of cases mentioned above (specific Litigous cases) often require face-to-face meetings.

Q101 (2020): There are minor changes in statistical data due to Covid-19 pandemic. The pandemic affected the hearings of the cases and procedure, because there were several case groups that were solved in written way affecting average length of the hearings.

Q101 (2019): Data on court statistics are being calculated by automated systems, we do not keep track on any changes that affect data in database.
Q101 (2018): Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – unresolved. Data on court statistics are being calculated by automated systems, we do not keep track on any changes that affect data in database. Any changes to the Court Information System can affect the data.

Q101 (2017): Data updated after court reorganisation in 2018.

Q101 (2016): Data updated after court reorganisation in 2018.

Q101 (2013): The number of pending insolvency cases in the beginning and in the end of the year increased because of the special handling procedures for insolvency cases set forth by the Civil Procedure Law. The duration of insolvency proceedings is mostly affected by external economic factors. The increase in the number of incoming insolvency cases is justified by external factors such as public activity submitting applications on legal protection of individuals in cases of insolvency. The increase of the resolved insolvency cases is due to the gradual improvement of the capacity of the courts work following the adoption of the new provisions of the Civil Procedure Law in 2012.

Q101 (2012): The decrease in the number of “litigious divorce cases” (pending, incoming, resolved) is due to the decrease in the number of incoming cases owing to the impact of external factors such as depopulation, decline in the number of marriages etc. As to the category “employment dismissal cases”, the decreases noticed in respect of all the items can be explained by external socio-economic factors such as the decrease of the unemployment after the end of the economic crisis.

Lithuania

Q091 (2021): in 2021 July 1 the amendments to the Code of Administrative Misdemeanors entered into force, by which the cases of administrative offenses were transferred to be examined (except for the cases referred to in Article 614, paragraph 1, point 3) from district courts out of court to pre-trial institutions.
in 2021 in the district courts, there was a noticeable decrease in the number of civil cases examined by the first instance due to the bankruptcy of legal entities - 1,212 cases (1,624 in 2020, 2,787 in 2019). Compared to 2019, such cases decreased by more than half. It can be assumed that such a decrease in cases in this category could have been caused by the 2020 initiative adopted by the Council of Judges. The impact of the consequences of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) on Lithuania entered into force Law no. XIII-2861, which was temporarily (until December 2020 31) the initiation of the insolvency process was suspended. It is noteworthy that out of 1212 civil cases on bankruptcy of legal entities, which examined in 2021, the majority - 860 cases - were received by 2020.

Q091 (2020): "Pending non-litigious cases": general decrease of number of cases and application of administrative means. The number of resolved civil and commercial litigious cases might have been affected by the pandemic as not all the categories of cases could have been adjudicated remotely. The number of administrative cases, sa well as for civil and commercial litigious cases could have decreased because of the need for some period to adapt IT and video conference equipment in the situation emerged. The increase of number of pending administrative cases older than 2 years is related to decisions of courts in environmental law cases to stay proceedings pending a decision in a related case, which will be a preliminary ruling in another case:legal entities are challenging a decision requiring them to pay a tax on the pollution of packaging waste from which they were exempted because they had concluded a contract for the organization of waste management. As the documents proving the waste management issued by the licensed recycler were canceled, the documents certifying the waste management of other entities were canceled, which obliged the entities (which had a contract with the waste manager to organize packaging waste management) to pay this fee. The cases are suspended and pending a decision in a case challenging a decision declaring waste management documents issued to applicants invalid because it will have a preliminary ruling in these cases.

Q091 (2019): In 2019 there is a downward trend in the backlog of incoming and resolved cases. At the end of the year, the backlog of pending cases at the district, county (I instance) and county administrative courts amounted to 29 898 cases, at the end of 2018 – 33 233 cases; at the end 2017 - 36 419 cases (10 percent less than in 2018 and 18 percent less than in 2017).
In 2019 the number of court order cases has decreased. This decrease may have been caused by the general decrease of debtors' natural persons in 2017–2019. According to the information provided by the credit bureau Creditinfo data, on 1st January 2020 there were 163 929 debtors (natural persons), on 1st January 2019 -177 055, on 1st January 2018 - 207 000 debtors (natural persons).
In 2018, the number of administrative cases received increased by 27.35% compared to 2017 (e.g. the number of cases concerning conditions and detention of prisoners, cases concerning the legal status of aliens have significantly increased) and this led to the growth in the number of pending cases at the end of 2018 (and to the beginning of the reference year 2019).
In 2019, compared to 2018, the number of administrative cases heard in regional administrative courts increased by 14 percent. The change in the increase was due to a 34 percent increase compared to 2018 in the number of applications for a local fee for the collection and treatment of municipal waste. In 2019 a further upward trend in tax cases, enforcement cases and arrest cases, but there has been a significant reduction in civil liability for damage caused by illegal actions by public authorities.
In 2019, as compared to 2018, the number of administrative misconduct cases investigated in district courts increased by 16 percent. The change was due to a 64 percent increase in the number of cases of administrative offenses related to transport and road transport (370-463 Articles of the Code of Administrative Offenses). In 2019 significantly increased the number of cases of driving under the influence of drugs, psychotropic or other psychoactive substances without driving license. The number of cases related to trade, the financial system and statistics has also increased.

Q091 (2018): The decrease in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases (2.1.) may have been due to the overall decrease in debtors' natural persons in 2017 and 2018. The latter suggestion is based in data from the credit bureau Creditinfo (1 January, 2019 number of debtors natural persons was 177,055; 1 January - 207,000; 1 January, 2017 - 252 479). Credit Bureau “Creditinfo“ stores information about credit risk for businesses and private entities, forms the credit history and establishes credit ratings.
The decrease in "other non-litigious cases" (2.3.): civil cases in process of enforcement (execution) in all district courts was due to changes in the law that came into effect in 2017 July 1, on the basis of which the bailiff, rather than the court of first instance, is responsible for dealing with the succession in enforcement proceedings.
The decrease in "other cases" (4): administrative offence cases (including cases in process of enforcement (execution) in 2017-2018 period was due to to the entry into force of the Code of Administrative Offenses on 1 January, 2017 which left the handling of a large proportion of administrative misconduct and the imposition of penalties to various public administration entities (out of court). This could also be due to the expanded list of circumstances in which the person is not prosecuted under the Code of Administrative Offenses. The decrease in these cases was also influenced by the Amendments to the Criminal Code (on 1 January, 2017) that criminalized persons who drove a road vehicle or taught practical driving while under the influence of alcohol with more than 1.5 ounces of alcohol. In 2018, compared to 2017, the number of cases of administrative offences investigated in district courts decreased by 15.66%, compared to 2016, a decrease of 75.83%. Concerning administrative cases (3): in 2018, the number of cases received increased by 27.35% compared to 2017 (e.g. the number of cases concerning conditions and detention of prisoners, cases concerning the legal status of aliens have significantly increased) and this led to the growth in the number of pending cases at the end of the reference year.

Q091 (2017): Other non-litigious cases: civil cases in process of enforcement (execution).
Concerning the category “non-litigious cases” the number of pending cases on 1 January 2017 increased considerably compared to their number on 1 January 2016. The same increase characterises the categories “general civil and commercial non litigious cases” and “other non- litigious cases” (pending cases at the beginning of 2017). However, we can observe that at the end of 2017 the number of pending cases decreased concerning the category “non-litigious cases” and the sub-category “other non-litigious cases”. Only with regard to “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” the number of pending cases at the end of 2017 increased. We can see that these variations are the result of variations in the number of incoming cases for the period 2015-2017. Besides, as the numbers are small, variations appear important. The main reason for increased pending cases is the increased number of incoming other non-litigious civil cases, i.e. enforcement cases, in 2017. More precisely, in 2017, the number of civil cases in enforcement procedure – requests to change the recoverer, increased. There is no particular reason, besides the fact that some companies were buying the recoverers‘ rights from other natural persons or legal entities.
As regards the category "other cases", it refers to cases of administrative offences and cases of administrative offences in process of enforcement (execution). Following the entry into force of a new Code of Administrative Offence (1 January 2017), the number of incoming cases of administrative offences decreased. The decrease in the number of incoming administrative law cases in 2017 is explained by the increased number of incoming administrative cases in previous years (due to the decisions of the Constitutional Court).
Registry cases cannot be identified among the overall number of general civil cases.
Administrative law cases: courts received less administrative cases; they are fighting backlogs from previous years.

Q091 (2016): Administrative law cases - courts are fighting backlogs. This led to the growth in the number of resolved cases and consequently to the decrease in the number of pending cases 31 December 2016.
Other non-litigious cases: civil cases in process of enforcement (execution). The increased number of these incoming cases also results in the increase of number of incoming non-litigious cases. The number of increased incoming other non-litigious cases (enforcement) may be due to the number of the resolved civil cases in 2015 (the number of pending cases on 1 January 2016 decreased). As regards registry cases: the answer should be NA, the NAP was chosen for the calculation purposes: it is not possible to identify those cases among all other general civil cases.

Q091 (2015): Civil and commercial non-litigious cases include court orders

Category "other" includes: Cases of administrative offences and cases of administrative offences in process of enforcement (execution).
Q091 (2014): The number of incoming administrative cases increased which affected the total. They were mostly cases on remuneration of public servants due to the decision of the Constitutional Court declaring the laws on the reduction of the remuneration of State servants and judges unconstitutional. For the same reason, the number of cases of administrative offence (in execution process) increased, which affected the category "other". As to the significant decrease in the number of general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases (pending 31 Dec) in 2014, civil cases on deliver of judicial orders are resolved quickly and such residues are normal.

Q092 (2014): For 2013 and 2014, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes court orders.

Q092 (2013): For 2013 and 2014, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes court orders.

Q093 (2013): For 2010, this category encompasses only cases of administrative offence, while since 2012 it subsumes also the administrative offence cases in the process of execution.
Q094 (General Comment): There is no separate statistical data allowing to distinguish between severe/minor/and other criminal cases. Neither the court information system is applied to this, nor the courts have obligation to provide the information on the seriousness of the crime. In the court information system offenses are described through the indication of an article (it does not show the severeness of a crime by itself).
Q094 (2018): On 1 January 2017 Amendments to the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania were adopted that provide for criminal liability for persons who drove a road vehicle or taught practical driving while under the influence of alcohol more than 1,5 promilles. This change of regulation had impact on the increase of the number of criminal cases starting from 2017 (in comparison with 2016).
Q094 (2016): The crime situation changed in Lithuania - the number of registered crimes by prosecution also decreased through these years, as a result less cases were received in courts. As regards 94.1 and 94.2: the answer should be NA, the NAP was chosen for the calculation purposes.
Q094 (2012): For 2012, in contrast with the 2010 data, criminal cases in the execution process were also taken into account. The increase in the number of incoming and resolved criminal cases is due to the entry into force of the Law on Domestic Violence in December 2011. It has made compulsory the criminal investigation in respect of every single incident of domestic violence. The Lithuanian economic situation as well as the national economic priorities also account for the increase.

Q097 (General Comment): In Lithuania, statistical data on case flow and their classification are made according to the specific regulations and are mainly based on the institutes of Civil, Criminal Codes and the codes of Civil and Criminal procedures, as well as the Code of Administrative Offences and the law on Administrative procedure. Therefore figures for some of the types of cases are unavailable because there is no such classification while making statistical reports. In respect of the variations that can be observed between figures provided for the different evaluation cycles and in the light of the above described peculiarity of the statistic system of Lithuania, it is noteworthy that cases the number of which is not available are included in other categories, i.e. “civil litigious”, “civil non-litigious”. Accordingly, the indicated totals are relevant. Second instance courts deal with some non-litigious cases, but their number is insignificant.

Q097 (2021): Other cases include appeal cases regarding decisions announced by the district courts in cases of administrative offenses.
The number of incoming administrative cases were increased in 2021 due to 1214 cases received in Vilnius Regional Administrative Court and the Regional Administrative Court regarding asylum (due to decisions taken by the Migration Department under the Ministry of Internal Affairs not to consider the request for granting asylum or decisions not to grant asylum). Only 335 such cases were examined.

Q097 (2020): Second instance courts deal with some non-litigious cases, but their number is insignificant.

Q097 (2019): "Other": administrative offence cases (including cases in process of enforcement (execution)).
"Administrative cases" - the data provided encompasses cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania; it is to notice that these figures include apellation cases (on decisions of the court of first Instance) well as cases that are heard in the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania as sole instance.
"Pending cases older than two years": the decrease is due to the fact that cases pending for more than 2 years have been resolved.

Q097 (2018): The decrease in "other cases" (4), i.e. administrative offence cases (including cases in process of enforcement (execution), at second instance courts (appeal) in 2017-2018 period was related to the decreased number of resolved administrative offence cases in the first instance courts (see Q091).

Q097 (2017): As regards the category "other cases" which refers to cases of administrative offences and cases of administrative offences in process of enforcement (execution), the observed decreases in their numbers (pending at the beginning of 2017, incoming, resolved, pending at the end of 2017) are the consequence of the entry into force of the new Code of Administrative Offences.

Q097 (2016): The changes in number of cases are mainly related to the increased number of resolved administrative cases in the first instance administrative courts in 2015 and 2016 (the courts were fighting backlogs from previous years) and the renewed processes that were suspended in the second instance court due to the application to the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania (related to salaries of civil servants, decreased pensions, etc.).

Q097 (2014): The increase between 2013 and 2014 in number of cases can be explained by the increase in the number of incoming administrative cases and cases of administrative offence. They were mostly cases on remuneration of public servants in 2013 due to the decision of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania, which recognized the laws on the reduction of the remuneration of state servants and judges unconstitutional. This also had an effect on the significant increase of the category “other cases” since this situation resulted in the increase of the number of cases of administrative offence (in execution process).

Q098 (General Comment): There is no separate statistical data allowing to distinguish between severe/minor/and other criminal cases. Neither the court information system is applied to this, nor the courts have obligation to provide the information on the seriousness of the crime. In the court information system offenses are described through the indication of an article (it does not show the severeness of a crime by itself).

Q099 (General Comment): Other cases - jurisdictional cases and cases based on requests to resume proceedings in cases of administrative offenses.

Q099 (2020): In 2019, the Supreme Court of Lithuania examined fewer cases than were received, therefore the number of pending cases increased at the end of the year. However, it should be noted that in 2019 the Supreme Court of Lithuania has provided a number of important and particularly socially sensitive interpretations in both civil, criminal and administrative offences cases.
The decrease in the number of resolved civil and commercial litigious cases and accordingly the increase in the number for pending cases at the end of 2020 are due to the reduction in the number of judicial posts and the lengthy appointment by Parliament procedures for vacancies.

Q099 (2019): Other cases - jurisdictional cases and administrative offences cases.
Over the last five years, there has been an almost consistent decline in cases, including cassation appeals. In 2019, as compared to 2015, 20 percent less civil cassation appeals were filed and 17 percent fewer civil cassation cases were accepted, 43 percent fewer civil cassation cases were examined. In 2019, the Supreme Court of Lithuania examined fewer cases than were received, therefore the number of pending cases increased at the end of the year.
However, it should be noted that in 2019 the Supreme Court of Lithuania has provided a number of important and particularly socially sensitive interpretations in both civil, criminal and administrative offences cases.

Q099 (2018): The number of civil (and commercial) litigious cases (1.) of the cassation instance court (Supreme Court) pending at the end of the year decreased due to the general decrease of resolved cases at first instance. In 2018 the number of civil cases resolved at first instance courts decreased by 10.89% compared to 2017 and was 15.03 % lower than in 2016. This led to the slightly lower inflow and larger number of resolved cases, therefore, to the decreased number of pending cases at the end of the year.

Q099 (2016): NA was changed to NAP only for calculation purpose -situation hasn't changed.

Q099 (2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been indicated that the Supreme Court of Lithuania received 1369 appeals (cassation) in criminal cases and 2794 appeals (cassation) in civil cases. 677 appeals in criminal cases and 2038 in civil cases were returned to the complainants.
2014: Different category of cases as in Q91, 97 and 99 exist in Lithuania, but they are all under the category 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases and it is not possible at this point to distinguish them from other cases.
The increase between 2013 and 2014 in number of cases can be explained by the increase in the number of incoming administrative cases and cases of administrative offence. They were mostly cases on remuneration of public servants in 2013 due to the decision of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania, which recognized the laws on the reduction of the remuneration of state servants and judges unconstitutional. This also had an effect on the significant increase of the category “other cases” since this situation resulted in the increase of the number of cases of administrative offence (in execution process).

Q100 (2020): general decrease of number of cases

Q100 (2016): The number of admitted cassation claims decreased in 2015 and in 2016 was almost the same as in 2015. Besides, the number of resolved cases increased in 2015 due to the aim to comply with the timeliness.

Q101 (2021): The decrease in insolvency cases category could be due to the initiative of the Council of Judges adopted in 21 April 2020
entered into force in 25 April 2020 The impact of the consequences of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) on Lithuania
Law no. XIII-2861, which was temporarily (until 31 December 2020) the initiation of the insolvency process was suspended. It is noteworthy that out of 1212 civil cases on bankruptcy of legal entities, which had been examined in 2021, the majority - 860 cases - were received by 25 April 2020.

Q101 (2020): Pending on 31 December 2020 litigious divorce cases: the result of the decrease in the number of incoming cases and the compulsory mediation in pretrial stage.
Insolvency cases: general decrease in number of cases
Roberry cases: general decrease in number of cases

Q101 (2019): In common the number of pending cases decreeses, this shows the efficient work of the courts.
Employment dismissal cases - the decrease of incoming and resolved cases might be due to the effective functioning of the Labor Disputes Commission (a mandatory pre-litigation labor dispute resolution body for individual and collective labor disputes).
Insolvency cases - in 2019 the number of bankruptcy proceedings compared to 2018 remained stably consistent, depending on the economic situation. The general number of received criminal cases has decreased. This may have been caused by the reduced level of crime in the Republic of Lithuania. In 2019, compared to 2018, fewer crimes were registered and fewer criminal proceedings were received. According to the publications of the Department of Informatics and Communications under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuaniadata, in 2019 51 449 criminal offenses were recorded (57 830 in 2018 and 63 846 in 2017). Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens - general political situation in Lithuania and situation in EU on this issue led to the decrease of incoming cases in 2019.

Q101 (2018): Employment dismissal cases - the decrease of incoming and resolved cases might be due to the effective functioning of the Labor Disputes Commission (a mandatory pre-litigation labor dispute resolution body for individual and collective labor disputes).
Insolvency cases - the decrease of incoming cases might be due to the decrease of debtors (legal entities). Robbery cases - the decrease of incoming and resolved cases might be due to a general decrease in crimes to property. Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens - general situation in EU on this issue led to the increase of incoming cases in 2017 and consequently to the increase of pending cases at the beginning of 2018. The number of ressolved cases is higher due to higher number of incoming and correspondently pending cases. Cases relating to asylum seekers fall within the cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens or other administrative cases.

Q101 (2017): Cases relating to asylum seekers fall within the cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens or other administrative cases.
The number of incoming cases related to the right of entry and stay for aliens is related to the number of requests from residents of countries where were no requests before (countries where are no military actions carried) and such requests are often declined by the Migration department.
The decrease in the number of pending employment dismissal cases at the end of the year is explained by the fact that courts are successfully fighting the backlog.
Variations observed in respect of the number of pending litigious divorce cases appear important mainly due to the small numbers.

Q101 (2016): For the reference year 2016 cases relating to asylum seekers fall within the cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens or other administrative cases.
Q101 (2013): Variations observed in respect of the categories “employment dismissal cases” and “litigious divorce cases” are justified mainly by fluctuations in the number of incoming cases (due to the crisis, developments of the constitutional doctrine or amendments in law). In 2013, the number of district courts has been reduced to 49, resulting in a transfer of cases from one year to another from several/two courts to one court.

Luxembourg

Q091 (2021): The comment provided for 2020 data remains relevant in respect of cases pending at the end of 2020. It should be recalled that since the law of 27 July 2018 establishing the Judge for family law litigation (JAF), which came into force on 1.11. 2018, cases under the jurisdiction of the JAF are included in the category "civil litigious cases". These are cases previously dealt with by the civil chambers, but also cases dealt with by the youth and guardianship court (e.g., cases relating to parental responsibility with regard to a natural child or a child whose parents are divorced) or at the level of the justice of the peace (maintenance cases). Moreover, it can be observed that the number of incoming cases in these matters has increased since they are within the JAF competence. This is explained by the simplification of the access to justice for the litigant, who, in procedures other than divorce, can refer to the JAF by a simple letter; by the emergence of cases on the basis of new legal provisions (e.g., application by the minor); and by all the litigation generated by the new legal provision establishing the institution of generalized joint parental authority. Moreover, since proceedings before the JAF take much less time than before the reform introducing the JAF, motions to modify decisions taken are filed more quickly and thus increase the volume of cases.

Q091 (2020): "The law of July 27, 2018 establishing the family court judge (JAF) went into effect on 1.11. 2018. The cases currently under the jurisdiction of the JAF were included for the first time in the category "contentious civil cases" for the year 2020 which explains the observed increases in the number of new, completed and pending cases compared to the previous data. These are cases previously handled by the civil chambers, but also cases handled by the juvenile and guardianship court (e.g., parental responsibility cases involving a natural child or a child whose parents are divorced) or at the justice of the peace level (alimony cases). In addition, there has been an increase in the number of new cases in these areas since they were handled by the Family Court. This fact can be explained by the simplification of access to justice for the litigant, who, in procedures other than divorce, can refer to the JAF by a simple letter, by the emergence of cases based on new legal provisions (e.g. request emanating from the minor) and by all the litigation generated by the new legal provision of the institution of a generalized joint parental authority? Moreover, since proceedings before the JAF take much less time than proceedings before the introduction of the JAF law, motions to modify decisions are filed more quickly and thus increase the volume of cases.
Including JAF cases, for 2019, new cases would be 7,626 (up from 5,038) while completed cases were 6,714 (up from 5,098).
Including JAF cases, for 2018, 91.1 new cases would be 5,248 (up from 4,807) while completed cases were 4,905(up from 4,857).
Regarding pending cases in 2018, at the end of the years JAF cases constituted a plus of 453, which corresponds to 1,649 pending cases at the end of the 2018 period in item 91.1. instead of the 1,256 cases informed. Taking into account horizontal consistency, the changes in new and completed cases discussed above, imply that at the end of the 2019 period, pending cases (91.1) totaled 2,561 (instead of 1,196).
The figures for previous years remain unchanged.
""Other non-contentious cases"" pending at year-end: Due to containment during the COVID-19 pandemic the number of public hearings was reduced to a minimum, allowing courts to prioritize work on cases not requiring such hearings. In addition, special crisis legislation allowed cases to be taken under advisement without a public hearing, with the agreement of the parties.
"

Q091 (2018): The pending cases at the date of 31/12/2017 had to be adapted, since there were 27 cases of vacation court, which were no longer pending at the end of the year. These 27 cases were withdrawn from the 1,341 pending cases indicated in the Scoreboard 2017 to reach 1,314 other pending non-litigious cases on 01/01/2018.

Q091 (2016): For question 91.1 the new data collection system revealed a higher number of pending cases, previously not considered by those in charge of counting.
For question 91.2.2, the new data collection system provides now information on other non-litigious cases, previously unavailable.
Q091 (2015): The figures given (with the exception of those for the administrative court) are those of the two district courts (Luxembourg and Diekirch).

The three justices of the peace totalized 78.273 national as well as 285 European payment orders.
Q091 (2014): The data (except for the Administrative Court) are those of the district courts. Uniform statistical data for both types of courts are not yet available. The three justices of peace ruled 75 411 national payment orders, 260 european payment orders and resolved a total of 6386 cases for a total of 65840 new cases. The implementation of statistics counters for civil and commercial cases resulted in variations. The applied criteria have been refined and give a more accurate image.

Q091 (2013): Data concerns (except for the Administrative Court) district courts. Uniform statistical data for both types of courts (district courts and justice of peace) are not yet available. The District Court of Diekirch rendered 580 decisions and registered 664 new cases. The three justices of peace ruled 69 859 payment orders and resolved a total of 5 682 cases for a total of 6 508 new cases. The increase in the number of civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases between 2010 and 2013 is partly explained by the establishment in 2011 of the judiciary statistics office. The increase in the number of administrative law cases mainly stems from the increase in the asylum-related disputes.

Q091 (2012): The data provided (except for the Administrative Court) are those of the district courts. Uniform statistical data for both types of courts (district courts and justice of peace) are not yet available. The District Court of Diekirch rendered 591 decisions and registered 688 new cases. The three justices of peace ruled 63 651 payment orders and resolved a total of 8041 cases for a total of 9310 new cases. The 2012 data encompasses civil and commercial cases of both district tribunals (Luxembourg and Diekirch).
Q092 (2014): 2014: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to european payment orders issued by two district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period. That is why the pending cases as well as incoming cases are classified as NAP.
Q092 (2013): 2012: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to payment orders issued by district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period.

Q092 (2012): 2012: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to payment orders issued by district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period.
Q094 (General Comment): The unavailability of the number of pending and incoming criminal cases is explained by the specific organisation of the workflow between courts and prosecution offices. Cases are only transferred to the courts shortly before the hearing and, if a case is not heard on the given date, it is physically returned to the prosecution until the new hearing date. Thus, there are - with a few exceptions - no cases pending before the criminal courts over a long period of time, and the number of incoming cases is more or less equal to the number of resolved cases.
Minor criminal cases represent all cases resolved by criminal order in the Police court and the district court. Severe criminal cases represent all cases resolved by a judgment at first instance in the Police, Correctional or Criminal court. “Other criminal cases” are cases that are dealt with by the investigating office.

Q094 (2018): Nous avons compté parmi les infractions mineures, toutes les affaires terminées par ordonnance pénale au tribunal de police ou au tribunal d'arrondissement. Les infractions graves représentent toutes les affaires terminées par jugement en première instance au tribunal de police, correctionnel ou criminel.
L’augmentation du nombre d’affaires résolues est due au fait que, pour les cycles précédents, les ordonnances pénales des tribunaux d’arrondissement n’étaient pas prises en compte au niveau des infractions mineures, qui comptabilisaient seulement les ordonnances pénales de justices de paix. Ainsi, pour 2016, les infractions pénales mineures reportées s’élevaient à 6460 en comptant les ordonnances pénales des tribunaux d’arrondissement, au lieu de 5454. Le total des affaires terminées a considérablement augmenté puisqu’il nous est depuis la période d’évaluation 2018-2020 possible, par l’ajout de la catégorie « Autres affaires » dans le questionnaire, de renseigner les affaires dont le cabinet d’instruction a été saisi. Les chiffres inscrits dans « autres affaires » correspondent donc aux affaires dont a été saisi le cabinet d’instruction.
Regarding the unavailability of the number of pending cases and incoming cases, Due to the specific organization of the work flow between the courts and the public prosecutor’s office, files are transferred to the courts only a short time before the hearing, and, if the case is not heard at the given date, are then returned to the public prosecutor’s office until the new date of the hearing. Thus, there are – with very few exceptions - no cases pending before the penal courts over a longer period of time, and the number of incoming cases equals more or less the resolved cases. With regard to civil cases, we should be able to provide information on cases pending for more than two years for the next evaluation, once the new application has been used for a longer period of time.

Q094 (2012): Courts do not have a "stock" given that cases are handled at the public prosecutor's office and are only reffered to the court shortly before the hearing. The only moment when cases are pending is between the hearing and the adoption of the decision. Usually, the jugdgment is made within 3 or 4 weeks after the hearing. Thus, data concerning incoming cases is identical to data concerning resolved cases.
Q097 (2021): The increased number of pending administrative law cases at the beginning of 2021 is a consequence of the increase in the number of pending administrative law cases at the end of 2020. In this respect, it should be recalled that the decrease of the Clearance rate for 2020 was mainly due to the increase in the number of appeals, in particular those relating to the general development plan of the City of Luxembourg. These cases had entered the first instance from January to March 2018, while the related judgments, consolidated by the administrative court, were delivered between May and September 2020. The related appeals, 51 in number, were filed between July and November 2020 and were still under investigation on 31 December 2020 due to the fixed time limit regime of investigation, but also due to the pandemic and the introduction of crisis legislation involving a suspension of appeal timeframes.

Q097 (2020):

Administrative cases - the decrease in the RC for 2020 is primarily due to the increase in the number of appeal motions, particularly those related to the City of Luxembourg's general development plan. These cases were entered in the first instance from January to March 2018, while the related judgments, consolidated by the Administrative Court, were issued between May and September 2020. The related appeals, numbering 51, were filed between July and November 2020 and were still being processed on December 31, 2020, due to the fixed timeframe regime (suspension from July 16 to September 15 - one month for the answer - one month for the reply - one month for the rejoinder), but also due to the pandemic and the implementation of crisis legislation involving a suspension of the appeal deadlines (until June 24, 2020). Thus, in addition to the increase in the number of requests for appeal, their investigation has been postponed, leading to an increase in the number of cases pending as of December 31, 2020. Throughout 2020, the Administrative Court was essentially up to date and disposed of cases as soon as they had been heard. The same is true in 2021.

Q097 (2019): Civil and commercial litigious cases pending at the beginning of the year have been restated in relation to those available at the time of the 2018-2020 evaluation cycle. The introduction of a new case management application at the Court of Appeal (JUCIV) has made it possible to identify a number of cases, still listed as pending, which were in fact completed.

Q097 (2016): It is a fact that the number of appeals before the Court decreased between 2014 and 2016. A key reason is that the number of appellate judgments rendered by the court has decreased significantly. The first reason is that the court had to evacuate a large number of cases as a matter of priority under the so-called accelerated procedure provided for by the law of 18 December 2015 on international protection. For the judicial year 2015/2016, 355 judgments out of a total of 938 judgments (excluding striking off) were rendered in accelerated proceedings and therefore not subject to appeal.

Q097 (2013): 2013: because of the international events that have increased the number of asylum seekers, the administrative courts that have jurisdiction in case of appeal against a refusal of refugee status, have, in particular in 2013 but already during the 3-4 previous years, known a significant increase in this very specific litigation both at first instance level and appeal level.

Q098 (General Comment): 0

Q098 (2018): Concernant le nombre d'affaire résolues en matière d'affaire pénales grave, une baisse des recours introduits à la Cour d'appel est observée depuis ces dernières années, en conséquence les affaires terminées ont diminué en 2018. Concernant le nombre d'affaire résolues en matière d'affaire pénales mineures, le chiffre plus élevé des affaires d'infractions mineures s'explique par le fait qu'en 2017, 59 recours avaient été introduits sur des jugements du tribunal de police et que ces recours ont été traités pour partie en 2018 seulement.

Q099 (General Comment): The pending files are now detailed between criminal and civil/commercial cases, thus this additional information is now available. There is no cassation possibility against the decisions of the administrative court of appeal.

Q099 (2021): The number of incoming cases depends on the appeals lodged which the Court has no influence on and which is, among other things, a function of the number of decisions taken at the level of the other instances. In 2020, the number of decisions taken by the different instances has decreased compared to the previous years, which can explain the decreased number of incoming cases before the Court of Cassation. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.

Q099 (2019): Pending cases at the beginning of the year have been restated in relation to those available at the time of the 2018-2020 evaluation cycle. The introduction of a new case management application at the Court of cassation (JUCIV) has made it possible to identify a number of cases, still listed as pending, which were in fact completed.

Q099 (2018): Comparing 2016 to 2018, the increase in pending cases at the end of the period is 40.73%. However, there was already a clear increase in cases pending at the end of the period between 2016 and 2017, which is largely explained by a larger number of new cases in 2017. Between 2017 and 2018, the variation in cases pending at the end of the period is + 5%, which does not seem excessive, especially taking into account the low numbers.

Q099 (2017): Q99: total and civil and commercial litigation cases: the slight increase in the number of incoming cases in 2017 and the relatively stable number of resolved cases explain the increase in the number of pending cases at the end of 2017 to 109 .

Q099 (2014): 2014: several categories are in NAP because the Court of Cassation has no jurisdiction over these categories.

Q100 (General Comment): The Court of cassation makes a legality control, independant from the severity of the infraction. The pending files are now detailed between criminal and civil/commercial cases, thus this additional information is now available.

Q100 (2020): "The number of new cases depends on the appeals filed, on which the Court has no influence, and which is, among other things, a function of the number of decisions taken by the other courts. In 2020, the number of decisions taken by the different instances has decreased compared to the previous years, which can explain the decrease of new cases at the Court of Cassation. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.
The decrease in pending cases can be explained by the decrease in new cases in 2020, since the number of decisions taken remained stable between 2018 and 2020.
"

Q101 (General Comment): The unavailability of the number of pending and incoming criminal cases is explained by the specific organisation of the workflow between courts and prosecution offices. Cases are only transferred to the courts shortly before the hearing and, if a case is not heard on the given date, it is physically returned to the prosecution until the new hearing date. Thus, there are - with a few exceptions - no cases pending before the criminal courts over a long period of time, and the number of incoming cases is more or less equal to the number of resolved cases.

Q101 (2021): "Robbery cases": After the strict health measures in 2020, robbery cases dealt with by criminal and correctional chambers of the courts returned in 2021 to a level 17% above the level observed in 2018.
"Intentional homicide": After the strict health measures in 2020, the number of resolved intentional homicide cases returned in 2021 to a level 5% higher than in 2018.

Q101 (2020):
"""Contentious divorce"": compared to the figures provided for the court systems assessment for 2018, new divorce cases had already increased significantly in 2019. It appears that at the end of 2018, there were a number of pending divorce petitions, awaiting the entry into force of the June 27, 2018 law establishing the family court judge (JAF law) on November 1, 2018. During the first two semesters of 2019, divorces were pronounced in a dual regime: on the one hand, cases filed under the old law were evacuated, and the JAF law, providing for very short deadlines, made it possible to close a greater number of cases in less time than was the case under the old procedure. Compared to the 1,070 new cases recorded in 2019, there is actually a 14% decrease in new cases in 2020.
""Robbery with violence"" The decrease observed between 2018 and 2020 of 23% of completed cases in violent robbery can be explained on the one hand by the decrease in new cases in this area and on the other hand by the general decrease in judgments issued during 2020 and related to the health situation.
Voluntary manslaughter cases include attempted homicides. The observed decrease between 2018 and 2020 of 27% of completed cases in intentional homicide can be explained on the one hand by the decrease in new cases in this area and on the other hand by the general decrease in judgments handed down during the year 2020 and related to the health situation. "

Q101 (2019): Compared to 2018 data, the number of incoming divorce cases has increased significantly. It seems that at the end of 2018, there was a number of pending divorce petitions, awaiting the entry into force of the law of 27 June 2018 establishing the family court judge (JAF law) on 1 November 2018. During the first two semesters of 2019, divorces were pronounced under a dual regime: on the one hand, cases filed under the old law were dismissed, and on the other hand, the JAF law, which provides for very short deadlines, made it possible to close a greater number of cases in less time than was the case under the old procedure.
“Cases relating to asylum seekers”: as we previously indicated in our 2018 comment, variations in the number of incoming and the number of resolved cases depend on factors external to the administrative courts. The variations are probably related to applications for international protection and especially the decisions taken in relation to these applications by the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (see https://maee.gouvernement.lu/content/dam/gouv_maee/directions/d8/publications/statistiques-en-mati%C3%A8re-d-asyle/Bilan-2019-Asile-Immigration-et-Accueil.pdf).

Q101 (2018): With regard to the number of incoming divorce cases, compared to the numbres provided for the 2017 scoreboard, they increased by only 8%. Since 2017, we have seen an acceleration in the number of divorce applications in 2018 since, before the entry into force of the law of the 27th of June 2018 establishing the Family Court (JAF law) and reforming the divorce procedure, many proceedings initiated under the former law were dismissed as a priority. In addition, the numbers for asylum seeker cases have decreased by 5% compared to the numbers available for 2017. The variation in incoming cases and resolved cases is linked to factors which are external to administrative courts and it is probably linked to the decrease in 2018 in applications for international protection and especially in decisions taken in relation to these issues. Finally, the number of cases resolved in 2016 concerning the entry and residence of foreigners was particularly high, this can be explained, among other things, with the creation of a new chamber in 2016 at the Administrative Court, the complexity of the cases, which can vary, as well as the delays in the investigation which can affect the date of delivery. The number of resolved cases related to the right of entry and residence of foreigners remains unchanged from the cases resolved in 2017.

Q101 (2017): Litigious divorce cases: The increase in the number of incoming cases in 2017 may have its origin in the fact that parliamentary proceedings had been initiated to reform the existing divorce procedure, which was intended to repeal the contentious divorce procedure. The Act of 27 June 2018 establishing the Family Court (juge aux affaires familiales) and reforming divorce and parental authority was initially supposed to come into force in the beginning of 2018 but it will only come into force on 1 November 2018. This law is also amending: 1. the New Code of Civil Procedure; 2. the Civil Code; 3. the Criminal Code; 4. the Social Security Code; 5. the Labour Code; 6. the amended Act of 11 November 1970 on the transfer and seizure of work pay and pensions; 7. the amended Act of 7 March 1980 on the organisation of the judiciary; 8. the amended law of 10 August 1992 on the protection of young people; 9. the amended law of 27 July 1997 on insurance contracts; 10. the amended law of 9 July 2004 on the legal effects of certain partnerships; 11. the law of 27 June 2017 adopting a multiannual programme for recruitment to the judiciary and amending the amended law of 7 March 1980 on judicial organisation. In addition, an increasing number of divorces between asylum seekers can be noticed.

Cases relating to asylum-seekers (refugee status under the 1951 Geneva Convention)[incoming cases and resolved cases]: the increase in the number of incoming and resolved cases is due to factors external to administrative courts and is probably linked to the general increase in 2017 in the number of applications and decisions taken in relation to asylum claims (see https://statistiques.public.lu/fr/actualites/population/population/2018/01/20180117/20180117.pdf).

Cases relating to the right of entry and residence of aliens [resolved cases]: the number of resolved cases in 2016 was particularly high, which can be explained by, inter alia, the creation of a new chamber in 2016 at the Administrative Court, the complexity of cases which may vary as well as the length of investigation proceedings, which may affect the date of delivery of the decision.

Q101 (2016): For insolvency cases the number of incoming and resolved cases is identical because these cases are treated immediately.
Q101 (2013): The number of employment dismissal cases corresponds to the incoming cases brought before the three competent courts. All these cases, with some exceptions, are generally heard and resolved within a few months. Regarding insolvency cases, they are all considered as urgent and are heard, at the latest one month after they are brought before the court.

Malta

Q091 (General Comment): The vast majority of cases heard before the courts of Malta are litigious cases. Nevertheless, there is the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction which deals with adoptions, appointment of tutor, curators and other administrators, interdiction and incapacitation and opening of secret wills.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the efficiency data are mainly derived from discrepancies in data inputting methodology. Data is also collected at a particular point in time and this means that eventual changes are not captured at the time of the submission of this information.
Q091 (2021): As from 2021, the civil litigious category includes the data of the Civil Court (Asset Recovery Section) that was established in 2021. A spike in the incoming caseload of civil litigious cases has resulted in the courts not managing to resolve enough cases in order to retain the previous levels of efficiency, despite a marginal increase in the number of resolved cases.

Q091 (2020): The lack of horizontal consistency results from recounts that happen throughout the year, and that ensure that the data is always as up to date as possible. However when taken as a global figure, horizontal consistency might then be lost.

Q091 (2019): Non litigious cases - incoming cases: The data was provided by the case managment system of the Court Services Agency and shows an increase in the incoming caseload of these cases over that of the previous year.
Non litigious cases - pending cases at the end of the reference year: The relative high number of pending cases at the end of the year compared by the previous year is the result of the increase of incoming cases but a retention in the number of resolved cases. As a result, efficiency, as expressed as a higher number of pending cases, has suffered.

Q091 (2018): This evaluation cycle contains for the first time the efficiency data of the First Hall, Commercial Section which is a new court established in April 2018. Furthermore there was a registered increase in the incoming caseload particularly of the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction and in cases of dissolution of marriage.
The lack of horizontal consistency results from recounts that happen throughout the year, and that ensure that the data is always as up to date as possible. However when taken as a global figure, horizontal consistency might then be lost.

Q091 (2017): Apart from the provision of the new non-litigious data captured by sub-section 2.1 above, this year we also introduced the data for another civil, litigious court, namely, the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction, established by the Civil Courts (Establishment of Sections) Order 2003, in terms of Art 2 of the Code of Organisation and Civil Procedure (Chp 12 of the Laws of Malta). The Court has jurisdiction to deal with, amongst other matters, applications related to adoptions, interdictions and incapacitations, matters related to wills and to trusts, and to specific cases falling under the Foster Care Act (Chp 491 of the laws of Malta).
As concerns pending cases at the beginning of the year, information is not available for the newly provided data, namely data from the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction and the non-litigious data. These data will be available for the next cycle. Increases observed between 2016 and 2017 in the total of incoming and resolved cases result from the fact that new data has been added (data on non-litigious cases and data from the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction).

Q091 (2016): Horizontal consistency: This is a problem encountered also in previous evaluations. Unfortunately this inconsistency results from the way that the data is logged, and it is practically impossible to resolve it at present. Concerning the variations between cycles: In reality, in 2015 the Administrative Review Tribunal worked real hard to reduce the pending caseload and also resolved one set of interrelated cases that translated in the conclusion of about 150 separate cases. So 2015 was a very good year in which the efficiency parameters of the Tribunal spiked. In 2016, the rhythm by which cases were being resolved went back to 2014 figures, hence the apparent decrease in the number of resolved cases between 2015 and 2016. The reduction in the pending caseload is also the result of the additional 150 odd cases that were resolved in 2015 and that dramatically reduced the pending caseload for good, even if the resolved caseload of 2016 was less than that of 2015. Concerning Administrative cases: These figures reflect the pending balance at the beginning of 2016. Throughout 2015, the Tribunal resolved one batch of related cases that resulted in a drop in the number of pending cases and a spike in the number of resolved cases.

Q091 (2014): The category “civil litigious cases” covers family mediation cases and cases before the Court of revision of notarial acts and the Small Claims Tribunal. In 2014, another magistrate started presiding over the Administrative Review Tribunal thereby increasing the judicial complement by 2 members. This change resulted in an increase in the number of resolved cases. Following an internal exercise carried out by the Court Administration, cases that have been prescribed, have been cleaned from the system.

Q091 (2013): In 2013, the number of administrative law cases continued increasing. The Administrative Court was created in 2010. Over the time, the number of areas of competence of the Administrative Court has increased, which resulted in an increased caseload.

Q091 (2012): The Administrative Court was set up in late 2010, as a result of which, figure given in the previous report reflected the operation of the Court over a couple of months only. For 2012, the communicated figures reflect the operation of the Court over a twelve month period.

Q092 (General Comment): The non-litigious case category is codified under Art 166A of the Code of Organisation and Civil Procedure (COCP), Chp 12 of the Laws of Malta.

Q094 (General Comment): In the Maltese legal system, all proceedings which appear before the Court of Magistrates may be punishable with a fine or imprisonment, bar a few contraventions which still appear before the Court of Magistrates and it is not possible to obtain data relating to these few cases. Nevertheless, all cases which lead to an imprisonment of ten years or more can only be heard by the Criminal Court whilst cases between 2 and 12 years may be heard by the Court of Magistrates only once the procedure before it as a Court of Criminal Inquiry is completed. Since in Malta the vast majority of the cases contemplate the possibility of imprisonment, barring a few contraventions, the cases indicated as misdemeanors/minor offences, are those cases which are heard by the Court of Magistrates (excluding those being heard as a Court of Criminal Inquiry) having a maximum punishment of 2 years imprisonment while the cases indicated as 'severe criminal offences' are those having a punishment of over 2 years (Criminal Court & Court of Criminal Inquiry).

Q094 (2020): Given that the categorisation of criminal offences in Malta does not exactly match with the CEPEJ definitions provided, only the total of such cases is being reported. An actual breakdown of the figures quoted above is as follows:
- Pending 1st January 2020 = 11899 (79 cases Criminal Court and 11820 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Incoming cases 2020 = 11086 (17 cases Criminal Court and 11069 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Resolved cases 2020 = 7321 (5 cases Criminal Court and 7316 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Pending cases 31st December 2020 = 15883 (89 cases Criminal Court and 15794 cases Court of Magistrates)

The lack of horizontal consistency results from recounts that happen throughout the year, and that ensure that the data is always as up to date as possible. However when taken as a global figure, horizontal consistency might then be lost.
The decrease in the number of incoming and resolved cases, and the ensuing high number of pending cases, results from the restrictions imposed by the pandemic on the functioning of the Courts of Law.

Q094 (2018): Given that the categorisation of criminal offences in Malta does not exactly match with the CEPEJ definitions provided, only the total of such cases is being reported. An actual breakdown of the figures quoted above is as follows:
- Pending 1st January 2018 = 11887 (61 cases Criminal Court and 11826 cases Court fo Magistrates)
- Incoming cases 2018 = 13817 (19 cases Criminal Court and 13,798 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Resolved cases 2018 = 14168 (8 cases Criminal Court and 14140 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Pending cases 31st December 2018 = 11589 (72 cases Criminal Court and 11517 cases Court of Magistrates)

The lack of horizontal consistency results from recounts that happen throughout the year, and that ensure that the data is always as up to date as possible. However when taken as a global figure, horizontal consistency might then be lost.
The decrease int he number of incoming and resolved cases is a phenomenon we are observing over the past years. The discrepancy between the data of 2016 and 2018 makes sense when one looks at the 2017 data that also shows a decrease in the caseloads from 2016. It is to be noted that the incoming caseload in 2018 is actually a bit higher than that of 2017.

Q094 (2016): In the Maltese legal system, all proceedings which appear before the Court of Magistrates may be punishable with a fine or imprisonment, bar a few contraventions which still appear before the Court of Magistrates and it is not possible to obtain data relating to these few cases. Nevertheless, all cases which lead to an imprisonment of ten years or more can only be heard by the Criminal Court whilst cases between 2 and 12 years may be heard by the Court of Magistrates only once the procedure before it as a Court of Criminal Inquiry is completed. Since in Malta the vast majority of the cases contemplate the possibility of imprisonment, barring a few contraventions, the cases indicated as misdemeanors/minor offences, are those cases which are heard by the Court of Magistrates (excluding those being heard as a Court of Criminal Inquiry) having a maximum punishment of 2 years imprisonment while the cases indicated as 'severe criminal offences' are those having a punishment of over 2 years (Criminal Court & Court of Criminal Inquiry).
This definition of severe/minor-misdemeanor cases is not fully consistent with the definition built by CEPEJ and therefore a comparison is not possible with the previous cycles. According to the Maltese categorization of cases, the number for severe criminal cases in 2016 is as follows: pending on the 1st Jan of Ref Year = 3054; Incoming cases = 827; Resolved cases = 1143; Pending cases on the 31st Dec of Ref Year = 2736. The number for minor/misdemeanor criminal cases is as follows: pending on the 1st Jan of Ref Year = 10571; Incoming cases = 15887; Resolved cases = 15682; Pending cases on the 31st Dec of Ref Year = 10805.

Q094 (2013): The 2014 data is derived from the official court statistics that are also available online at www.justiceservices.com. The horizontal discrepancy in the data at point 6 cannot be verified since the data collection in the criminal courts is not as yet automated.
Q097 (2020): The decrease in the Incoming caseload results from the disruption of the pandemic on the court operations.
In the second instance courts, we are still unable to distinguish precisely between the cases that are appealed. Thus, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

Q097 (2019): Total other than criminal cases - resolved cases: The data shows an increase in the resolved cseload of the 2nd instance courts and in fact, the pending caseload at the end of the year is less than that registered in 2018. These courts were more efficient in 2019.
Q097 (2017): In Malta, the civil second instance courts comprise the Civil Court of Appeal in its Inferior and Superior Jurisdiction. To date, whilst we can collect the data relating to the incoming, resolved and pending caseloads of these courts, we cannot easily distinguish between the sub-divisions of case typology outlined above. What we can tell for sure is that all cases filed before the Courts of Appeal are civil and commercial litigious cases (including a minority of administrative law cases) so the figures provided at Category 1 reflect the global total of cases heard at the second instance courts. Non-litigious cases are not filed before these courts (hence NAP answers).
Concerning the variation between 2016 and 2017 in the pending cases older than 2 years, the reason is due to a different methodology used in 2016 and in 2017.

Q097 (2016): Regarding Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: 2015 was the best year in terms of number of resolved cases, mainly because the judiciary were trying hard to conclude cases that were ready for sentencing. In fact, our efficiency indicators reflected this effort. As regards to the other data, we do not, as yet, have those statistics at hand and hence, the last 3 evaluations were marked as NAP.
Q097 (2014): The discrepancy in the data provided for 2014 as “pending cases on 31st December 2014” results from an internal exercise being carried out by the Court Administration in which cases that have been prescribed, are being cleaned from the system. This exercise is going to be carried out more frequently so that it does not reflect in discrepancies in the data that is published.
Q097 (2013): The significant increase of the number of civil and commercial litigious cases between 2010 and 2013 was due to the fact that the number of appeals has increased substantially in the past few years and the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal has been extended to include also appeals from large public contract awards. Accordingly, the Court of Appeal was not in a position to manage the considerable influx of cases.

Q097 (2012): In 2012, a number of judges in the Appeal Court retired and their replacement took some time to materialise, as a result of which, the number of decided cases decreased.

Q098 (2021): During 2021, the criminal courts were still largely effected by Covid restrictions. Given that these particular courts did not introduce video-conferencing, it was not possible to counteract the increasing incoming caseload with an equally increasing resolved caseload. As a result of this imbalance, the efficiency parameters of the criminal courts suffered. Having said this, following the removal of the pandemic restrictions, sincere efforts have been made in order to restore the efficiency of the criminal courts to the former levels.

Q098 (2020): The above data reflects the aggregate scores of the Criminal Court of Appeal in its Superior and Inferior Jurisdiction.
The pandemic restrictions effected the caseload of the Court.

Q098 (2018): Given that in the Maltese legal system, the definition of severe/ minor-dismeneanor cases is not fully consistent with the definition built by CEPEJ, the data for these types of cases for Malta, is going to be presented within this section: For severe cases: Pending caseload at 1st January 2018 = 32; Incoming cases = 6; Resolved cases = 14; Pending cases on the 31st December = 21. Minor/ misdemeanour criminal cases: 1st January 2018 = 1266; Incoming cases = 445; Resolved cases = 644; Pending cases on the 31st December = 1018.

Q098 (2016): There was an increase in the pending caseload of the Court of Criminal Appeal, Inferior Jurisdiction.
In the Maltese legal system, the definition of severe/minor-misdemeanor cases is not fully consistent with the definition built by CEPEJ and therefore a comparison is not possible with the previous cycles. According to the Maltese categorization of cases, the number for severe criminal cases in 2016 is as follows: pending on the 1st Jan of Ref Year = 26; Incoming cases = 15; Resolved cases = 10; Pending cases on the 31st Dec of Ref Year = 32. The number for minor/misdemeanor criminal cases is as follows: pending on the 1st Jan of Ref Year = 1214; Incoming cases = 629; Resolved cases = 485; Pending cases on the 31st Dec of Ref Year = 1358.

Q098 (2012): In 2012, the increase of the number of criminal cases resulted from the fact that for some time the number of judges hearing the appeals, particularly in the Criminal Court of Appeal (Inferior Jurisdiction), was reduced due to retirement and re-allocation of duties. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the inferior jurisdiction increase considerably.

Q099 (2017): In Malta the 2nd instance courts are the highest instance. Hence the NAP answer to this section.

Q099 (2016): In Malta the 2nd instance courts are the highest instance. Hence the NAP answer to this section.

Q100 (2018): NA

Q101 (2021): There was a registered increase in insolvency cases throughout 2021 that has been confirmed by the Court Services Agency.

Q101 (2020): Less incoming and resolved cases due to court closure.

Q101 (2019): Following the establishment of the Civil Court, Commercial Division, a number of insolvency cases previously filed before other courts were still being transferred to the new Court and hence the relatively high number of incoming cases in previous years. The Commercial Court is now fully operational and receiving new cases filed before it. Hence this figure is presumed to reflect more faithfully the cases of insolvency filed within a year.

Q101 (2017): The employment dismissal cases are not heard by the courts but rather by the Industrial Tribunal which is separate from courts and has no connection whatsoever to courts or the Ministry of Justice. Cases related to asylum seekers are processed by the Refugee Commission and heard by the Refugee Appeals Board, which is an entity separate from the courts. Therefore such data is NAP. The Office of the Refugee Commissioner (RefComm) is regulated by The Refugees Act, Chp 420 of the Laws of Malta, and its main responsibly is to receive, process and determine applications for international protection in Malta, as stipulated by the Refugees Act, amended by Act VI and VII in 2015 and its Subsidiary Legislation 420.07 on Procedural Standards in Examining Applications for Refugee Status Regulations. This Office is also bound by the obligations assumed by Malta under the 1951 Geneva Convention relating to the status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol, as well as its obligations under European Directive 2011/95/EU, European Directive 2013/32/EU and the Dublin Regulation. RefComm implements a single asylum procedure. It first examines whether the applicant fulfils the criteria to be recognised as a refugee according to law, and in the case of those applicants who do NOT meet the criteria to be recognised as refugees, the Office proceeds to examine whether the applicant fulfils the criteria for subsidiary protection according to law. The applicant is informed in writing about the decision issued by the Office of the Refugee Commissioner. The reasons in fact and in law are stated in the decision. In the case of a negative decision, applicants are informed of their right to enter an appeal against this decision to the Refugee Appeals Board. Information on how to challenge a negative decision is given in writing to those applicants whose application was rejected with regards to refugee status and/or subsidiary protection status. This is an administrative review and involves the assessment of facts and points of law. An asylum seeker has 2 weeks to appeal since the day in which the written negative decision by the Refugee Commission has been received. Whilst the Refugee Appeals Board does not accept late appeals, it does have suspensive effect.
An onward appeal is not provided in the law in case of a negative decision from the Refugee Appeals Board. However, judicial review of the decisions taken by the Board is possible before the First Hall of the Civil Court, limited only to an enquiry into the validity of the administrative act. However, such information is not available. Judicial review does not deal with the merits of the asylum claim, but only with the manner in which the concerned administrative authority reached its decision. At this stage, applicants could be granted legal aid if eligible under the general rules for legal aid in court proceedings.

Q101 (2016): Litigious cases: the number of incoming and resolved cases has been on the increased every year.

Netherlands

Q091 (General Comment): In the Netherlands, some registers are kept by the judiciary. Those do not include a land- or business registry, see www.rechtspraak.nl/registers. Most registers are related to debt, bankruptcy and help or surveillance of people who are unable to handle their financial situations. Also, there is a register with ‘nevenfuncties’ (jobs and positions held by judges next to their judgeship). Mutations in these registers are not counted as court cases. The Dutch system does not count mutations in the registers as court cases, so ‘other registry cases’ is NAP.

Q091 (2021): In previous years, we were able to produce the number of incoming and pending cases for categories 1, 2 and 2.1, but not this year. The Judiciary has decided on a different norm for one of the components needed for this number, so these numbers are no longer available.
Q091 (2020): Administrative law cases include tax cases and immigration / asylum cases.
First instance cases at Council of State, Court of Appeal, including trade tribunal, are excluded.
In the Netherlands, there are some registers that are kept by the judiciary. Those do not include a land- or business registry, see www.rechtspraak.nl/registers. Most registers are related to debt, bankruptcy and help or surveillance of people who are unable to handle their financial situation. There is also a register with so-called ‘nevenfuncties’ (a list of jobs and positions held by judges next to their judgeship). Mutations in these registers are not counted as court cases. For the category ‘other registry cases’ the answer is NAP, as the Dutch system does not count mutations in the registers as court cases.

Q091 (2019): In The Netherlands, there are some registers which are kept by the judiciary. These do not include a land- or business registry (see www.rechtspraak.nl/registers). Most registers are related to debt, bankruptcy and help or surveillance of people who are unable to handle their financial situation. There is also a register with so-called 'nevenfuncties' (a list of jobs and positions held by judges next to their judgeship). Mutations in these registers are not counted as court cases. For the category 'other registry cases', the answer is NAP, as the Dutch system does not count mutations in the registers as court cases.

Q091 (2018): In the Netherlands, there are some registers that are kept by the judiciary. Those do not include a land- of business registry. See: https://www.rechtspraak.nl/Registers
Most registers are related to debt, bankruptcy and help or surveillance of people that are unable to handle their financial situation. There is also a register of 'nevenfuncties', which lists all the jobs/positions that judges fulfill next to being a judge. Mutations in these registers are not counted as court cases. For the category "other registry cases", since the Dutch system does not count mutations in the registers as court cases, the answer is NAP.

Q091 (2017): None

Q091 (2016): Number of administrative law cases litigious plus non-litigious.
In 2016, there has been a strong decrease in numbers of cases compared to 2014. This decrease pertains to the group of misdemeanours, in particular the group of traffic offences ("Mulder Law"). The cases of "vorderingen dwangsom" (coercive detainment) are no longer treated by the Public Prosecution. This following complaints at the Ombudsman. These coercive detainment cases increased at first strongly in 2013 and 2014. But after that decision of the Public Prosecution The "Mulder Law" cases decreased from 200.000 in 2014, via 100.000 in 2015 to 40.000 in 2016.

Q094 (General Comment): Classification of minor and severe cases:
Minor offences – mainly traffic offences (speeding tickets, running red lights), petty theft, vagrancy, littering, etc.
Severe offences – driving while drunk, grand theft, violent crimes, vice, drugs/narcotics etc.
Q094 (2020): Classification of severe and minor cases:
Minor offences: mainly traffic offences (speeding tickets, running red lights) and petty theft, vagrancy, littering, etc.
Severe offences: driving while drunk, grand theft, violent crimes, vice, drugs/narcotics, etc.
Effects of the pandemic:
No in person hearings happened in the period between 17 March and April 6 2020. At the start of the pandemic, not everyone was able to work remotely due to insufficient available laptops and that many files were still coming in on paper. There were some exceptions for working remotely as well, such as security, some administrative staff (people that compiled paper files, for example), etc.
Some measures were taken: hearing in other buildings, online or hybrid, and hearings in the evenings. The age restriction for judges was upped from 70 years old to 73 years old, more criminal orders were handled by the public prosecution and more cases were handled by one judge instead of more (enkelvoudig versus meervoudig)

Q094 (2016): In 2016, there has been a strong decrease in numbers of cases compared to 2014. This decrease pertains to the group of misdemeanours, in particular the group of traffic offences ("Mulder Law"). The cases of "vorderingen dwangsom" (coercive detainment) are no longer treated by the Public Prosecution. This following complaints at the Ombudsman. These coercive detainment cases increased at first strongly in 2013 and 2014. But after that decision of the Public Prosecution The "Mulder Law" cases decreased from 200.000 in 2014, via 100.000 in 2015 to 40.000 in 2016.

Q097 (General Comment): It is not possible to differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases at second instance. The financial registrations at first instance make a clear distinction between types of cases (that the answer for first instance can be based upon), but for second instances this differentiation does not exist (and thus, the registration is all the same).
As to the lack of horizontal consistency that can be observed, the reason is that the official number of cases pending on January 1st is determined at different time then the other 3 categories (official incoming, official resolved, official pending on December 31st). Due to time lags in registration and dynamics in the data systems, if the cases pending on January 1st are measured at the same time as the others, the result would be different.

Q097 (2021): The number of incoming administrative law cases increased between 2020 and 2021, most probably due to the pandemic. Especially, the number of appeals for tax cases is higher in 2021.
Q097 (2020): It is not possible for us to differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases at second instance. In short, we can provide this for first instance because the financial registrations makes clear distinction between types of cases (finances differ) that we can base that answer on, but for second instances, this differentiation in finances does not exist and thus, the registration is all the same.
Q097 (2019): .

Q097 (2018): If there is an appeal, cases are litigious in my view. I would tend to enter the value "0", but since the question is being asked, you probably see things differently. So I chose the answer "NA"
Q097 (2017): Administrative law cases, litigeous plus non-litigeous.

Q097 (2016): Administrative law cases, litigeous plus non-litigeous.

Q098 (2014): The reason for the horizontal inconsistency in 2014 is that the figures from the 4 columns of the table are not retrieved at the same time. The number of pending cases on Jan 1st is determined one year before the other 3 columns can be filled. One year later it is possible to determine the number of incoming cases, the number of resolved cases and the number of pending cases on Dec 31st. The definition of 'pending' together with dynamic changes in the registration system mean that the number of pending cases on Jan 1st will have changed. To ensure horizontal consistency, all the 4 columns should be determined after the years' end which would imply to overrule a previously determined and official (i.e. published) number of pending cases on Jan 1st.

Q099 (General Comment): Information in this section is taken from the annual report of the High Court. The formula for pending cases on 31 December might not work satisfactory – there will be a gap between pending cases at the ent of the year and the number of pending cases at the beginning of the year + incoming cases -/- resolved cases. The gap is caused by cases that are labelled 'outflow other'. These are cases that do not get resolved because of administrative reasons (for instance, the appeals is filed to late, or mandatory court fees have not been paid and there is no dispensation).

Q099 (2021): The formula for pending cases on 31 December might not work satisfactory – there will be a gap between pending cases at the ent of the year and the number of pending cases at the beginning of the year + incoming cases -/- resolved cases. The gap is caused by cases that are labelled 'outflow other'. These are cases that do not get resolved because of administrative reasons (for instance, the appeals is filed to late, or mandatory court fees have not been paid and there is no dispensation).
2 – Non-litigious cases: in theory, it might possible these cases get to the Supreme Court, but the numbers are not specified for the courts.
3 – Administrative law cases: please note that the Dutch Supreme Court only handles tax cases and some social security cases. There is not third instance court for other administrative cases in the Netherlands, so these are not included in the numbers given. 4 – Other cases: There might be other cases in separate courts, but these numbers are not nationally available. Regarding discrepancy: There are always factors that might influence the number of cases the SC handles in a year. There are no published numbers identifying the various types of cases the tax chamber handles. As mentioned before, we can provide a more general explanation for an increase in SC cases and/or disposition time. For example, delays or catch up in lower courts (increasing/lowering the number of incoming cases), new laws or changes in law that the SC must answer, cases may become more complex due to increasing complexity of laws and differences (and thus, cases may take longer), or cases that are connected are grouped to deal with in clusters (meaning more cases for a longer time). While a specific cause cannot be clearly pinpointed, all these factors might influence the numbers.

Q099 (2020): With regard to 2. Non litigious cases: In theory, it is possible these cases get to the Supreme Court, but these cases are not specified in available numbers for the courts.
With regard to 3. Administrative law cases: Please note that the Dutch Supreme Court only handles tax cases and some social security cases. There is no third instance court for other administrative cases in the Netherlands, so these are not represented in this number.
With regard to 4. Other cases: There might be other cases in separate courts (Kamers), but these numbers are not available nationally.
With regard to the discrepancies: there are always some factors that might be of influence on the number of cases the Supreme Court handles in a year. It might be due to delays or catch ups in lower courts (so incoming cases are lower/higher), new laws or changes in law that the SC must answer (like covid-regulations), cases may become more complex because laws and differences are more complex (as a result cases may take longer), or cases that are connected that are grouped to deal with in clusters (meaning more cases for a longer time). While we cannot clearly pinpoint a 'cause' of the discrepancies, all these factors mentioned might influence the numbers.

Q099 (2019): Reason for discrepancies: discrepancies seem higher, as absolute values are lower. When asked, the High Court explains that there is always an eb and flow of cases due to several factors.
Q099 (2018): Cases handled by the High Court are 'litigious' by nature (= cases are settled at first instance if one party remains inactive)
Q099 (2017): the answer to this question is still not available.
Q099 (2016): A the moment the Supreme Court has not the data available to answer this question. The National Correspondent is consulting the Supreme Court to improve this situation.

Q100 (General Comment): No distinction is made between severe criminal cases, misdemeanors and/or minor criminal cases in the numbers and accounts kept by the Dutch SC.
The gap in horizontal consistency is caused by cases that are labeled as 'outflow other' (in Dutch: uitstroom overig). These are cases that do not get resolved because of administrative reasons (for instance: the appeal is filed too late, or mandatory court fees have not been paid and there is no dispensation).

Q100 (2021): No distinction is made between severe criminal cases, misdemeanors and/or minor criminal cases in the numbers and accounts kept by the Dutch SC.
Pending cases at the end of the year are not equal to the number of pending cases at the beginning of the year + incoming cases - solved cases

Q100 (2020): In the numbers and accounts that are kept by the Dutch Supreme Court, no distinction is made between severe criminal cases and misdemeanours and/or minor criminal cases.
With regard to the discrepancies: there are always some factors that might be of influence on the number of cases the Supreme Court handles in a year. It might be due to delays or catch ups in lower courts (so incoming cases are lower/higher), new laws or changes in law that the SC must answer (like covid-regulations), cases may become more complex because laws and differences are more complex (as a result cases may take longer), or cases that are connected that are grouped to deal with in clusters (meaning more cases for a longer time). While we cannot clearly pinpoint a 'cause' of the discrepancies, all these factors mentioned might influence the numbers. The gap of 213 is caused by cases that are labeled as ‘outflow other’ (in Dutch: uitstroom overig). These are cases that do not get resolved because of administrative reasons (for instance: the appeal is filed too late, or mandatory court fees have not been paid and there is no dispensation).

Q101 (General Comment): There are a few numbers available, but NL does not register whether cases are litigious or not in the manner asked here.
Q101 (2020): There are some numbers available on this, but we don’t register whether cases are litigious or not in this manner.
Q101 (2018): As for the number of resolved employment dismissal cases, it dropped significantly in recent years, most probably because of the shortage in labour or low unemployment
Q101 (2017): The distinction of litgious cases is only available for resolved cases.

Q101 (2016): A the moment the Supreme Court has not the data available to answer this question. The National Correspondent is consulting the Supreme Court to improve this situation.

Poland

Q091 (2021): * administrative law cases - It is difficult to identify, apart from the COVID-19 pandemic, any particular reason for the increase in the number of cases brought before provincial administrative courts. A particularly large increase in the number of cases submitted to administrative courts concerned complaints about the inaction of public administration bodies and the protracted conduct of proceedings by these bodies. The increase in the receipt of such complaints in 2021 was 73.2 % compared to 2020. This may also be indicative of some backlog in public administration due to the numerous pandemic restrictions in 2020.

Q091 (2020): Comments: The discrepancies in Table 91. First instance courts: number of other than criminal law cases - compared to the previous periods (2018 and 2019) are mainly due to combinations of two reasons. First - the COVID19 pandemic, which significantly reduced case inflow to the courts (in some type of cases even by several dozen of percent), reduced the number of resolved cases and pendig cases as well. The second factor, which in contrary - caused increase in the volume of cases registered in court system was the inflow of cases related with conversion of the right of perpetual use of built-up land for residential purposes into land ownership (2.2.1 - Non litigious land registry cases). In 2020, there were more than a million incoming cases of this type (in 2019 – more than 2,5 million), which also resulted in an increase in the number of resolved cases in this area, as well as pending cases for the next reporting period.
Administrative law cases: the main reason for the slight slowdown in casework was the pandemic.

Q091 (2019): The discrepancies in section 4.2.2. Case flow management - first instance - compared to the previous period mainly concern the data shown in point 2.2.1 Non-litigious land registry cases.
In explaining the above, it should be emphasized that the general state of cases in courts of first instance in 2019 was related to cases brought to the land registry departments with regard to the conversion of the right of perpetual use of built-up land for residential purposes into land ownership. In 2019, more than 2 million incoming cases of this type, which also resulted in an increase in the number of resolved cases in this area, as well as pending cases for the next reporting period.
It should be noted that after excluding from the analysis all cases considered in Land Registry Departments, the impact of cases and settlements in 2019 were almost at the same level as in the previous year.

Q091 (2018): The discrepancy between 2016 and 2018 was realised in 2017 due to the increasing number of mostly non-litigious cases. More details in 2017 data.
Number of pending cases in the category 2.1. General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases has dropped slightly. That situation is caused by high effectiveness of courts. Number of resolved cases is higher than number of incoming cases. That situation has maintained since 2017.
Higher number of pending cases in Non-litigious business registry cases is temporary and it is a result of higher number of initiated compulsory proceedings. If it is ascertained that the application for entry in the Register or compulsory documents have not been submitted despite expiry of the deadline, the registry court shall call on the obliged parties to submit them.
We observed that the effectiveness of courts has increased and therefore number of pending cases in mentioned category has dropped at the end of the year.
In regard to non litigious land registry cases we observe in Divisions of Land and Mortgage higher staff turnover. It contributes to problems with solving cases, therefore number of pending cases has increased.
In regard to “other” cases we have observed significant increasing of incoming cases without specified category. In this category we include following cases: exemption from costs, reconstruction of files, affidavit of assets, excluding judge etc.
Higher number of pending cases on 31 Dec. is a consequence of high number of in incoming cases during the year. It was probably temporary situation.

Q091 (2017): As to a general explanation for discrepancies in 2016 to 2017 data, it has to be stated that in 2016, there was a substantial number of incoming non-litigious cases, mostly general civil cases, but also registry cases (around 700k cases total).
This important number of cases was not resolved and the backlog remained important at the end of the year. This could explain the large difference of pending cases between 1 Jan 2016 and 1 Jan 2017.

2.1. In 2016 there were serious problems with the information system which is in use in electronic proceedings therefore the number of pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year has increased. In 2017 we did not notice any problems with mentioned system, so the number of resolved cases has increased significantly. At the same reason the number of pending cases on 31 Dec. 2017 has dropped.
We indicate that fluctuation of the number of cases can be also caused by implemented organizational changes in courts (changes in staff, changes in the organization of work). 2.2. Registry cases (2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3) discrepancies are justified in points 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.
2.2.1. Non litigious land registry cases. Higher number of pending cases (on 1 Jan. ref. year and on 31 Dec. ref. year) is caused by Higher number of incoming cases than resolved cases. This situation is related to large-scale investments in infrastructure in Poland Building new roads is closely connected with changes in land registry. We need to indicate that courts have to cope with large number of difficult cases. (Mentioned reason is related to resolved / incoming cases)
2.2.2. Within the changes in business registry cases we can observe significant increase in all types of Application for registration
(first registration) cases, but there is also considerable increase in general business cases (changes in the registry, including cases of
removing from registry). We indicate that it could be caused by fluctuation in compulsory proceedings. Mentioned proceedings are carried on in the cases where it is found that an application for an entry in the National Court Register or the documents whose submission is obligatory were not submitted despite the lapse of the time limit. The registry court shall summon the obliged persons to submit them, and shall set an additional 7-day time limit. We emphasize, that the registry court shall discontinue the compulsory proceedings, if it can be concluded from the circumstances of the case that the proceedings will not lead to the fulfilment of the mentioned obligation. (Mentioned reason is related to resolved / incoming and pending cases)
2.2.3. and 2.3. - Categories do not exist in our judicial system.

Q091 (2016): Within the changes in business registry cases we can observe significant increse in all types of Application for registration (first registration) cases, but there is also considerable increse in general business cases (changes in the registry, including cases of removing from registry).
In 2016 there were serious problems with the information system which is in use in electronic proceedings therefore the number of pending cases had incresed.
Q094 (General Comment): Severe criminal cases include all offences under the Penal Code, Penal Fiscal Code and offences specified in other Acts. Misdemeanours are cases conducted under the Petty Offence Code.
The category “Other cases” covers the rest of cases conducted in criminal courts which are not connected directly with the severe criminal cases or misdemeanours (mainly cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).

Q094 (2020): The discrepancies in Table 94. First instance courts: number of criminal law cases - compared to the previous period (2018) are mainly due to two reasons. First – the COVID19 pandemic which reduced the inflow of Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (p. 2). Second – in 2020 release the number of Other cases (p. 3) was added to the table. It significantly increased the number of total cases shown in the line Total of criminal cases (1+2+3).

Q094 (2014): For the 2014 evaluation, changes in the statistical forms made possible the identification of some types of misdemeanor cases (mainly the organizational ones, which were not considered in 2012). Above this, there is a constant growth in the number of incoming cases.
Q094 (2012): The increase of the total of criminal cases and the number of severe criminal cases in respect of the item "pending cases on 1st January 2012" is due to the fact that since 2010, there was a significant increase of the inflow of cases.

Q097 (General Comment): The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97, while Q99 is replied by NA.
The category „Other cases" includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.

Q097 (2021): The category „Other cases" includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.
* administrative law cases - The figures given to you on the receipt of cases at the Supreme Administrative Court and their settlement were affected primarily by two circumstances, i.e. changes in the organizational structure of the Supreme Administrative Court (NSA) and the related transfer of cases between departments, and, as indicated above, restrictions on court operations due to the declared epidemic state in Poland.
As of January 1, 2021, new additional adjudicatory divisions were established in the Finance Chamber and the General Administrative Chamber. Some cases from Divisions I and II of both chambers were transferred to the newly created Division III. These actions had a significant impact on the way the statistics were read.
According to the data provided to you, in 2020 the NSA completed 15786 cases registered in the "SK" repertory (cassation complaints, complaints for the resumption of proceedings). However, this number includes not only cases completed by issuing a substantive decision, but also cases closed due to their transfer to a new department. There were 3115 such cases in 2020. Given the above, the real efficiency in 2020 was 88%, not 110% as reported. Cases closed in the Finance Chamber of the Supreme Administrative Court in 2020 were, in turn, in large part added to the impact in 2021, for they were re-registered in another judicial department.
The re-registration of the aforementioned cases in the Financial Chamber, as well as the re-registration of cases in the General Administration Chamber for similar reasons (4079 cases) were recorded in the total number of cases received by the NSA in 2021. Hence, 7194 cases (re-registered) would have to be deducted from the total number of 26873, which was given to you in earlier correspondence. Thus, the real flow of new cases to the NSA was 19679.
The data on the completion of cases for 2021 shows that 17111 cases were completed at the NSA. It should be noted that this figure also includes cases closed in the General Administration Chamber due to their transfer to Division III. Such cases, as mentioned, were 4079. Thus, it can be assumed that in 2021 the NSA completed 13032 cases through their substantive settlement. These data, in turn, allow us to assume that the NSA's adjudication efficiency in 2021 was 67%.
Despite the decrease in efficiency in 2021 compared to the previous year, it should be noted that in 2021 the NSA settled more cases than in 2020. On the other hand, undoubtedly, the higher inflow of cases to the NSA was due to the increased number of complaints filed with provincial administrative courts, as discussed in more detail in point 1. The increased inflow of cases to the NSA was also due to a partial blockage in the circulation of documentation between administrative courts of both instances, which occurred especially during the first phase of the pandemic (March-May 2020). During this period, far fewer cases were submitted to the NSA, which consequently translated into an increase in impact in the following months of 2020 and 2021. In turn, referring to issues related to the number of cases handled at the NSA in 2021, one can additionally point to staff shortages resulting from the retirement of some judges and the fact that more than a quarter of full-time positions were unfilled (more than 20% of judicial positions remained unfilled). In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated the reorganization of the Court's work by providing parties with the opportunity to attend hearings remotely. For technical reasons, fewer cases may be handled at remote hearings than at land-based hearings.

Q097 (2020): “Other than criminal law” cases: compared to the previous period (2018), decreases in the numbers of "incoming cases" before courts and "resolved cases" result from the COVID19 pandemic. As regards increases in the number of pending cases, they are due to increased amount of unresolved specific categories of cases in civil litigious procedures (e.g.claims under the loan agreement) and civil non-litigious procedures (e.g. division of the property). Administrative law cases : In 2020, the court disposed of 57.70% of all cases within 12 months, and within up to 24 months 78.66%. With regard to cassation complaints, 44.06% of cases were dealt with within 12 months. As far as complaints are concerned, 75.99% are settled within 2 months, while within 12 months the rate is 99.57%. 4. "4.Other cases": From the analysis of annual information for 2020 at the level of district courts and appellate courts in the labour and social security division, the following factors had an impact on the decrease in the degree of control of the impact (and thus the number of cases handled) and the increase in the average duration of proceedings in Ua, Uz and AUa and AUz cases in relation to 2019: - restrictions on court activity in 2020 related to the Covid-19 pandemic, due to the declaration of an epidemic state in the territory of the Republic of Poland from 20 March 2020 and the associated need for quarantine, sick leave, isolation, the need to provide care for children under 8 years of age, remote working, resulting in a reduction in the work of adjudicators, clerks and experts; - Insufficient number of experts on the list of expert witnesses compared to the number of cases requiring an opinion and the need to carry out joint or multiple expert opinions from different specialities, refusal of experts to carry out examinations necessary for their opinion (as a result of the epidemic situation in relation to SARS-CoV-2 infections), - a large number of suspended cases resulting from the regulation of the Act of 19 June 2020 on amending the Act on pensions from the Social Insurance Fund (Journal of Laws of 2020, item 1222), concerning a group of women born in 1953 (in these cases the proceedings were suspended by law as of 10 July 2020 until the pension authority issues a new decision recalculating the benefit of entitled persons, but not earlier than after 6 months from the suspension).

Q097 (2019): The decrease of Clearance Rate for 1. Civil and commercial litigious cases and 4. Other cases in 2019 compared with 2018 is caused by increased value of incoming cases. For 1. Civil and commercial litigious cases: from 141 045 cases in 2018 to 155 341 cases in 2019 (increase of 10%) and for 4. Other cases: from 41 242 cases in 2018 to 44 233 cases in 2019 (increase of 7%). The number of judges hearing in these type of cases in 2019 was at comparable level like in 2018 so the number of cases per one judge had increased automatically. In 2019, 16,844 cassation appeals (3,385 appeals less than in 2018) and 80 appeals for reopening the proceedings were submitted to the Supreme Administrative Court. From the previous period, 27,649 complaints and 28 applications for reopening of proceedings remain to be considered. In total, the Supreme Administrative Court had to consider 44,493 cassation appeals. In 2019, a total of 16,375 cassation complaints were examined. In 3,465 cases, the Supreme Administrative Court allowed the cassation appeal (21.16%), dismissed 11,721 cassation appeals (71.58%), and settled 1,189 in a different way (7.26%). Apart from cassation appeals, in 2019 the Supreme Administrative Court handled 4,665 complaints against decisions (orders) of courts of first instance, of which 715 allowed the appeal (15.36% of all appeals), and in 3,773 cases, the Supreme Administrative Court dismissed the appeal (80.88%), and it handled 177 matters in a different way (3.79%).
Moreover, the Supreme Administrative Court examined 162 complaints about violation of a party's right to hear a case in court proceedings without undue delay, of which 4 were admitted (2.47% of all settlements of this type), 60 were dismissed (37.04%), and 98 were settled in other way (60.49%).
In 2019, the Supreme Administrative Court handled 42.33% of all cases within 12 months, and 80.43% within 24 months. With regard to cassation complaints, 23.54% of the cases were settled within 12 months. In the case of complaints, 91.13% are examined by 2 months, and within 12 months, this ratio is 99.72%.

Q097 (2017): 2.2.2. There is not any specific explanation for observed increase. We can indicate only that mentioned increase is related especially to Register of Pledges.
As regards General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, we have validated previous data and we have made some corrections. We also indicate that a number of pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year have been increased due to higher number of incoming cases in 2016.

Q097 (2016): Within the changes in business registry cases we can observe significant increase in all types of Application for registration (first registration) cases, but there is also considerable increase in general business cases (changes in the registry, including cases of removing from registry).
In 2016 there were serious problems with the information system which is in use in electronic proceedings therefore the number of pending cases had increased.

Q098 (General Comment): Severe criminal cases includes all offences under the Penal Code, Penal Fiscal Code and offences specified in other Acts. Misdemeanours are cases conducted under the Petty Offence Code. The category “Other cases” covers the rest of cases conducted in criminal courts which are not connected directly with the severe criminal cases or misdemeanours. Mainly these are cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code, e.g: complaints against the discontinuation of the proceedings, complaints against the application or extension of pre-trial detention, complaints against the ordering the execution of a substitute prison sentence, complaints against a failure to grant parole.

Q098 (2021): Severe criminal cases includes all offences under the Penal Code, Penal Fiscal Code and offences specified in other Acts. Misdemeanours are cases conducted under the Petty Offence Code.
The category “Other cases” covers the rest of cases conducted in criminal courts which are not connected directly with the cevere criminal cases or misdemeanours (mainly cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).

Q098 (2020): Variations in the number of criminal law cases in 2020 compared to the previous period (2018) are mainly due to two reasons. First – the COVID19 pandemic which reduced the inflow of severe criminal cases (p. 1) and misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (p. 2). Second – in 2020 release, the number of Other cases (p. 3) was added to the table. It significantly increased the number of total cases shown in the line Total of criminal cases (1+2+3).

Q098 (2012): The increase of the total of criminal cases and the number of severe criminal cases in respect of the item “pending cases on 1st January 2012” is due to the fact that since 2010, there was a significant increase of the inflow of cases”.

As to the number of minor cases, there was a change in the statistical system which resulted in aggregating some categories of cases considered as minor with other criminal second instance cases. Accordingly, it was impossible to include them in the provided figures.

Q099 (General Comment): The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97, while Q99 is replied by NA.
While the Supreme Court considers non-contentious cases, there is no inclusion of this category of cases in the internal statistics. Accordingly, the reply is NA.

Q099 (2021): *1. They include cases conducted in the Civil Chamber, the Labor and Social Insurance Chamber Chamber and the Chamber for Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs, including those with the reference NSNc
*4)The data includes cases conducted in the Chamber for Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs with the references NSK, NSKP, NZP, NZ, NSW, NSP NKRS, NWW, and NO signatures. These are cases that fall under the jurisdiction of the Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs Chamber mainly in the field of public law public, i.e., other than extraordinary complaints in both civil and criminal cases (which have been assigned to civil and criminal cases shown in boxes 99 and 100, respectively),
For example, cases in the field of telecommunications regulation, energy, competition protection, but also appeals against resolutions of the National Judicial Council.
*4)Other cases are also disciplinary cases resolved in the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court.
In the case statistics of the Chamber Civil, Labor and Social Security Chamber, as well as in the statistics of civil cases (extraordinary complaints) of the Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs Chamber, there was an increased receipt in 2021 compared to 2020.This was an increase so significant that the statistics of cases handled declined compared to 2020.It should be assumed that - similar to previous years previous years, the general reason for the less favorable statistics are further organizational changes within the Supreme Court and the impact of the dispute over judicial reform on the efficiency of the work of Supreme Court judges. In addition, following the assumption of the post of President of the Civil Chamber of the Supreme Court by prof. Joanna Misztal-Konecka, there has been a review of the observance of the order in which cases are received in their allocation to individual judges. The Office Instruction was then modified in the part concerning the system of case numbers. Some cases were then assigned new case numbers, which could lead to an artificial overestimation of the number of cases with an unchanged rate of their handling.

Q099 (2020): *Civil cases :- litigious cases heard by the civil chamber and the labour and social insurance chamber: Civil Chamber - pending cases on 1 Jan - 2596, incoming cases - 4360, resolved cases - 5518, pending cases on 31th Dec - 1438; Labour and social insurance chamber - pending cases on 1 Jan - 2161, incoming cases - 1535, resolved cases - 1938, pending cases on 31th Dec - 1758; *Other cases: - cases pertaining to public law, decided by the Chamber for Extraordinary Control and Public Issues and disciplinary cases resolved in the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court: the Chamber for Extraordinary Control and Public Issues - pending cases on 1 Jan - 149, incoming cases - 6696, resolved cases - 6710, pending cases on 31th Dec - 135; the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court: pending cases on 1 Jan - 105, incoming cases - 312, resolved cases - 395, pending cases on 31th Dec - 22; Other cases: *These increases must be explained by the election year, in which the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs dealt with numerous protests. This has resulted in a substantial increase in the dynamics of cases in this Chamber.
Discrepancies - Administrative law cases - see data in Q97 and general comment to that question.

Q099 (2019): 1. Civil cases = civil cases + labour and social security cases;
4. Other cases = public law cases + disciplinary cases;
3. Data from Supreme Administrative Court; “1. Civil and commercial litigious cases”: Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 2586 (civil cases) + 2010 (labour and social security cases); Incoming cases :5105 (civil cases) + 2480 (labour and social security cases); Resolved cases: 5095 (civil cases) + 2329 (labour law and social security cases); Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 2596 (civil cases) + 2161 (labour and social security cases);
“4.Other cases”: Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref year: 117 (disciplinary cases) + 215 (public law cases); Incoming cases: 269 (disciplinary cases) + 894 (public law cases); Resolved cases: 281 (disciplinary cases) + 955 (public law cases); Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 105 (disciplinary cases) + 154 (public law cases).
Public law cases and disciplinary cases were not entered in the table in 2018. Public law cases in 2018: Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. Year – no data; Incoming cases – 293; Resolved cases – 81; Pending cases 31th December – 212; Disciplinary cases in 2018 : In 2018 the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court received a total of 161 cases, of which 52 to the First Department and 109 to the Second Department. In the First Department, in 2018, 11 cases were resolved. In the Department of the Second Disciplinary Chamber, 17 cases were considered and completed in terms of content, and 16 cases formally (data from the Supreme Court activity report for 2018).

Q099 (2016): In 2014 the Administrative Supreme court cases were not included and they are reintroduced in this cycle. In regard to administrative law cases we kindly indicate that administrative cases are excluded from the jurisdiction of the common courts. Administrative cases are proceeded by the Voivodship Administrative Courts and Supreme Administrative Court, which are only competent to proceeded such cases.

Q099 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been indicated that the Supreme Court provided the Ministry of Justice with data set that allowed summing up non-criminal cases with administrative cases of the Supreme Administrative Court. Therefore it was possible to include both data-sets.

Q100 (General Comment): The Supreme Court does not divide its statistics into categories corresponding to those defined and used by the CEPEJ.

Q100 (2020): The dynamics of the movement of cases of 2020 in the work of the Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court was due to changes of a personnel nature. In addition, some of the disciplinary cases of advocates were submitted for consideration to the Criminal Chamber on the basis of decisions of the First President of the Supreme Court made in the period until May 2020 or decisions of the President of the Supreme Court directing the work of the Criminal Chamber at a later date, as the Disciplinary Court of the Polish Bar Association refers files of disciplinary cases with cassation appeals to the Criminal Chamber, recognizing that the Disciplinary Chamber should refrain from examining them. At the same time, the above-standard involvement in the work of judges, assistants and all other employees of the Criminal Chamber allowed for an increase in the number of cases dealt with.

Q100 (2018): Number of incoming cases has increased due to implemented law changes in Code of Criminal Procedure. On 15 April 2016 entered into force regulations about complaints against appellate court judgments. Parties may complain to the Supreme Court of the Republic of Poland against an appellate court judgment revoking a judgment of the court of the first instance and referring the case for reconsideration. In the first period of functioning of mentioned regulations there were not many incoming cases. The situation changed in 2018. We have observed that many cases incoming on the base of regulations implemented in 2016. Moreover, in 2018 were carried on some organisational changes e.g. Military Chamber of Supreme Court has been closed and all cases were moved to Criminal Chamber.

Q101 (General Comment): As regards criminal cases heard in cours - only total numer of such cases is collected (without the breakdown by the type of crime commited). The breakdown by the articles of Criminal Code is used while collecting statistics on convicted persons (both in first and second instance).
Lack of horizontal consistency in the table in respect of divorce cases: in respect of this case type, he horizontal consistency is not always ensured. Sometimes the case incoming to the court as „divorce” may be adjudicated as „separation” or the case incoming to the court as „separation” may be adjudicated as „divorce”.

Q101 (2020): The discrepancies in Table 101. Number of specific litigious cases received and processed by first instance courts - compared to the previous period (2018) are mainly due to the significant increase in number of cases of personal bankruptcy (in the „incolvency” category). The amendment to the bankruptcy law made it much easier to obtain the right to bankruptcy for a natural person, therefore the number of such cases brought to court has been increasing for several last years.

Q101 (2019): *) In divorces cases the number of Pending cases on 31 Dec ref. year is not equal to pending cases on January + Incoming cases - resolved cases because some cases brought to the court as a divorce cases may be judged after a trial as a separation.
*)The number of incoming insolvency cases has been increasing in recent years, inter alia, due to the significant increase in number of cases of personal bankruptcy. The amendment to the bankruptcy law made it much easier to obtain the right to bankruptcy for a natural person, therefore the number of such cases brought to court has increased many times.

Q101 (2018): In regard to litigious divorce cases, please note that pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year plus incoming cases minus resolved cases are not equal pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year. In some judicial proceedings parties decided to change their decision and do not get divorce but they get separation. In that situations incoming cases are classified as divorce cases but in resolved cases they are classified as separation cases which are included in different statistical position.

Q101 (2017): Changes in insolvency cases pending on 31 Dec are probably caused by implemented organizational changes in courts.
Q101 (2016): The growth of the number of insolvency cases is a result of the amendment of The Bankruptcy and Reorganisation Act which entered into force on the 31 December 2016.
It should be noted, that this is a very important change, which simplifies the submission of requests for consumer bankruptcy. It also implemented solutions for insolvent consumers which facilitate reaching deal with their creditors. The amended regulations do not establish automatisation in declaring consumer bankruptcy - it is still a legal proceeding. Every time the consumer must fulfil a number of conditions, which are subject to an individual assessment conducted by the judge.
Since the implementation of this act, the number of incoming insolvency cases has increased singnificantly (300 in 2014, 8694 in 2016).

Portugal

Q091 (General Comment): The question 91_1 “Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases.
Q091 (2021): The increase in the number of cases resolved on 1 January 2021 should be contextualised, in our view, within the framework of the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent confinement, with a reflection on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.

Q091 (2020): The decrease in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases reflects the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent lockdown, that had an impact on the functioning of the courts, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services have been interrupted or conditioned.
On 1 September 2013, the new Code of civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigma, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly – those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. This new model, which enables a new way of organizing tasks, of work monitoring ando f differentiating responsabilities is provided for in Article 551, paragraph 5 of the new Code of Civil Procedure. This new system follows more closely the current model in other countries and, without prejudice to the specificities of each planning and method of statistical production, will facilitate the future approach to a comparision of the Portuguese system with that of other countries. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still ongoingaimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. Since is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases fot the year 2020 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2020: 521224; Incoming cases: 96047; Resolved cases: 159616; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2020: 457655. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2020, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma.
For this reason, the alerts and notes transmitted in previous years with regard to comparisons between countries still remain. A comparative Reading of these values must, as we have repeatedly drawn attention, be very cautious, refraining from any comparison in terms of volume or duration of cases and should be limited to the evaluation of the development indicators.
In the scope of Working Group within the Ministry of Justice that monitors the development of the procedural processing system of the 1st instance judicial courts (Citius System), work is underway to implement the mechanism in question, in order to allow for autonomous accounting of cases that are awaiting the performance of an act that falls within the competence of the registry or the judge. At the moment, it is not yet possible to estimate a date for the conclusion of the work. The question 91_3 “Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases. The number of Pending cases on 1 Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 44542. The number Incoming cases that correspond only to taxcases is 44329. The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 48704. The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. That correspond only to tax cases is 40167. In what concerns this typ of cases, in 2020 there were 68,467 new cases and 73,880 completed cases. However, of these totals, only 20,731 new cases and 26,144 completed cases corresponded to real movements of the beginning and end of cases. The remaining 47,736 cases refer to cases that were internally transferred between units, namely due to the establishment of specialised courts in September 2020 (which are not independent legal entities), or that were subject to changes in the subject matter. Considering that in 2020 the number of cases transferred between organizational units was very high in the 1st instance administrative and tax courts, for this cycle we indicated in the table only the numbers of cases opened and closed, without including transferred cases. In previous editions, the figures included transferred cases, which could impair the comparative reading.

Q091 (2019): 91.1 The decrease of the number of pending cases older than 2 years follows the general trend of decrease of pending cases for this category. There were no legislative changes that can explain this decrease.

Q091 (2018): The question 91_1 “Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases.
On 1 September 2013, the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigm, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly - those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. This new model, which enables a new way of organizing tasks, of work monitoring and of differentiating responsibilities is provided for in Article 551, paragraph 5 of the new Code of Civil Procedure. This new system follows more closely the current model in other countries and, without prejudice to the specificities of each planning and method of statistical production, will facilitate the future approach to a comparison of the Portuguese system with that of other countries. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still ongoing aimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. Since is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2018 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2018 700.638; Incoming cases:127.646; Resolved cases:222.480; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2018: 605.804 This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2018, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma.
For this reason, the alerts and notes transmitted in previous years with regard to comparisons between countries still remain. A comparative reading of these values must, as we have repeatedly drawn attention, be very cautious, refraining from any comparison in terms of volume or duration of cases and should be limited to the evaluation of the development indicators.
The question 91_3 ”Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.
The number of Pending cases on 1Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 47931
The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 14895
The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 16828
The number of pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 45998
91.1 Due to increased efficiency of first instance courts, we can notice for the last several cycles a down-word trend in respect of the number of pending cases, namely civil and commercial litigious cases

Q091 (2017): Q 91.1 - the decrease of pending cases older than 2 years can be explained by the global decrease of theses cases. There were no legislative changes that could explain this decrease.
The question 91_1 “Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases.
On 1 September 2013, the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigm, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly - those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. This new model, which enables a new way of organizing tasks, of work monitoring and of differentiating responsibilities is provided for in Article 551, paragraph 5 of the new Code of Civil Procedure. This new system follows more closely the current model in other countries and, without prejudice to the specificities of each planning and method of statistical production, will facilitate the future approach to a comparison of the Portuguese system with that of other countries. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still ongoing aimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. Since is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred above (the technical work is still on going), the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2017 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2017: 804.423; Incoming cases: 148.713; Resolved cases: 249.837; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2017: 703.299. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2017, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma.
For this reason, the alerts and notes transmitted in previous years with regard to comparisons between countries still remain. A comparative reading of these values must, as we have repeatedly drawn attention, be very cautious, refraining from any comparison in terms of volume or duration of cases and should be limited to the evaluation of the development indicators.
The question 91_3 ”Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.
The number of Pending cases on 1Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 49.943
The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 14.707
The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 16.811
The number of pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 47.839

Q091 (2016): " Item 91-1 “Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. On 1 September 2013, the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigm, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly - those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. This new model, which enables a new way of organizing tasks, of work monitoring and of differentiating responsibilities is provided for in Article 551, paragraph 5 of the new Code of Civil Procedure. This new system follows more closely the current model in other countries and, without prejudice to the specificities of each planning and method of statistical production, will facilitate the future approach to a comparison of the Portuguese system with that of other countries. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still on-going aimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. Since is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The data on enforcement cases for the year 2016 is: pending cases on 1 Jan. 2016: 934.860; incoming cases: 158.164; resolved cases: 289.402; pending cases on 31 Dec. 2016: 803.622. These numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2016, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma. For this reason, the alerts and notes transmitted in previous years with regard to comparisons between countries still remain. A comparative reading of these values must, as we have repeatedly drawn attention, be very cautious, refraining from any comparison in terms of volume or duration of cases and should be limited to the evaluation of the development indicators. Item 91_3 ”Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases. The separate data on tax cases is as follows: pending cases on 1Jan. - 53.597; incoming cases - 16.445; resolved cases - 20.222; pending cases on 31 Dec. - 49.820. Regarding the decrease in the number of incoming administrative law cases, it results from the decrease in the number of incoming tax law cases, in particular in what concerns misdemeanour appeals".

Q091 (2015): The category “civil (and commercial) litigious cases” includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. On 1 September 2013, the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigm, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly - those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still ongoing aimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. It is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred in that table. Just for information, the data on the total number of existing enforcement procedures in Portugal in 2015, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma is the following: pending cases on 1 Jan. 2015: 1.000.446; incoming cases: 199.359; resolved cases: 272.191; pending cases on 31 Dec. 2015: 927.614.
The category “administrative law cases” includes administrative and tax cases. The separate data on tax cases is the following: pending cases on 1Jan - 47.866; incoming cases - 24.808; resolved cases - 19.164; pending cases on 31 Dec. - 53.510.

Q091 (2014): For 2014, data are not available due to technical constraints.

Q091 (2013): Portugal took important measures in order to improve the courts clearance rate and backlogs which resulted in an increased number of resolved non-criminal and enforcement cases. Some measures were focused primarily on enforcement cases, since they represent 70% of the total of pending cases. For example, the government adopted measures with the purpose to eliminate cases where there are no assets to execute or no procedural momentum, as well as measures with the aim to limit the number of incoming cases, establishing initial court fees. Courts with excessive number of pending cases were subject to particular assistance of specialized teams.

Q091 (2012): As for the number of incoming non-criminal and enforcement cases, the 2012 data reflect the effects of the entry into force of Decree 113-A/2011, which proceeded to a major judiciary reorganization. The figures reflect the corresponding movement of cases between organizational units. As a result, in 2012, a higher number of cases that have not entered ex novo in the Portuguese courts were taken into account. These cases have ended in the unit/court where they left and entered into the new courts where they were transferred.

Q092 (2013): On the occasion of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises, it has been specified that the category of civil (and commercial cases) litigious cases includes the case flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice.

Q092 (2012): On the occasion of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises, it has been specified that the category of civil (and commercial cases) litigious cases includes the case flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice.

Q094 (2021): The discrepancy should be contextualised, in our view, within the framework of the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent confinement, with a reflection on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.

Q094 (2020): 94.1 - The decrease in the number of cases completed in the category "Total of criminal law cases" between 2018 and 2020 is justified by the decrease in court activity in the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.
94.2 -The decrease in the number of incoming and outgoing cases in the category "Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases" between 2018 and 2020 is justified by the decrease in court activity in the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation. Still, the number of cases pending on January 1, 2020 reduced compared to the number of cases pending on January 1, 2018, since the number of cases completed from 2018 to 2019 was relatively higher than the number of cases entered in those years. 94.3 - The increase in the number of pending cases older than 2 years in the "Other criminal cases" category in 2020 compared to 2018 may be related to reduced court activity in the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.

Q094 (2018): Regarding the decrease of the numbers comparing to 2016, there were no legislative changes or others that could explain this decrease. Due to increased efficiency of first instance courts, we can notice for the last several cycles a down-word trend in respect of the number of pending cases, namely criminal law cases.

Q094 (2016): There is no specific reason explaining the decrease in the number of incoming and pending criminal cases in comparison with the values of previous cycles. There were no legislative changes or other that could explain this value. However, we can note that cases at first instance in criminal and other areas have been decreasing in the last years. In addition, this decrease may also result from the fact that the number of criminal cases registered by police forces has been decreasing.

Q094 (2012): The number of pending minor criminal cases on 1 January and 31 December 2012 decreased due to the fact that the number of misdemeanor and minor criminal resolved cases in 2010 and 2011 was significantly superior to the number of cases filed on both those years. Generally, there is a decreasing trend concerning minor offences.

Q097 (General Comment): Since 2007, statistical data concerning pending cases in 2nd instance judicial courts are collected through the courts information systems. Being a dynamic system, allowing regular corrections and up-dating, this data collection may lead to oscillation data from previous years resulting in variations in pending cases.
In Portugal, there are not non-litigious cases in superior courts.
The category "other" does not exist in the higher instances.
It is noteworthy that before 2015, data concerning the total of “other than criminal law cases” did not include administrative law cases. Since 2015, administrative law cases are included in the total which explains the significant increase of cases.

Q097 (2021): The decrease in the number of pending cases is related to the fact that in 2020 the number of cases that were completed in the second instance courts was higher than the number of new cases. This downward trend in pending cases has been constant since 2016.
Q097 (2020): The decrease in the number of cases under the category "Civil (and commercial) litigious cases" between 2018 and 2020 is justified by the decrease in court activity in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation. The number of cases pending on December 31, 2020 has reduced compared to the number of cases pending on December 31, 2018, since the number of cases completed from 2018 to 2020 was relatively higher than the number of cases entered in those years. The increase in the number of cases completed in Administrative Courts between 2018 and 2019 may be justified by the increase in the number of judicial magistrates working in these courts. Even so, despite this increase in cases completed, there was an increase in the number of cases pending on January 1, 2020 compared to the number of cases pending on January 1, 2018, considering that the number of cases completed from 2018 to 2019 was still relatively lower than the number of cases entered in those years.

Q097 (2019): This increase of resolved cases can be explained by the increase on the number of judges in Administrative Courts.
Q097 (2018): Regarding the increase in the number of pending administrative law cases comparing to 2016, there were no legislative changes or others that could explain this variation”.
Q097 (2016): There is no specific explanation as regards the increase in the number of civil and commercial litigious cases pending on 1 January 2016 between 2015 and 2016. The question 97_3 ”Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.
The number of Pending cases on 1Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 3.909
The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 1.809
The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 1.663
The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 4.055

Q097 (2015): The question 97_3 ”Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.

Q098 (General Comment): When courts handle appeal cases it is not possible to separate appeals that had in their origin a criminal case or a misdemeanor case.

Q098 (2016): There is no specific reason explaining the increase in the number of pending criminal cases on 31 December 2016 in comparison with the values of the previous cycle. There were no legislative changes or other that could explain this change.

Q099 (General Comment): In Portugal, there are not non-litigious cases in superior courts.
The category "other" does not exist in the higher instances.
It is noteworthy that before 2015, data concerning the total of “other than criminal law cases” did not include administrative law cases. Since 2015, administrative law cases are included in the total which explains the significant increase of cases.

Q099 (2021): The increase in the number of cases pending on 1 January 2021 is related to the fact that in 2020 the number of cases brought was slightly higher than the number of cases completed. There is no specific explanation for these values.

Q099 (2020): There was an increase in the number of cases pending from 2018 to 2020 at the Supreme Court of Justice, considering that the number of cases that ended from 2018 to 2020 was relatively lower than the number of cases brought in those years. The rise in the number of pending cases in the year 2020 is also partly explained by the decrease in court activity in the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.

Q099 (2019): 99 (total) - the increase on the number of pending cases vis a vis 2018 is explained by the fact that the closed cases from 2018 to 2019 were relatively inferior to the number of incoming cases in those years. There were no legislative changes that could explain these numbers.
99.1 - the increase on the number of pending cases vis a vis 2018 is explained by the fact that the closed cases from 2018 to 2019 were relatively inferior to the number of incoming cases in those years. There were no legislative changes that could explain these numbers.

Q099 (2018): Regarding the slight decrease in the number of pending civil and commercial litigious cases at the beginning of the year 2018, comparing to 2016, there were no legislative changes or others that could explain this decrease

Q099 (2017): Q99.1 - The decrease in the number of pending civil and commercial litigious cases on 31 december 2017 is explained by the fact that the number of resolved cases in 2017 was superior to the number of incoming cases in the same year. There were no legislative changes or other that can explain this decrease.

Q099 (2016): In Portugal, there are not non-litigious cases in superior courts.
The category "other" does not exist in the higher instances.
It is noteworthy that before 2015, data concerning the total of “other than criminal law cases” did not include administrative law cases. Since 2015, administrative law cases are included in the total which explains the significant increase of cases.
The question 99.3 “Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.
The number of Pending cases on 1Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 783
The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 1.039
The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 946
The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 876

Q099 (2015): The question 99.3 “Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.

Q100 (General Comment): The communicated data reflects the case-flow of criminal cases before the highest instance courts.
“Misdemeanor cases” are never taken to high instance courts.

Q100 (2020): The increase in the number of criminal cases pending on January 1, 2020 compared to the number of cases pending on January 1, 2018, at the Supreme Court is justified by the fact that the number of cases completed from 2018 to 2019 was relatively lower than the number of cases entered in those years.

Q100 (2016): In Portugal, misdemeanour/minor criminal cases may not be dealt in the Supreme Court of Justice.

Q100 (2012): The number of pending cases has decreased between 1 January 2010 and 1 January 2012 due to the fact that the number of resolved cases in that period was superior to the number of incoming cases. Conversely, in the period between 31 December 2010 and 31 December 2012, the number of incoming cases was superior to the number of resolved cases, which resulted in the increase of the number of pending cases. In addition, the number of pending cases at 1 January 2010, as well as the number of incoming cases in 2010 benefited from the effect of the change of the Criminal Procedure Code (Law n.48/2007) that narrowed the access to the High Judicial Superior Council. In the years 2011 and 2012, this effect was diluted, leading to a slight increase of the pending cases on 31 December 2012.

Q101 (General Comment): Since 2007, statistical data concerning pending cases in 1st instance judicial courts are collected through the courts information systems. Being dynamic systems, allowing regular corrections and up-dating, the data collection may lead to oscillation data from previous years resulting in variations in pending cases.

Q101 (2021): The increase in the number of pending cases on 1 January 2021 is related to the fact that in 2020 the number of incoming cases was higher than the number of completed cases. This situation should be contextualised, in our view, within the framework of the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent confinement, with a reflection on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.

Q101 (2020): The increase in the number of employment dismissal cases pending from 2018 to 2020 is largely justified by the fact that in 2020 the number of the cases filed was much higher than the number of cases completed. This is be partly justified by the decrease in court activity in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.
The number of pendinginsolvency cases as of January 1, 2020 has decreased compared to the number of cases pending as of January 1, 2018, as the number of cases completed in 2018 and 2019 was relatively higher than the number of cases entered in those years. The decrease in the number of insolvency cases completed between 2018 and 2020 is justified by the decrease in court activity in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.
Robbery and intentional homicide: At the trial stage, the classification of the type of crime in criminal cases is done only at the time the case ends, so it is not possible to provide data on the movement of cases before the case is finished.

Q101 (2019): The number of insolvency pending cases has decreased in relation to 2018, because the number of resolved cases has increased. In addition, the number of insolvency cases in 2018 decreased due to a more favourable economic situation. Finally, this decrease follows the decrease in pending cases in the civil procedural area in global terms.

Q101 (2018): The decrease of the number of pending cases follows the global general tendency of decrease of the number of civil and labor cases filed and pending. We have not identified any legislative or other changes that could directly justify the decrease of such cases.
Q101 (2017): The number of pending employment dismissal cases decreased in 2017 in relation to2016. This was due to the fact that the numer of resolved cases in 2016 was superior to the number of new cases that year. The number of cases in 2016 decreased as a result of a better economic environment.
In addition, labour cases have been decreasing in global terms.
The number of pending insolvency cases decreased in 2017 in relation to2016. This was due to the fact that the numer of resolved cases in 2016 was superior to the number of new cases that year. The number of cases in 2016 decreased as a result of a better economic environment.
In addition, civil procedural cases have been decreasing in global terms.

Q101 (2016): - The decrease in the number of pending cases in the beginning of 2016 in relation to 2015 in respect of litigious divorce cases, employment dismissal cases and insolvency is explained by the fact that the number of resolved cases in 2015 was superior to the number of incoming cases that year. There is no specific explanation as regards the decrease in the number of these cases (for example legislative changes). However the decrease of these cases follow the general trend of the decrease of incoming and pending cases in civil and labour matters.
- The decrease in the number of pending cases in the end of 2016 in relation to 2015 in respect of litigious divorce cases, employment dismissal cases and insolvency is explained by the fact that the number of resolved cases in 2016 was superior to the number of incoming cases that year. There is no specific explanation as regards the decrease in the number of these cases (for example legislative changes). However the decrease of these cases follow the general trend of the decrease of incoming and pending cases in civil and labour matters.

Q101 (2015): The decrease in the number of employment dismissal cases follow the general trend of the decrease of incoming and pending cases in labour matters.
Q101 (2013): The number of incoming litigious divorce cases is decreasing since 2010, entailing a decrease in the number of pending cases. Between 2010 and 2013, the clearance rate has remained stable, with values above 100%. Besides, the number of marriages has decreased in these last years. In 2012, legislative and other measures were adopted with the objective to accelerate procedural times of insolvency cases. These measures have allowed courts to respond more promptly to the increasing number of insolvency cases.

Romania

Q091 (General Comment): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
Q091 (2021): As presented in the comments to the data communicated in the previous CEPEJ cycle, the measures taken in the pandemic period led to an increase in the stock of cases, that explain the number of pending cases on Jan 1st and also some of the values of the pending cases in courts for 2 years. At the same time, as shown in some of the data on resolved cases, although the stock at the beginning of 2021 was considerable by the enhanced activity the number of resolved cases increased

Q091 (2020): The decrease in the number of resolved cases in 2020 was caused by the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. The activity of al the courts was partially suspended between the 15-th of March until the end of May 2020 because a state of emergency was declared. During that period only few urgent cases were adjudicated. Some courts instituted preventive mesures even before the 15-th of March 2020 which included postponing non-urgent cases. After the state of emergency ended there were still in place measures that affected the normal activity of the courts like: the introduction of specific timeframes for each case, hearings through video conference, a strict limitation of human interaction at the auxiliary compartments of the courts that dealt directly with public like the Archive and the Registry office, so that requests and documents had to be submitted by post, fax or e-mail. These measures affected not only the court staff but all court users that had to adapt to the new circumstances and led to the postponement of many cases. There were also gaps in activity caused by cases of Covid-19 among the personnel of the courts. The same explanation is valid for the increased Disposition time which led to an increased numer of pending cases older than 3 years.

Q091 (2019): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
Referring to the non-litigious business registry cases,the differences in the statistical data are given by the dynamics in the business environment and the interactions at economic level and do not relate to any manifestation at the level of public authority. By referring to total requests that are the object of registration in the trade register, the influence is insignificant.
Referring to the administartive cases, the decrease in the number of pending cases in administrative matters can be determined by aspects such as: certain types of cases that have been exhausted before courts (e.g cases on salary rights of public servants initiated in 2010) or cases such as those on pollution taxes that were mostly exhausted before courts and for which administrative procedures have been expressly regulated as to discharge the huge workload in courts that they have generated. In terms of incoming administrative cases, when referring to a decrease in their number, similar reasons that justify the decrease in the number of pending administrative cases should be taken into consideration, namely, for example, those referring to the administrative procedures that have been expressly regulated as to discharge the huge workload in courts (e.g. regarding to the cases on pollution taxes). There is no particular explanation on the increased number of general civil and commercial non-litigious cases in 2019, resulting in a slight decrease of the CR for this category. However, it should be noticed that the operatitivity and volume of solved cases has increased.

Q091 (2018): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
Referring to the non-litigious business registry cases,the differences in the statistical data are given by the dynamics in the business environment and the interactions at economic level and do not relate to any manifestation at the level of public authority. By referring to total requests that are the object of registration in the trade register, the influence is insignificant.
Referring to the administartive cases, the decrease in the number of pending cases in administrative matters can be determined by aspects such as: certain types of cases that have been exhausted before courts (e.g cases on salary rights of public servants initiated in 2010) or cases such as those on pollution taxes that were mostly exhausted before courts and for which administrative procedures have been expressly regulated as to discharge the huge workload in courts that they have generated. In terms of incoming administrative cases, when referring to a decrease in their number, similar reasons that justify the decrease in the number of pending administrative cases should be taken into consideration, namely, for example, those referring to the administrative procedures that have been expressly regulated as to discharge the huge workload in courts (e.g. regarding to the cases on pollution taxes).

Q091 (2017): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
“Administrative law cases”: indeed, the data are correct, namely there is a significant increase in the number of incoming cases in 2017 that could be explained by the changes brought in 2013 to the Law no. 554/2004 of administrative litigations; the amendments resulted in a high number of second appeals in this matter (by number of second appeals we understand all second appeals under the competence of both the Supreme Court (High Court of Cassation and Justice) and of the courts of appeal, because in this matter some of the cases shall be judged in first instance by tribunals and others by the courts of appeals).

Q091 (2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
The high clearance rate of administrative cases in previous cycles has led to lower significantly the number pending cases. The increase of the number of incoming cases is a consequence of a higher number of requests filed in administrative domain that also triggers an increase in the number of resolved cases. The decrease in the number of non-litigious pending cases as well as "other" pending cases is mostly due to lower number of incomming ases.

Q091 (2014): By the decision n° 46/2012, the Superior Council of Magistracy has decided that all the courts will implement by 1 January 2014 the IT system of collecting data. The new method is based on new definitions of the indicators. Accordingly, a case is transferred from the field “stocks” to the field “closed” only when the final decision, including its reasoning is drafted signed and communicated to the parties. For that reason, the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 cannot be identical with the number of pending cases on 1st January 2014.
The initial total number of pending cases has increased as a result of reporting the data into Ecris database. The number of incoming cases and this of resolved cases are comparable from one year to another for the period 2010-2013. The stocks at the end of the period is in relation to the adjustment of the stocks at the beginning of the period, but comparable with 2012.
Concerning the number of administrative law cases the workload has constantly decreased starting with 2012. The increase of stocks initially communicated for 2013 comes from the high number of incoming cases in 2012. The final stock of 2014 is lower also because of the lower number of the new cases in 2013. It may also be noticed that the new cases closed in 2013 was higher than in 2012. The high decrease in the number of incoming, resolved and pending administrative law cases on 31 December between 2013 and 2014 is progressive and is caused by the social climate.

Q091 (2013): With regard to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, because of the delays between hearings that are often very long (usually the first hearing is determined by an electronic system after a long period of time, in relation with the actual workload of judges), the new entered files are not usually finalised within a year.
With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, all the indicators kept a growing trend in 2012 and 2013. As for the stock of files (pending on 31.12), the increase between 2012 and 2013 is due to the fact that during the same period the number of resolved files has also decreased.
As to the trends observed in 2013 in respect of the “non-litigious enforcement cases” and “non-litigious land registry cases”, data are correct.
As to the category “administrative law cases”, the big differences have always been a reason for concern and continuous analysis. In the report on the status of Judiciary on 2012, it was noted that “in the administrative contentious and fiscal matters, the most of the cases were related to the restitution of the tax for pollution, but also to the obligation of the authorities to register the vehicles, without the payment of the tax for pollution (obligation to perform)”. It should be mentioned that the actions of the legislative have led to the growth of the number of administrative cases in the past 5 years, at tribunals with more than 400% and at the courts of appeal with around 200%.

Q091 (2012): With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, all the indicators kept a growing trend in 2012.
As to the category “administrative law cases”, the big differences have always been a reason for concern and continuous analysis. In the report on the status of Judiciary on 2012, it was noted that “in the administrative contentious and fiscal matters, the most of the cases were related to the restitution of the tax for pollution, but also to the obligation of the authorities to register vehicles, without the payment of the tax for pollution (obligation to perform)”. It should be mentioned that the actions of the legislative have led to the growth of the number of administrative cases to be solved in the past 5 years, at tribunals with more than 400% and at the courts of appeal with around 200%.

Q094 (General Comment): There is no classification of severe and less severe offences in the Romanian statistics.
In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.

Q094 (2020): As stated at Q91 the context of the Covid-19 pandemic affected the activity of the courts which led to the decrease in the number of resolved cases in 2020 an increased Disposition time and an increased numer of pending cases older than 3 years. In criminal law cases postponements were reccurent in cases involving persons serving a prison senstence, because generaly they have to be brought to every court hearing which was not always possibile due to the curantine measures taken by the prison administrations.

Q094 (2018): The changes brought to the code of criminal procedure may be among the reasons for the augmentation of the total number of criminal law cases pending on January 1st between 2016 and 2018, namely for e.g. the procedure regarding the prosecutor's decision to discontinue the criminal investigation has to be confirmed by a judges/in court, according to the new provisions.

Q094 (2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on categories of pending cases as follows: - 0-1/2 years;
- 1/2-1 year;
- 1 - 1 and 1/2 years;
- 1 and 1/2 - 3 years;
- 3 - 5 years;
In the table above, last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years.
The total number of incoming criminal cases in first instance courts has substantially increased when compared to 2014 data (+41%). These figures have been confirmed by the CEPEJ National Correspondent.

Q094 (2014): The significant increase in the number of total pending cases on 1st of January within the period 2012 – 2014 is due to the new way of counting the statistical data by the application Statis. The time of reaching a decision is not equivalent to the time of drafting the decision. For the present evaluation, files where a decision is reached but is not drafted yet are not counted.

Q097 (General Comment): It is worth specifying that, since 2010, the first table (question no. 91) centralizes all the first instance cases (irrespective of the level of the courts), the second table (question no. 97) centralizes all the second instance cases – appeal (irrespective of the level of the court) and table no. 3 (question no. 99) shows the statistical data on all second appeal cases (last instance cases) from all courts (irrespective of their level).
In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.

Q097 (2021): As stated at Q91 the context of the Covid-19 pandemic affected the activity of the courts which led to the decrease in the number of resolved cases, therefore the the stock with old cases increased in some cases.

Q097 (2020): As stated at Q91 the context of the Covid-19 pandemic affected the activity of the courts which led to the decrease in the number of resolved cases in 2020 an increased Disposition time and an increased numer of pending cases older than 3 years.

Q097 (2019): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.

Q097 (2018): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
The increase in the number of cases in appeal reflects the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes; the jurisdiction of the courts in judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the New Civil Procedural Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the Old Code and shows continous increase since the entry into force of the provisions.

Q097 (2017): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
The increase in the number of cases in appeal reflects the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes; the jurisdiction of the courts in judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the New Civil Procedural Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the Old Code and shows continous increase since the entry into force of the provisions.

Q097 (2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
The general increase in the number of cases in appeal reflects the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes; the jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the new Civil Procedure Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the old Code and shows continuous increase after 2014.

Q097 (2014): By the decision n° 46/2012, the Superior Council of Magistracy has decided that all the courts will implement by 1 January 2014 the IT system of collecting data. The new method is based on new definitions of the indicators. Accordingly, a case is transferred from the field “stocks” to the field “closed” only when the final decision, including its reasoning is drafted signed and communicated to the parties. For that reason, the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 cannot be identical with the number of pending cases on 1st January 2014.
The meaningful increases in figures observed between 2012 and 2014 are due to the fact that, in relation to the appeal, beyond the differences recorded in Statis, there was a change of jurisdiction in civil matters. Accordingly, the appeal (apel) became the main instrument to challenge a decision.

Q097 (2013): With regard to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, the observed evolutions between 2010 and 2013 are due to the fact that following the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes, the jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the new Civil Procedure Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the old Code. Thus, even if the number of solved files in second instance is higher in 2013 than in the previous year, the number of new appeals (incoming cases in second instance) is higher. This explains the growth of the workload in the last period of time on these courts, although previously the trend was descending.
With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, the analysis of data and the noticed evolutions and variations between 2010 and 2013 should be qualified. In fact, the figures are not so high and the growth and regress of a few cases during one year lead to relatively important variations. For example, a growth of only 8 cases at the end of the year will reflect a growth of 35%. The same reasoning should be applied with regard to the category “non-litigious land registry cases” where a growth of only 122 cases at the beginning of the year will reflect a growth of over 40%.
In respect of the category “non-litigious enforcement cases”, the considerable increases between 2010 and 2013 with regard to all the items (pending cases, incoming and resolved) were the consequence of the new distribution of competences between courts. Since 2013, all the enforcement cases are in the jurisdiction of the courts of appeal. The number of cases in third instance decreased correlatively.
Following the changes in the procedural provisions made in 2013, the second appeal, as means of review in the field of non-litigious business registry, became appeal, in accordance with the new principles of the Civil Procedure Code as regards the means of review.

Q098 (General Comment): There is no classification of severe and less severe offences in the Romanian statistics.

Q098 (2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on categories of pending cases as follows: - 0-1/2 years;
- 1/2-1 year;
- 1 - 1 and 1/2 years;
- 1 and 1/2 - 3 years;
- 3 - 5 years;
In the table above, last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years.

Q098 (2014): The significant increase of the total of criminal cases in respect of all the enumerated categories (pending, incoming and resolved cases) in 2014 is due to the entry into force of the new Codes and the changes of jurisdiction.

Q098 (2012): The decrease of the total of criminal cases in 2012 in respect of all the enumerated categories (pending, incoming, resolved cases) is due to the entry into force of Law n° 202/2010, the so called “small reform law”. Consequently, the legal remedy of appeal (appeal on the merit) has been abolished in several criminal matters, remaining only the “recurs” (“appeal on law”).
Q099 (2021): The increase in Pending cases older than 2 years for administrative cases could be explained both by the significant increase in 2017 of the number of incoming cases of this type and by the limited capacity for resolving cases during the pandemic crises (from 30038 in 2019 to 26800 in 2020); therefore, the effect shall be seen in terms of statistics after 3 years in the number of pending cases (according to our statistical application the pending cases are registered in the category cases pending for more than 3 years).
Q099 (2019): In 2017 there was a significant increase in the number of incoming administrative cases explained by the modifications in terms of procedure, namely amendments regarding the jurisdiction for administrative cases brought in 2013 that might have generated later effects in terms of number of "second appeals" (peculiarity of our system). Since 2017 and the described peak, the number of incoming administrative cases is decreasing.

Q099 (2018): The differences compared to the previous cycle are due to changes brought by the Constitutional Court's decisions to the interpretation given by the High Court of Cassastion and Justice to the legislation regarding the increasing number of incoming civil litigious cases and the decreasing number of civil litigious cases pending for more than 2 years.

Q099 (2017): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, for the last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years. The increase in the number of incoming administrative cases may be explained by the modifications in terms of procedure, namely modifications regarding the jurisdiction for administrative cases brought in 2013 that might have generated later effects in terms of number of "second appeals" (peculiarity of our system); moreover, there should be mentioned that the number of second appeals in this question, refers to both the second appeals judged by the supreme court (High Court of Cassation and Justice) and by the courts of appeals, aspect that is valid even for the previous cycles.

Q099 (2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, for the last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years. As result of the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes; the jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed and some of the cases that were under the jurisdiction of the High Court are now under the jurisdiction of the courts of appeal Consequently the number of cases in Supreme court shows significant decrease in all categories.

Q099 (2014): By the decision n° 46/2012, the Superior Council of Magistracy has decided that all the courts will implement by 1 January 2014 the IT system of collecting data. The new method is based on new definitions of the indicators and offers data with greater value for 2014. This partly explains the considerable increase of the number of pending administrative cases on 1st January between 2012 and 2014. Besides, the number of incoming cases in 2013 was higher than in 2014.

Q099 (2013): In respect of the administrative law cases, until 2013, there was only a second appeal that is encompassed in the answers to question 99.
Q100 (2021): according to the application for statistics

Q100 (2018): The increase in the total of criminal law cases incoming between 2016 and 2018 can be explained by the retrail / re-examination of a high important number of cases (to be noted that none of these cases were new) according to the Constitutional Court's decision that brought changes to the interpretation given by the High Court of Cassation and Justice in the matter of judicial organisation.
Q100 (2016): The jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed and some of the cases that were under the jurisdiction of the High Court are now under the jurisdiction of the courts of appeal Consequently the number of cases in Supreme court shows significant decrease in all categories.
In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on categories of pending cases as follows: - 0-1/2 years;
- 1/2-1 year;
- 1 - 1 and 1/2 years;
- 1 and 1/2 - 3 years;
- 3 - 5 years;
In the table above, last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years.

Q100 (2014): The significant decrease between 2012 and 2014 of the total of criminal cases in respect of the following categories – incoming, resolved and pending on 31st December, is due to the entry into force of the new Codes and the changes of jurisdiction.
Q100 (2012): The important increase of the total of criminal cases pending on 1 January 2012 is the consequence of the entry into force of Law n° 202/2010. Consequently, the legal remedy of appeal (appeal on the merit) has been abolished in several criminal matters, remaining only the “recurs” (“appeal on law”). It resulted in an increase of the number of “recurs”.

Q101 (General Comment): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
Q101 (2021): The decrease in the number of incoming employment dismissal cases is linked to the decrease in the number of this type of pending cases. A similar explanation can be given for the robbery cases. The decrease in the number of resolved cases of intentional homicide is linked to the decrease in the number of incoming intentional homicide cases. However, at least some of the increase, such as for the divorce cases, may be caused by the context of Covid 19 pandemic period since the number of pending cases on January 2021 increased since the previous cycle.

Q101 (2020): The increase in the number of employment dismissal cases may be attributed to a complex set of socio-economical factors and we do not have the data analisis in this matter. However, at least some of the increase may be caused by the context of Covid 19 pandemic that affected a lot of economic sectors that may have caused a suge in employment dismissal cases.
Q101 (2019): As to the increased number of cases relating to asylum seekers at the beginning of 2019, the reason is the increased number of incoming cases in 2018 due to the increase of the migration as a phenomenon

Q101 (2018): The augmentation of cases related to asylum seekers is due to the increase of the migration as a phenomenon

Q101 (2017): With regard to "cases related to asylum seekers" the increase in the number of incoming cases in 2017 may be determined by the extended phenomenon of immigration lately registered in Europe. Referring to the decrease in the number of resolved cases related to the right of entry and stay for aliens (resulting in an increased number of pending cases on 31 December 2017) there is not an objective reason that may explain this statistical data.

Q101 (2016): The decrease of pending Employment dismissal cases is due to high Clearance Rate in 2015. Regarding insolvency cases, the decrease observed for the period 2014-2016 was determined, on the one hand, by the change in economic conditions and the re-launching of the companies' potential. On the other hand, the reform of insolvency legislation (Law 85/2014) encouraged early recovery prior to insolvency and, balancing the protection of creditors with that enjoyed by debtors, has reduced the tendency of borrowers to use this judicial procedure.

Q101 (2015): One may notice an important decrees of first instance new cases in administrative law and insolvency as a cause of legislative amendments dating from 2012. The same reason is for increases of numbers in appeal and decreases in second appeal, except for special laws like administrative law.
Q101 (2014): By the decision n° 46/2012, the Superior Council of Magistracy has decided that all the courts will implement by 1 January 2014 the IT system of collecting data. The new method is based on new definitions of the indicators. Accordingly, a case is transferred from the field “stocks” to the field “closed” only when the final decision, including its reasoning is drafted signed and communicated to the parties. For that reason, the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 cannot be identical with the number of pending cases on 1st January 2014.
The decrease of the number of resolved litigious divorce cases between 2013 and 2014 was due to the socio-economic conditions.

Q101 (2013): In respect of the category “litigious divorce cases”, the decrease of the number of cases in 2013 may have social causes and may also reflect the alternative instruments to litigious divorce (.g. divorce in front of notaries).
In respect of the category “employment dismissal cases”, because of the delays on the first hearings allocated by the new automatic system implemented with the new Civil Procedure Code, even if the number of the new entered cases has decreased, the total volume of activity was focused on stocks. The problem enters on a normal path in 2013.

Q101 (2012): In respect of the category "litigious divorce cases", the decrease of the number of cases in 2012 may have social causes and may also reflect the alternative instruments to litigious divorce (.g. divorce in front of notaries).

Slovak Republic

Q091 (General Comment): For 2016 data, new methodology was implemented based on the working group’s conclusions and CEPEJ mission’s recommendation (06/2016). Former reporting structure was not consistent with the methodology of CEPEJ, which could lead to inappropriate comparison of Slovak Republic (SR) with other countries. Also, the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) realized that evaluation of courts’ performance by disposed and unresolved (decided and undecided) cases is discriminating SR in comparison with other countries in European Union (EU) as this methodology is not counting a decision of first instance court as disposed until the case becomes valid. This results into reporting such case as unresolved despite respective court has already made a decision and it is no longer in its disposition how - and more importantly when - the case will be resolved (disposed) by the second instance court. This is the nature of reporting of many “unresolved” cases on courts despite court already decided, in fact. Newly proposed way of reporting extracts the numbers of decided cases in respective court instances from “unresolved” and allocates these numbers to those court instances that made an actual decision in respective time. This means that decision validity state is not being awaited for as it could potentially contain an appeal and thus also a time that a case spends on second instance court. Upon decision’s validity the case would become „disposed/resolved“ at the first instance court but most probably it would not be disposed in the same period when it was decided by the (first instance) court. This past methodology (applied by 2016) resulted (visually) in accumulation of unresolved cases while some of them were already decided by first instance court.

Q091 (2021): An erroneous reporting of decided cases at the courts in 2020 had to be corrected in Pending cases at 1st January 2021 by 1128 cases (line 2. and Total of other than criminal law cases).
2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases - the increase in cases comming to the courts in 2019 due to the new legislation gradually stabilized over the course of the year 2020, 2021.
The category “other” encompasses bankruptcy and debt restructuring cases, including the debt elimination procedure (bankruptcy of the natural persons),inheritance proceedings and other. In covid years especialy the number of cases inheritance proceedings rose.
3. Administrative law cases - new reform of Administrative courts was expected and the clearance rate of the regional courts dropted to 80 %.

Q091 (2020): Exolanation of the discrepancies:
In the category 2.2.3. Other registry cases was added register "RPVS" - Register of public sector partners. The Register of public sector partners has the character of a register of legal and natural persons, which receives from the state, local-government and other public sector entities public financing or property above the limit specified by law. The persons who conclude a contract, framework agreement or concession contract pursuant to public procurement regulations, healthcare providers and so on. The classification of the registry in category 2.2.3. was consulted with CEPEJ organization.
In the category 2.2.2 and consequently in the category 2.2. - at the end of year 2019, the incoming cases into the business register was enormously increased due to new applied legislation, which caused high level of the pending cases at the beginning of the year 2020.
Administrative law cases - keeps the high level of pending cases.
Non-litigious business registry cases - the cause of the increase is explained below:
The Commercial Code (Act No. 513/1991 Coll) was amended by the Act No. 390/2019 Coll, which became effective from the 1st of October 2020. This amendment brought following changes (also changes to the Commercial register):
1.From October 1, 2020, it is possible to submit an application for registration of data in the Commercial Register only in electronic form (including objections to the refusal of registration)
2.Obligation of the company´s founders to submit the consent of the real-estate owner to setting up a registered seat of the company with verified signature of the owner.
3.The list of the information is being expanded in order to identify these persons more precisely. In the case of natural persons, a date of birth and a birth number must be given, if it was assigned. In the case of legal persons, their registration number must be given. The existing companies are required to complete this information by September 30, 2021.
4.The amendment also covers one of the reasons why the court is entitled to dissolve a company without liquidation. It is a breach of the obligation filing the financial statement into the collection of deeds within the specified period of 9 months from its preparation. This means, that if a company doesn't deposit this financial statement in the collection of documents within 15 months from its preparation, the registry court will decide on its dissolution without a proposal.
The other discrepancies are mainly caused by the situation in 2020 due to Covid-19 pamdemic situation.
The emergency situation due to COVID 19 has been ongoing since March 2020. Since then, hearings have been held to the necessary extent, which is determined by a decree of the Ministry of Justice. The decree was amended 4 times according to the development of the epidemic situation.
Thus, the courts were not closed in 2020, but operated in a restricted regime, and that restricted regime depended on the development of the epidemic situation. There were situations where hearings were organised to the absolute minimum, for example in April 2020, almost no hearings were held. Since May 2020, it has been up to the courts to ensure hearings to the extent necessary and in accordance with other regulations related to the pandemic situation.
In several measures in 2020, the Ministry of Justice recommended that courts organize work so that court staff and judges work from home.As for an access to the file for lawyers, it was provided.

Q091 (2019): The changes in the total number of Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year - the courts, which did not comply with the established methodology for reporting bankruptcy and restructuring, corrected the data in 2019 and thus the initial state of 2019, which causes differences compared to 2018 pending cases. Similar situation is in the other non-litigious cases, where the methodology for the cases (acceptance of things into custody of court) was changed due the legislation changes in the court register during the year 2019.
Line 2; 2.1;2.2;2.2.2: According to the act. no. 390/2019 Coll. on the end user of benefits for entrepreneurs, the entrepreneurs became obliged to make the corresponding entry in the Business Register by 31 December 2019. The increase in new-coming cases was mainly in the last three months of 2019 by 117 thousand cases in business register courts.
The deadline for processing proposals for the registration of end-user benefit data by the court has been postponed to 30 June 2020, due to the large expected new-coming cases of business records at the end of the year.

Q091 (2018): 1. Differences in the initial states of things as of 1 January 2018 different from the final states as of 31 December 2017 are due to the introduction of electronic data collection through the Data Collection Application (hereinafter referred to as AZU). When introducing electronic data collection in 2018, the courts were allowed to record the actual state of pending cases as of 1 January 2018 with the aim of not transmitting any inaccuracies from paper collection of previous periods. These differences should not occur in the next year due to the introduction of automatic transfer of the number of undecided cases from the end of the previous period in the electronic data collection.
2. Another reason for the differences in the opening cases as of 1 January 2018 from the closing stocks as of 31 December 2017 is the change in the classification of some court registers between rows in the table in question 91. The change of classification was carried out on the basis of the recommendation of the national correspondent for the SR and after its thorough consultation with the members of the working group GT CEPEJ - EVAL

Q091 (2017): The data in the table are not horizontally consistent. This is caused by the fact, that the data on pending cases on 1. January 2017 (the same as data on 31. December 2016 given for the previous cycle) were collected in a one-shot collection for the Justice Scoreboard 2017 and were not bound by control patterns of horizontal consistency as it is in the new electronic data collection active since January 2018. The improper initial number of unresolved cases taken from a “paper” collection of data in 2016 caused such differences. Likewise, the transition from 2015 final numbers to 2016 initial numbers were counted up manually from paper collections. We cannot therefore consider the initial numbers as of 1 January as reliable. The transition between the old system of collecting the statistical data to new one is more complicated than was expected, with the setting up of Analytical centre of the MoJ, application of CEPEJ methodology and its tools is one of the targets in the ongoing project between CEPEj and Ministry of justice of the Slovak republic.
There are still two different IT tools used to collect the statistical data from the courts to Analytical centre. Some inconsistencies in data between the old and new system persist.
The Analytical centre makes every effort to complete the transition between two systems as soon as possible to get reliable data as soon as possible.
As to administrative cases, until the 30. June 2016 the case-jurisdiction in administrative matters in the first instance stipulated by law was divided between Regional courts and the district courts. The general rule was, that the general jurisdiction in first instance lies at the Regional courts. However, there was a small number of proceedings (enumerated in law) where the District courts had the jurisdiction to act as a court of first instance. In reality, more than 90% of all administrative cases were tried by the Regional court as the courts of first instance.
Since 1. July 2016 the new Code of the administrative procedure came into force. According to this new law the Regional courts have the exclusive jurisdiction to try administrative cases as the courts of first instance.
As for the appeal procedure, there is the general rule that the appellate court is the court one level above in the structure of the court system. It means that the appeals against the decisions of the District courts are processed at the Regional courts and the appeals against the decisions of Regional court are processed at the Supreme court as the court of appeal.
In our data for administrative cases in the year 2017 there were some appeal procedures pending at Regional courts as the courts of appeal as the result of application of the previous procedural rules described in point 1. Those appeal proceedings were indicated in table to Q 97
All appeals against the decisions of Regional court (as the courts of first instance) were always tried by the Supreme court and we are presenting this data for all evaluation cycles in the table to Q 99

Q091 (2016): The new structure of data presented by the Ministry of Justice is the reason for the discrepancies and incompatibility of the data with the previous cycles. As regards the category "general civil non-litigious cases" we notice a decrease of incoming cases as of the year 2013.
In this cycle the succession cases were classified as "Other non litigious cases" while in previous years they were classified as "general civil (and commercial) non litigious cases.

Q091 (2014): The increase in the number of incoming and pending other than criminal law cases at all levels of the judiciary is due to the increase in the number of litigious cases. The Slovak judicial system for a several years faces significant increases of claims filed with the courts by debt-collecting companies and non-bank loan companies against consumers, as well as class actions of one private company against the State for alleged damages etc. The higher number of resolved administrative cases was achieved by the intensive effort to reduce the existing backlogs in administrative matters.

Q091 (2013): The Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called “non-bank loan companies” where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

Q091 (2012): The number of pending enforcement and business registry cases was gradually and considerably decreasing over the period 2011-2012. As concerns the variation noticed in respect of the number of incoming and resolved administrative law cases, it was due to the fact that in 2010 a meaningful number of specific collective claims were filed and resolved.

Q092 (General Comment): The category "civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases" includes all cases arisen from legal relationships regulated by family law (maintenance cases, custody of the child, visiting rights, guardianship, divorce cases with the ruling on rights and obligations towards the minor child etc.), cases related to assessment of the legal capacity of natural persons, reminder procedure (electronic payment orders).

Q093 (General Comment): The category “other” encompasses bankruptcy and debt restructuring cases, including the debt elimination procedure (bankruptcy of the natural persons), issuing of the enforcement permission for the enforcement agents, enforcement of court rulings on the visiting rights to minor child and enforcement of court fees receivables.

Q094 (General Comment): The statistical data collected by the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic does not allow the categorization of the criminal matters according to the types of criminal offences as defined in explanatory note.

Q094 (2020): Sources: Analytical center, Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic

Q094 (2018): There is a big discrepancy between pending cases on 31st of December 2016 and “Pending cases on 1st of January 2018”. This is caused of two factors: The first one and major is in delivered data in 2016. In the 2017 was the data collection still in paper form and in the old methodology, as we explained already. In the same time the project Audit with the experts from CEPEJ was already influencing the newly growing Analytical center and motivated as to try collect pending cases for 2016 backward. Since there were no electronic tools for collecting data available neither for courts nor for Ministry of Justice; the result were obviously full of mistakes. Analytical center had no chance to make data check, since pending cases were never collected before, so we had to rely on the courts data without possible checkup. After 2017, when was already available electronic tool (AZU) for collecting data from courts with implemented controlling formulas, then the mistakes from previous manual collection have occurred significantly especially in the first instance criminal agenda. The second factor is, that the Clearance rate dropped from 106, 52% in 2016 to the level 101, 81% in 2018.

Q094 (2016): For 2016 data, new methodology was implemented to make the reporting structure consistent with the CEPEJ methodology and leads to better comparison of Slovak Republic (SR) with other countries. The previous methodology was not counting a decision of first instance court as resolved until the case becomes finalised at last instance. This resulted in reporting such case as unresolved despite respective court has already made a decision. This is the nature of reporting of many “unresolved” cases on courts despite court already decided, in fact. New way of reporting extracts the numbers of decided cases in respective court instances from “unresolved” and allocates these numbers to those court instances that made an actual decision in the reference period that is in correspondence with CEPEJ methodology and better comparable with other countries.

Q097 (2021): Explained in the table.

Q097 (2020): More significant decline of incoming cases and resolved cases as well in the Second instance courts as a result of a pandemic situation. In the category 3. Administrative law cases was only one pending case on 1 January 2020, which was resolved during the year and no case came into the Second instance courts in the year 2020.
The number of non-litigious business registry cases is included in "general civil and commercial non-litigious cases".

Q097 (2019): The decrease in the number of cases (especially incoming and pending on 31 December) was not analysed yet but we can confirm that there were no significant changes in the system or legislation.
Q097 (2018): The discrepancies in the number of pending cases as of 1 January 2018 in comparison with the final numbers as of 31 December 2017 were caused due to the introduction of electronic data collection through the Data Collection Application (hereinafter referred to as AZU). When introducing the electronic data collection in 2018, the courts were allowed to record the actual state of pending cases as of 1 January 2018 with the aim of not transmitting any inaccuracies from paper data collection of previous periods. These differences should not occur in the next year, given the introduction of automatic transfer of the number of undecided cases from the end of the previous period in the electronic data collection

Q097 (2017): As regards the trends of the decrease in all monitored indicators, the decrease in caseload at first instance courts has a secondary impact on the drop in caseload at the courts of appeal. We did not analyse in details the cause of decrease and the detail structure of caseload. The decrease of caseload has the positive effect of raising the CR to 121% and decreasing of total number of pending (unresolved) cases.
The data in the table are not horizontally consistent. This is caused by the fact, that the data on pending cases on 1. January 2017 (the same as data on 31. December 2016 given for the previous cycle) were collected in a one-shot collection for the Justice Scoreboard 2017 and were not bound by control patterns of horizontal consistency as it is in the new electronic data collection active since January 2018. The improper initial number of unresolved cases taken from a “paper” collection of data in 2016 caused such differences. Likewise, the transition from 2015 final numbers to 2016 initial numbers were counted up manually from paper collections. We cannot therefore consider the initial numbers as of 1 January as reliable. The transition between the old system of collecting the statistical data to new one is more complicated than was expected, with the setting up of Analytical centre of the MoJ, application of CEPEJ methodology and its tools is one of the targets in the on-going project between CEPEJ and Ministry of justice of the Slovak republic.
There are still two different IT tools used to collect the statistical data from the courts to Analytical centre. Some inconsistencies in data between the old and new system persist.
The Analytical centre makes every effort to complete the transition between two systems as soon as possible to get reliable data as soon as possible.
As to administrative cases, since 1 July 2016 the appeals against the decisions of the District courts are processed at the Regional courts and the appeals against the decisions of Regional court are processed at the Supreme court as the court of appeal.
In our data for administrative cases in the year 2017 there were some appeal procedures pending at Regional courts as the courts of appeal as the result of application of the previous procedural rules described in point 1. Those appeal proceedings appear in this table. All appeals against the decisions of Regional court (as the courts of first instance) were always tried by the Supreme court and we are presenting this data for all evaluation cycles in the table to Q 99

Q097 (2016): The new structure of data presented by the Ministry of Justice influenced also the second instance. Registry cases are all included in 2.1 and can not be separated by categories.
Q097 (2014): In respect of the variations observed in 2014 with regard to the category “administrative law cases”, it is worth mentioning that the low number of cases makes small absolute variation large in relative terms.

Q097 (2013): For 2013, a general remark was provided in respect of questions 91, 97 and 101, explaining that there were no specific reasons justifying the variations in the numbers of cases of the particular categories. It was stressed that the Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called “non-bank loan companies” where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. The capacity of the court staff to resolve all of the filed cases in the appropriate time period was limited despite the measures which have been taken. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

Q098 (2020): Sources: Analytical center, Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic

Q098 (2016): The 2016 data are based on the new methodology which may cause inconsistency comparing to previous cycles. The 2014 data are based on the methodology that covered only two main criminal court registers, while the 2016 data are based on the methodology that covers more than two criminal court registers. This makes the basic and key difference.

Q099 (General Comment): The collected statistical data for the Supreme Court do not distinguish the litigious and non-litigious cases. In the civil and commercial matters the Supreme court decides primarily on the applications for appellate review on legal questions. In the commercial cases it decides also in the appellate procedure against the decisions of the Regional courts as the courts of first instance. The administrative cases at the Supreme Court level includes the remedy procedures against the decisions of the Regional courts as the courts of first instance. Depending on the type of the administrative procedure it might be appeal procedure or the cassation review procedure.

Q099 (2021): As to the number of administrative law cases, in August 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic was established as a separate institution and it took over all the administrative law cases of the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic. Therefore, the above-mentioned figures of the administrative law cases cover only the period from January to July 2021.
Q099 (2020): Decline of incoming cases and resolved cases as well in the Supreme court as a result of a pandemic situation.

Q099 (2019): No cases in the category other cases
Line 1: A significant drop in the number of cases for 2019 compared to 2018 has been caused by a massive decrease of incoming cases of a certain plaintiff - Pohotovosť s. r. o., a legal person which back then overwhelmed the Supreme Court´s Civil and Commercial law divisions with thousands of appeals and caused an abnormal caseload. Therefore, the indicators for 2019 should be considered as regular average numbers. Compared to e.g. 2018 and previous years which were rather exceptional.

Q099 (2018): The decrease in numbers of both incoming and resolved other than criminal cases may be explained by two important issues. First of all this is the complex change of the Civil and Administrative court procedure by introducing the new procedural rules which came into force since 1 July 2016. The other reason is the decrease of the caseload at the lower courts which naturally influence the number of cases at the Supreme court level.

Q099 (2017): The decrease in numbers of both incoming and resolved cases must be understood in connection with the data for previous years. As we explained in previous cycles (data 2014, 2015, 2016), at the level of the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic there was the enormous increase of incoming (and resolved) cases related to consumer protection in civil and enforcement procedure. We recorded in previous years thousands of recurring submissions of several private loans' companies. These submissions started to be processed quicker and subsequently, its number dropped. The similar explanation is relevant also for the administrative cases.
As regards the variations, some inconsistencies in data between the old and new system persist, and they can be explained as the transition between the old system of collecting the statistical data to new one is more complicated than was expected, with the setting up of Analytical centre of the MoJ, application of CEPEJ methodology and its tools is one of the targets in the on-going project between CEPEJ and Ministry of justice of the Slovak republic.
There are still two different IT tools used to collect the statistical data from the courts to Analytical centre. The Analytical centre makes every effort to complete the transition between two systems as soon as possible to get reliable data as soon as possible.
As to administrative cases, in the year 2017 there were some appeal procedures pending at Regional courts as the courts of appeal as the result of application of the previous procedural rules described in point 1. All appeals against the decisions of Regional court (as the courts of first instance) were always tried by the Supreme court and we are presenting this data for all evaluation cycles in this table.

Q099 (2016): The enormous increase of the incoming cases is related to consumer protection in civil and enforcement procedure.
Q099 (2013): For 2013, a general remark was provided in respect of questions 91, 97 and 101, explaining that there were no specific reasons justifying the variations in the numbers of cases of the particular categories. It was stressed that the Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called "non-bank loan companies" where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. The capacity of the court staff to resolve all of the filed cases in the appropriate time period was limited despite the measures which have been taken. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

Q100 (General Comment): The collected statistical data does not distinguish between the two types of criminal offences.

Q100 (2018): The decrease in incoming and resolved cases is influenced by the decrease of the caseload at the lower courts

Q100 (2016): During 2015 there were more pending cases created

Q101 (2021): The data listed in the category "Roberry case" and "Intentional homicide" represent the number of convicted persons in legally closed cases. These are data obtained from the database of legally closed cases, which are marked as completed in statistical reporting, and therefore the data is only available for the category " Resolved cases". Since 2018, the number of convicted persons is not reported according to the most severe criminal offense, but convictions for all criminal offenses are taken into account (i.e. in the event that a person was convicted of committing several criminal offenses, the person in question is reported as convicted for each criminal offense separately).

Q101 (2020): More significant decline of incoming cases and resolved cases as well in the courts as a result of a pandemic situation. In the employment dismissal cases the rate of the discrepancy is not so high in comparison with 2019.

Q101 (2019): Note 1: The data in the "Roberry case" and "Intentional homicide" categories represent the number of convicted persons in legally finished cases (resolved cases). These are the data obtained from the database of legally completed/finished cases, which are reported as resolved cases in the statistical reporting, and therefore the data are only available in the category "Resolved cases". Since 2018, the number of convicted persons has not been reported according to the most severe criminal offense, but convictions for all criminal offenses are taken into account. This means that if a person has been convicted of more than one crime (for example 2), the person is reported as convicted of each crime separately (it means twice).
Note 2: The difference between pending cases on 1 Jan. 2019 and the final state pending cases on 31st of December 2018, is due to the findings of a non-uniform method of reporting cases in the insolvency agenda among the our courts. Based on these findings, the courts were instructed/directed on how to report the number of decided insolvency cases. Subsequently, the courts were allowed to record the actual state of pending cases on 1 Jan. 2019, that the methodology is the same for all courts and in the whole year (2019) period. For the next year, these differences should not occur, due to the automatic transfer of the data from the end of period (2019) into the beginning of the monitored period 2020 in the electronic data collection.

Q101 (2018): Note 1:Differences in the initial states of things as of 1 January 2018 different from the final states as of 31 December 2017 are due to the introduction of electronic data collection through the Data Collection Application (hereinafter referred to as AZU). When introducing electronic data collection in 2018, the courts were allowed to record the actual state of pending cases as of 1 January 2018 with the aim of not transmitting any inaccuracies from paper collection of previous periods. These differences should not occur in the next year, given the introduction of automatic transfer of the number of undecided cases from the end of the previous period in the electronic data collection.
Note 2: The increasing number of insolvency cases is caused by an important amendment of the Act on bankruptcy. The personal bankruptcy of the natural persons has been introduced in march 2017 and in 2018 we registered significant increase of new cases. Note 3: Data in the "Robbery case" and "Intentional homicide" categories represent the number of convicted persons in lawfully completed cases. These are data obtained from the lawfully completed database, which are classified as equipped in the statistical reporting and therefore data are only available for " Since 2018, the number of convicted persons has not been reported according to the strictest crime, but convictions for all crimes are taken into account (i.e. if the person has been convicted of several offenses, the person is reported as convicted for each crime separately).

Q101 (2017): Q101 : The data in the table are not horizontally consistent. This is caused by the fact, that the data on pending cases on 1. January 2017 (the same as data on 31. December 2016 given for the previous cycle) were collected in a one-shot collection for the Justice Scoreboard 2017 and were not bound by control patterns of horizontal consistency as it is in the new electronic data collection active since January 2018.
As regards the variations, some inconsistencies in data between the old and new system persist, and they can be explained as the transition between the old system of collecting the statistical data to new one is more complicated than was expected, with the setting up of Analytical centre of the MoJ, application of CEPEJ methodology and its tools is one of the targets in the on-going project between CEPEJ and Ministry of justice of the Slovak republic.
There are still two different IT tools used to collect the statistical data from the courts to Analytical centre. The Analytical centre makes every effort to complete the transition between two systems as soon as possible to get reliable data as soon as possible.
The increase in litigious divorce cases is influenced by significant decrease in the clearance rate (CR) to 79% in previous year 2016. The reason for the reduced CR can be found in the change of records of divorce without children from register C to the register of Pc, which was carried out in the middle of 2016, and with this change the organizational shift of the relevant number of judges into another department was not parallel.
The increase in the numbers of insolvency cases was significantly influenced by the legislative changes related to the personal bankruptcy of natural persons. Since 1.3.2017 the simplified access to personal bankruptcy and the possibility of debt elimination of natural persons is in effect. The impact of this changes was immediate in both incoming and resolved cases.

Q101 (2016): Comparison with previous cycles is not possible due to the change of methodology of calculation of cases introduced by the Analytical centre. The methodology now can identify cases finalised at each instance. The inconsistency between pending cases at the beginning of 2016 and pending at the end of 2015 is disturbed because of introduction of new methodology of calculation by the Analytical centre .

Slovenia

Q091 (General Comment): Category 1. 'Civil (and commercial) litigious cases' at first instance includes: civil litigious cases at local and district courts, various civil cases at local and district courts, legal aid at local and district courts, international legal aid at district courts, commercial litigious cases at district courts, labour law cases at labour courts, social law cases at social court, various labour and social law at labour and social courts, legal aid at labour and social courts. insolvency cases including compulsory composition, bankruptcy of legal person, bankruptcy of physical person, bankruptcy of inheritance, compulsory dissolution, simplified compulsory composition and preventive restructuring at district courts. The number includes the labour law and social law cases (before specialised labour and social law courts) due to their similarity to litigious cases in material and procedural aspects.
Q91 - Category 2.1. 'General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases': see Q92.
Q91 - Category 2.2.1. 'Non litigious land registry cases' at first instance includes (at local courts): land registry cases, decisions on appeals at first instance and various land registry cases.
Q91 - Category 2.2.2 'Non-litigious business registry cases ' at first instance includes (at district courts): business registry cases and various business registry cases.
Q91 - Category 2.2.3. 'Other registry cases': No cases were included in this category.
Q91 - Category 2.3. 'Other non-litigious cases': No cases were included in this category.
Q91 -Category 3. 'Administrative law cases' at first instance include (at the Administrative court): - administrative cases and various administrative cases.
Q91 - Category 4. 'Other cases': see Q93.
The above listed cases are classified into CEPEJ categories slightly differently over the years.
Q 91, 97, 99, 101 - Inconsistencies:
Inconsistencies within the tables are possible due to the peculiarity of the Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse (used in the Slovenian judiciary as the official source of data since January 1st 2012, at every court, and for providing data to the Ministry of Justice and at the Judicial Council).
It is a "live" system (dynamic reporting), meaning that the reported figures for a specific date or period of time inevitably vary for different reasons (e.g. the data was not promptly entered into the CMS; in some instances, the decision, in which category some specific new cases should be included, may be subsequently changed and when data are unified some figures change; there is also the possibility that a mistake was done when entering the data and was later detected in the quality check and corrected.)
In Data warehouse reports, every category (column in the table) is calculated (counted) separately, therefore the „Pending on 31 Dec“ may not equal to the formula (Pending 1 Jan + Incoming – Resolved) due to fore mentioned influences."

Q091 (2021): 2.2 Registry cases and 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: decrease by approx. 50%
In 2020, the number of incoming cases decreased due to Covid-19 pandemics and its effect on the sales of real estate. Consequently, the number of pending cases at the beginning of 2021 decreased. 2.2 Registry cases and 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry cases - Incoming cases/Resolved cases: increase by approx. 25%
In 2021, the number of incoming (and consequently resolved) cases increased, most likely due to the loosening of Covid-19 restrictions and its effect on the real estate market.
2.2 Registry cases and 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry cases - Pending cases on 31 Dec.:
In 2021, the number of incoming and resolved cases increased (see above). However, the increase in resolved cases was slightly lower, hence the increase in pending cases at the end of the year (Disposition time in register cases is low – approx. 0,2 months; ratio of Resolved vs. Pending cases is approx. 65:1).
2.2.2. Non litigious business registry cases – Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court: decrease by 200%:
Please note the small (absolute) number of cases (less than 5 cases).
4. Other cases - Pending cases on 31 Dec.: decrease 38%
The majority of cases in this category are enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters before the writ for the execution became final (all cases processed at the Central Department for Authentic Document at the Local Court in Ljubljana – exclusive jurisdiction), where the trend of decrease of pending cases is observable in 2021 and 2022. More factors could have contributed to the decrease, but no specific major reason can be identified.
4. Other cases - Pending cases older than 2 years: increase by 58%
The majority of cases in this category are enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters before the writ for the execution became final (all cases processed at the Central Department for Authentic Document at the Local Court of Ljubljana – exclusive jurisdiction). Some of those cases are waiting for inheritance cases regarding parties to finish. Please note the small number of cases (less than 100 cases), compared to incoming cases (more than 100.000 per year).

Q091 (2020): The decrease in the number of resolved cases at 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases and 4. Other cases is due to the limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics.
The decrease in the number of pending cases at the end of the year at 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry cases (and consequently at 2.2 Registry cases) is not unusual due to the high number of incoming and resolved cases in a year compared to pending cases at the end of the year (around 1-2%).
Regarding the increase in Administrative law cases - Pending cases older than 2 years: In previous years, the Administrative court was faced with the influx of new cases, due to the implementation of the ECHR judgement 60642/08 (e.g. 24,5 % of incoming cases in 2017), as well as some new competences. This caused an increase in the number of pending and resolved cases. In the aforementioned cases, the court was also faced with new legal and factual issues, as well as administrative difficulties. In recent years, the Administrative court is also dealing with a considerable number of priority or urgent cases (e.g. asylum seekers), which means a longer waiting line for “regular” cases. Though administrative and managerial actions have been taken, the number of (older) pending cases has increased due to the aforementioned difficulties and the overburdening of the court.

Q091 (2019): In general, the trend of decrease in the number of incoming cases can be observed in all types of civil cases, causing also a decrease in the number of resolved and pending cases. In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and partly to a successful introduction of new business models in the
Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Accordingly, in the last years, the clearance rate is at or slightly above 100%.
In 2019, a new Family Code and new Non-Contentious Civil Procedure Act stepped into force. The main change for district courts was establishing family law cases as non-litigious cases (before 2019 classified as litigious cases). Additionally, local courts became competent to decide in tutelage cases (before 2019 in competence of the executive branch).
This reflected in a decreased number of reported 1. Civil litigious cases, while the number of 2.1 General civil non-litigious cases did not change (an increase in new cases is similar to the decrease in the number of incoming cases that is generally observed).
Administrative cases: In previous years, the Administrative court was faced with the influx of new cases, due to the implementation of the ECHR judgement 60642/08 (e.g. 24,5 % of incoming cases in 2017), as well as some new competences. This caused an increase in the pending and resolved cases. In the aforementioned cases, the court is faced with new legal and factual issues, as well as administrative difficulties. Though administrative and managerial actions have been taken, an increase in the number of pending cases is expected due to the aforementioned difficulties and the overburdening of the court.

Q091 (2018): In general, the trend of decreasing number of incoming cases can be observed in all types of civil cases, causing also a decrease in number of resolved and pending cases. In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and partly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Accordingly, in last years, clearance rate is at or slightly above 100%.
Administrative cases: The Administrative court is faced with the influx of new cases, due to the implementation of the ECHR judgement 60642/08 (24,5 % of incoming cases in 2017). This caused an increase in the pending and resolved cases. In these cases, the court is faced with new legal and factual issues, as well as administrative difficulties - the actions are often incomplete or the information is insufficient, filled in foreign languages, the foreign parties have yet to nominate a proxy etc. The court has established a special office to perform a preliminary examination of the actions and assist in the exchange of documents between parties, however longer times for resolving cases are expected due to the aforementioned difficulties and the overburdening of the court.

Q091 (2017): In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 20%-30% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases might have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases. For discrepancies, see general comments.
The Administrative court is faced with the influx of new cases, due to the implementation of the ECHR judgement 60642/08 (24,5 % of incoming cases in 2017). In these cases, the court is faced with new legal and factual issues, as well as administrative difficulties - the actions are often incomplete or the information is insufficient, filled in foreign languages, the foreign parties have yet to nominate a proxy etc. The court has established a special office to perform a preliminary examination of the actions and assist in the exchange of documents between parties, however longer times for resolving cases are expected due to the aforementioned difficulties and the overburdening of the court. At the end of 2017, the first case was ready to be processed on the merits of the case.

Q091 (2016): In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 20%-30% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases might have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases. For discrepancies, see general comments.

Q091 (2015): In recent years, the number of incoming non-litigious cases is generally decreasing partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary. Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 15%-20% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases.

Q091 (2014): In previous cycles, insolvency cases have been accounted in former category 1. 'Civil (and commercial) litigious cases'. For 2014, they are encompassed within the item ''other''. The 2014 data includes labour law and social law cases decided before specialised labour and social law courts, due to their similarity to litigious cases in material (employment contract derives from civil law contract) and procedural (the court procedure in labour and social cases is based on general civil law procedure) aspects.
Q091 (2013): "Civil and commercial litigious cases" include labour law and social law cases that are proceeded by specialised labour and social law courts. Cases that do not fit exactly to the determined types of civil, commercial, non-litigious, land and business registry, enforcement and administrative law cases, were previously included in other cases. For 2014, 'Other cases' include only cases outside of the above mentioned legal fields, while the various cases are distributed among the other items. With regard to the category 'non-litigious business registry cases', the increase of the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 can be explained with the fact that there were 8.000 more incoming cases in 2013 than in 2012, but courts were not able to handle the case-load.

Q091 (2012): “Civil and commercial litigious cases“ encompasse bankruptcy proceedings, which were in the previous round counted as 'other cases'. The number of incoming non-litigious business registry cases rose, probably due to the postponed effect of the financial and economic crisis. Nevertheless, courts managed to solve almost all incoming cases. The total subsumes for the first time cases processed by the Central Department for Authentic Document (part of the Local Court of Ljubljana) which has jurisdiction over all enforcement cases. The area of land registry cases is in constant improvement since a successful computerisation project in 2003. The decrease in the number of pending cases stems from a better organisation of work and of the totally electronic procedure.

Q092 (General Comment): Categories used in “Civil and commercial non-litigious cases”: all non-litigious civil cases at local and district courts, non-litigious commercial cases at district courts (different kinds of personal and family status, property and other disputes, provided by the Non Contentious Procedure Act or other law, procedures for issuing a payment order at local and district courts in civil matters, procedures for issuing a payment order in commercial matters at district courts, cases pursuant to the Inheritance Act at local courts, cases pursuant to the Mental Health Act at local courts; and civil enforcement cases on the basis of an enforcement title, commercial enforcement cases on the basis of an enforcement title, cases for enforcement on real-estate property, enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters after the writ for the execution became final, temporary injunctions in civil matters, temporary injunctions in commercial matters, various enforcement cases.
The above listed cases are classified into CEPEJ categories slightly differently over the years.

Q092 (2014): 2014 Category 2.1 „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“at the first instance includes 1. (former category 2. „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“): N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D, Pr; and 2. (former category 3. ' Non litigious enforcement cases'): I, Ig, In, VL, Z, Zg and R-i.

Q092 (2013): 2013 Civil and commercial non-litigious cases at first instance include: N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D, Pr.

Q092 (2012): 2012 "Civil and commercial non-litigious cases at first instance include: N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D and P."

Q093 (General Comment): Category 4. „Other cases“ at first instance includes: free legal aid at district courts, labour courts and at the Administrative court, enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters before the writ for the execution became final (all cases processed at the Central Department for Authentic Document at the Local Court of Ljubljana – exclusive jurisdiction), international attestations at district courts, attestations according to the Hague convention at district courts.

Q093 (2014): 2014 4. „Other cases“ at first instance includes: Bpp ,COVL, Ov-i, Ov-H and St [(St-01), (St-02), (St-03), (St-04) (St-05)].
In previous cycles, all the mentioned St cases have been accounted in former category 1. 'Civil (and commercial) litigious cases'."

Q093 (2013): 2013 "Other" civil law cases at first instance include: Bpp, COVL, Ov-i, Ov-H."

Q093 (2012): 2012 "Other” civil law cases at first instance include: Pom , Pom-i, R, Rg, Ov-i, Ov-H, Bpp, COVL, II Upr, I Upr.

Q094 (General Comment): The figures in the table include the following cases: Severe criminal cases: criminal cases at local and district courts,, criminal cases against juveniles at district courts. Misdemenour cases: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection, minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals, cancellation of validity of the driver’s licence according to the legal limit of punitive points
Other cases: criminal investigations at district courts, criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings, execution of the sanction of prison, execution of criminal sanctions of foreign courts, criminal investigation actions at local and district courts, various criminal matters at local and district courts, cases of the out-of-hearing senate, clemency procedures at local and district courts, legal aid in criminal matters, international legal aid in criminal matters, cases of decisions to permit interventions within human rights and freedoms, legal aid in minor offences, international legal aid in minor offences, search of premises, setting a task for the good of the community or the local community, various cases in minor offences, compliance detention.
Regarding criminal investigations at district courts: Slovenia has a system where the state public prosecutor can request a (first instance) court to perform a criminal investigation (or individual investigatory acts). When this procedure at court is finished, the case is returned to the state prosecutor, who can decide whether to dismiss a case or file an accusatory act at the (same) court. When the accusatroy act is filed, a criminal trial (i.e. deliberating on the responsibility and sanctioning of the offender) begins.

Q094 (2021): 1. Severe criminal cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: increase by 22%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in pending cases at the beginning of 2021.
1. Severe criminal cases - Resolved: increase by 17%
In 2020 first instance courts resolved less cases than usual due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in resolved cases in 2021.
2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court: decrease by 34%.
The decrease is due to the more efficient work of courts in resolving older cases.
3. Other criminal cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year: increase by 16%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in pending cases at the beginning of 2021.
In 2021, approx. 30% of pending cases and 7% of incoming/resolved cases were criminal investigation cases (see general comment).

Q094 (2020): Until now, at "1. Severe criminal cases" we have reported both criminal investigation and criminal trial cases (see general comment) for the same criminal offence. For 2020, we have excluded data on investigations to report data on criminal trials only, and criminal investigation is reported at 3. Other criminal cases. The main reason is the comparability of data between countries as criminal investigation is not within the juridiction of courts in most countries. Investigation cases, that were previously reported at 1. Severe criminal cases and are now reported under 3. Other cases represent 5-10% of all reported cases.
The number of incoming Severe criminal cases decreased by 1% in 2019 and the number of resolved cases decreased by 2% in 2019. However, in 2020 the number of incoming cases decreased by 1%, and the number of resolved cases decreased by 23%, mostly due to limitations of operations of courts due to the Covid-19 pandemics. Consequently, the number of pending cases has also increased by 22%.
The number of pending Severe criminal cases, older than 2 years increased in 2019 (by 15%) and stayed roughly the same in 2020, while the number of Misdemeanour cases stayed roughly the same in 2019 and increased significantly (by 128%) in 2020. No specific explanation can be given for any of the mentioned changes. This two factors resulted in increase in total number of pending cases older than 2 years.

Q094 (2018): Severe criminal law cases include all offences, listed in the Criminal Code. Such offences are punishable by either imprisonment, fine (monetary penalty) or in some cases with restricting the driving of motorized vehicles. Minor offences are set in other laws (not the Criminal Code) and the procedure is regulated by the Minor Offences Act. Minor offences cannot be punished by deprivation of liberty, but rather by a fine and/or other sanctions, provided by laws.
Discrepancies: This year, some of the cases, previously reported at Severe or Misdemeanor cases, are reported under new category - Other cases (for details, please see general comment). The metodology for the total number of cases reported did not change, and the changes for total are below 20%.

Q094 (2016): The observed decreases can be attributed to the decrease in the number of cases, processed by the police and the state prosecution (see Q107).
Q094 (2014): According to 2014 data, the category “severe criminal law cases” includes all offences, listed in the Criminal Code. Such offences are punishable by either imprisonment, fine (monetary penalty) or in some cases with restricting the driving of motorized vehicles. At first instance, this category encompasses: criminal cases at local and district courts (K); criminal investigations at district courts (Kpr); criminal cases against juveniles at district courts (Km); criminal investigation actions at local and district courts (Kpd); various criminal matters at local and district courts (Kr); clemency procedures at local and district courts (Po); criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings (Kmp); cases of the out-of-hearing senate (Ks); execution of the sanction of prison (IKZ); execution of criminal sanctions of foreign courts (IKZt); cases of decisions to permit interventions within human rights and freedoms (Pp). The attention should be drawn on the fact that the 2014 data is not comparable to pre-2014 results, because until 2014, only first 3 categories above were reported. In 2015, the reporting method was further improved, and other types of cases were also included in the reporting.
The minor offences are set in other laws (not the Criminal Code) and the procedure is regulated by the Minor Offences Act. The minor offences cannot be punished by deprivation of liberty, but rather by a fine and/or other sanctions, provided by laws. At first instance, this category subsumes: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PR-zsv); minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PR-obp); cancellation of validity of the driver’s licence according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVD); compliance detention (PRuz). This category does not include: legal aid in minor offences (PomPR); international legal aid in minor offences (PomPRi); search of premises (PRhp); setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnk) and various cases in minor offences (PRr).

Q094 (2012): The decrease in the number of “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” in 2012 is the result of the reform in law on minor offenses which transferred the jurisdiction of some cases previously tried by courts to other authorities. According to 2012 data, the category “severe criminal law cases” at first instance included: criminal cases at local and district courts (K); criminal investigations at district courts (Kpr); and criminal cases against juveniles at district courts (Km). The category did not encompass: criminal investigation actions at local and district courts (Kpd); various criminal matters at local and district courts (Kr); clemency procedures at local and district courts (Po); criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings (Kmp); cases of the out-of-hearing senate (Ks); execution of the sanction of prison (IKZ); execution of criminal sanctions of foreign courts (IKZt); cases of decisions to permit interventions within human rights and freedoms (Pp).

The category “misdemeanour cases and minor offences cases” at first instance included: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PR-zsv); minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PR-obp); minor offences at the transition from 2004 to 2005 (PRs); minor offences, introduced in the judicial jurisdiction after the 31.12.2004 (PRv); cancellation of validity of the driver’s licence according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVD); compliance detention (PRuz). This category did not subsume: legal aid in minor offences (PomPR); international legal aid in minor offences (PomPRi); search of premises (PRhp); setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnk); and various cases in minor offences (PRr).

Q097 (General Comment): The distribution of cases for Q97 is the same as for Q91.
Inconsistences noticed are due the Data Warehouse system explained in Q91.
Q097 (2021): All categories - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: decrease by approx. 50%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions (and the number of resolved cases at first instance courts decreased). As second instance courts deal with the majority of cases without hearing of parties, their functioning was not affected that much. The number of appeals coming from first instance decreased, which resulted in the decrease of pending cases at second instance courts at the beginning of 2021.
Resolved cases: The decrease in the number of resolved cases is due to two factors: 1. impact of Covid-19 pandemics, namely the higher number of judges and court staff on sick leave or quarantined (compared to 2020), and 2. more general human resources issues (retirement of judges, prolonged sick leaves etc.).
Categories 1, 2 and 2.1 - Pending cases on 21 Dec.: increase by approx. 10-30%
Higher courts resolved approx. 10% less cases in 2021, which resulted in a greater increase of pending cases on 31. Dec (Disposition time in higher courts is low – 1-2 months; ratio of Resolved vs. Pending cases is approx. 10:1)
Categories 2.2/2.2.1 - Pending cases on 21 Dec.: increase by approx. 60/90%
Please note the increase in resolved land registry cases in 2021 (Q91) which may result in an increase of appeals, and small (absolute) number of cases at second instance (20-30 pending cases).
Category 2.2.2 - Pending cases on 21 Dec.: decrease by approx. 25%
Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at second instance (less than 5 pending cases).

Q097 (2020): The decrease in pending cases at the beginning and the end of the year is due to the fact that higher courts are sucesfully reducing the number of pending cases. The decrease in incoming and resolved cases is partially due to the national trend observed in general, and paritally due to the limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics.
The discrepancies in categories 2.2.1. Non litigious land registry cases and 2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases (and subsequently in 2.2. Registry cases), as well as at Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court are due to a small absolute number of cases.

Q097 (2019): No particular explanation can be given for the general decrease of incoming cases (national trend) which resulted in the decrease in the number of incoming and pending cases.
The increase in incoming Non-litigious business registry cases in 2018 resulted in an increased number of pending cases in the beginning of 2019. Please note small (absolute) number of cases.
Q097 (2018): No particular explanation can be given for the general decrease of incoming cases (national trend), as well as for the increase in number of incoming registry cases.
Q097 (2017): In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 20%-30% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases might have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases.

Q097 (2016): In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 20%-30% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases might have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases.

Q097 (2015): In recent years, the number of incoming non-litigious cases is generally decreasing partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary. Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 15%-20% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases.

Q097 (2013): 2013 The area of land registry cases has been in constant improvement since a successful computerisation project in 2003 – the average disposition times have fallen from 18 months to 2 weeks. The lowering of the number of pending cases is the consequence of a better organisation of work and of the totally electronic procedure.

Q097 (2012): 2012 The figures of pending cases on 1 January 2012 for civil litigious cases (as well as for incoming, resolved and pending cases on 31 December 2012) are higher than in the previous exercise, because we included in this category the cases of bankruptcy proceedings (including: compulsory composition, bankruptcy of legal person, bankruptcy of physical person, bankruptcy of inheritance and compulsory dissolution), which were counted as 'other cases' in the previous evaluation cycle. The example in the questionnaire for this 7th category was ‘insolvency registry cases’, so we mistakenly included here all the cases pursuant to the Financial Operations, Insolvency Proceedings and Compulsory Dissolution Act handled by district courts. These are not insolvency registry proceedings, but are to be understood as litigious proceedings according to the CEPEJ Explanatory note.
With regard to the category "administrative law cases, in the previous round we included appeals in administrative disputes, which are lodged with and dealt with by the highest instance court, namely the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia in this category (Q 97.6). To ensure internally consistent answers we decided to provide the data in this chapter regarding the instance of the court that decides on the case not the instance of the procedure in which the cases is decided. This means that all the cases that are addressed by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia are taken into account at question 97.

Q098 (General Comment): For explanation on severe criminal cases and minor offences please see comment to Q94.
The figures for severe criminal law cases at second instance include criminal cases (Kp).
The figures for minor offences cases at second instance include:
- PRp-zsv – minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection,
- PRp-obp – minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals,
- EPVDp – cancellation of validity of the drivers license according to the legal limit of punitive points,

The figures for other cases include:
- Kr – various criminal cases,
- PRnkp – setting a task for the good of the community or the local community,
- PRr – various cases in minor offences,
- PRuzp – compliance detention.

Q098 (2021): All categories - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: decrease by approx. 10-70%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions (and the number of resolved cases at first instance courts decreased). As second instance courts deal with the majority of cases without hearing of parties, their functioning was not as affected that much. The number of appeals coming from first instance decreased, which resulted in the decrease of pending cases at second instance courts at the beginning of 2021.
2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases – Incoming/Resolved cases: increase by approx. 150/90%, Pending cases on 21 Dec.: increase by approx. 1400% (this also reflected in Total)
The increase in incoming cases at second instance in 2021 is mostly due to two factors: 1) according to the Minor Offences Act, the appeal in minor offences in regular court procedures – request for judicial protection was limited (depending on the criteria - sanction). At the end of 2020 the Constitutional court established that the aforementioned limitation for appeal was unconstitutional, which lead to the increase in the number of appeals in 2021; 2) In 2021, the higher court, competent for the coastal region received multiple cases of fishermen regarding border-crossing issues (in relation to the Arbitration under the arbitration agreement between the government of the Republic of Croatia and the Government of the Republic of Slovenia; PCA CASE NO. 2012-04). Despite the efforts (see the number of resolved cases), the number of pending cases at the end of the year increased (Disposition time in higher courts is low – less than 1 month; ratio of Resolved vs. Pending cases is approx. 33:1).

Q098 (2020): The decrease in pending cases at the beginning and the end of the year is due to the fact that higher courts are sucesfully reducing the number of pending cases. the decrease in incoming and resolved cases is due to the limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics
The discrepancies at Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court are due to a small absolute number of cases.

Q098 (2018): Discrepancies: This year, some of the cases, previously reported at Severe or Misdemeanor cases, are reported under new category - Other cases (for details, please see general comment). The metodology for the total number of cases reported did not change, and the changes for total are below 20%.

Q098 (2016): The observed decreases can be attributed to the decrease in the number of cases, processed by the police and the state prosecution (see Q107).

Q098 (2014): According to 2014 data, the figures for “severe criminal law cases” at second instance includes: criminal cases (Kp) and various criminal cases (Kr). In this respect, it should be highlighted that the 2014 data is not comparable to pre-2014 results, because until 2014, only first category was reported. In 2015, the reporting method was further improved, and other types of cases were also included in the reporting.
The figures for “minor offences cases” at second instance included: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PRp-zsv); minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PRp-obp); cancellation of validity of the drivers license according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVDp); compliance detention (PRuzp); setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnkp); various cases in minor offences (PRr).

Q098 (2012): According to 2012 data, the figures for “severe criminal law cases” at second instance included criminal cases (Kp) and excluded various criminal cases (Kr).
The figures for “minor offences cases” at second instance included: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PRp-zsv); minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PRp-obp); minor offences at the transition from 2004 to 2005 (PRps); minor offences, introduced in the judicial jurisdiction after the 31.12.2004 (PRpv); cancellation of validity of the driver’s licence according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVDp); and compliance detention (PRuzp). The category did not include: setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnkp) and various cases in minor offences (PRr).
The decrease of the number of “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” before courts in 2012 is the result of the reform in law on minor offenses which transferred some of the jurisdiction in cases previously tried by courts to other authorities.

Q099 (General Comment): The Supreme court has Criminal, Civil, Commercial, Labour and Social and Administrative department, The categories 1., 2.1 and 2.2.1 include corresponding cases from Civil, Commercial and Labour and Social departments registers. Category 3. includes registers of the Administrative department. The distribution of cases for Q99 is the same as for Q91.
Inconsistences noticed are due the Data Warehouse system explained in Q91.
Q099 (2021): 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: decrease by approx. 40%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions (and the number of resolved cases at first instance courts decreased). As the Supreme Court deals with the majority of cases without hearing of parties, its functioning was not affected as much and it managed to resolve more cases than it had received.
2. Non litigious cases (2.1+2.2+2.3); 2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases; 2.2 Registry cases; 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry casesPlease note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.

Q099 (2020): Please note, the procedure of manifested inadmissibility cases are included in figures above.
The decrease in the number of (all) pending cases is due to the efficient work of the court in 2019 and 2020. Discrepancies in sub categories (form 1. through 3) are due to a small absolute number of cases).
Q099 (2019): The differences are due to a small (absolute) number of cases in some legal areas. The decrease in pending cases at the end of 2019 is due to more efficient work of the Supreme court (changes in criteria for manifested inadmissibility in 2017).
Q099 (2018): Administrative cases - in 2017, the procedure of manifested inadmissibility was introduced in aministrative cases, reducing the number of incoming (as well as resolved and pending) cases. As for other categories and Total, the difference is due to more efficient work of the Supreme court and due to aforementioned reason.
Please note, the procedure of manifested inadmissibility cases are included in figures above.

Q099 (2017): Administrative cases: the higher number of pending administrative law cases older than two years is partially a result of higher workload of the court. Partially this is the consequence of the fact that some older cases are waiting on the decision of the Constitutional court regarding laws in question (mainly taxes and public access to information issues).

Q099 (2015): Differences in pending, incoming and resolved cases Non litigious and administrative cases are mainly due to the small absolute number of cases and the nature of the cases (most complicated cases).

Q099 (2014): 2014: Variations: The numbers in that almost all categories for 2014 deviates more than +/- 20% from the 2012 data. This is due to a small (absolute) number of cases but also because the number of judges is smaller when compared to first and second instance and a single absence due to prolonged illness has a significant impact on the solving of some types of cases. We also believe that changes in economy (financial crisis), as well as in legislation, had impact on the overall statistics, but since cases at the Supreme Court level are "filtered" through courts of first and second instance, a direct connection cannot be established.

Q099 (2012): 2012: The decrease of the number of pending cases at the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia can be attributed to different factors. On one hand procedural legislation has changed. Following the changes to the Administrative Dispute Act (2007) and the Civil Procedure Act (2008) the Supreme Court has now the right to decide in these types of cases whether to review a case or not. With the reform the admissibility criteria have changed and revision is now a remedy that depends mainly on the discretion of the Supreme Court. Now revision is admissible only, if the case raises a question of law of fundamental significance or if the development of law or the preservation of uniformity of case law requires a decision by the Supreme Court. The number of all incoming cases for the whole Supreme Court has dropped considerably from more than 5 000 in 2008 to less than 4000 in 2012). On the other hand this is the consequence of changes in human resources management. Firstly, the number of judicial advisers has risen and secondly, several judicial advisers were transferred from less burdened departments to those with more pending cases and consequently the productivity has risen and the number of pending cases decreased.

Q100 (General Comment): For explanation on severe criminal cases and minor offences please see comment to Q94.
Figures for severe criminal law cases at the highest instance include:
- Kp – appeals in criminal cases,
- Ips – requests for protection of legality in criminal cases, against a decision ordering or prolonging a detention, extraordinary mitigation of punishment,
- I Kr – other criminal cases – delegations, jurisdiction disputes, prolongation of detention, other.

Figures for minor offences cases at the highest instance include:
- IV Ips – requests for protection of legality in minor offences cases.

Q100 (2021): Discrepancies: Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.

Q100 (2020): The discrepancies are due to a small absolute number of cases.

Q100 (2018): Discrepancies are due to small (absolute) of cases which fluctuate between years.
For distinction see general comment.

Q100 (2016): The observed decreases can be attributed to the decrease in the number of cases, processed by the police and the state prosecution (see Q107).

Q100 (2014): According to 2012 and 2014 data, figures for “severe criminal law cases” at the highest instance include: appeals in criminal cases (Kp); requests for protection of legality in criminal cases (I Ips); requests for protection of legality against a decision ordering or prolonging a detention (XI Ips); extraordinary mitigation of punishment (IX Ips); other criminal cases – delegations, jurisdiction disputes (I Kr); other criminal cases – prolongation of detention (II Kr); other criminal cases (III Kr). Figures for “minor offences cases” at the highest instance include requests for protection of legality in minor offences cases (IV Ips).

Q100 (2012): The decrease of the number of “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” before courts in 2012 is the result of the reform in law on minor offenses which transferred some of the jurisdiction in cases previously tried by courts to other authorities.
According to 2012 and 2014 data, figures for “severe criminal law cases” at the highest instance include: appeals in criminal cases (Kp); requests for protection of legality in criminal cases (I Ips); requests for protection of legality against a decision ordering or prolonging a detention (XI Ips); extraordinary mitigation of punishment (IX Ips); other criminal cases – delegations, jurisdiction disputes (I Kr); other criminal cases – prolongation of detention (II Kr); other criminal cases (III Kr). Figures for “minor offences cases” at the highest instance include requests for protection of legality in minor offences cases (IV Ips).

Q101 (General Comment): The number of litigious cases does not include litigious cases regarding the custody of children without divorce (as partners were not married to begin with).

Q101 (2021): Litigious divorce cases- Pending cases on 1 Jan.: increase by 26%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in pending cases at the beginning of 2021.
Litigious divorce cases - Resolved cases: increase by 24%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions. Cconsequently, the number of resolved cases decreased. In 2021 with the loosening of Covid-19 restrictions, the number of resolved cases increased.
Employment dismissal cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: increase by 61%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in pending cases at the beginning of 2021.
Employment dismissal cases - Incoming cases: decrease by 29%
The number of incoming cases most probably decreased due to numerous state measures aiming to aid the economy. Cconsequently, the employers delayed their preventive measures (in 2022, the number of incoming cases increased).
Employment dismissal cases - Resolved cases: increase by 27%
Employment dismissal cases are considered urgent, therefore the courts were working on cases despite Covid-19 restrictions.
Employment dismissal cases - Pending cases on 31 Dec.: decrease by 27%
The number of incoming cases decreased and the number of resolved cases increased (see above). Cconsequently, the number of pending cases decreased. Employment dismissal cases - Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - decrease by 25%:
Please note the small (absolute) number of cases.
Insolvency - Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - decrease by 19%:
The biggest decrease is in the number of personal bankrupcies, which reppresent 71% of all pending cases, older than 2 years. Intentional homicide cases and Robbery cases: Please note the small (absolute) number of cases.
GC
Insolvency - Pending cases older than 2 years
Please note that the personal insolvency cases are considered resolved only when the assets have been liquidated and the trial period for the discharge of debts (that can be set to last from 6 months to 5 years) has ended.

Q101 (2020): Litigious divorce cases - the decrease in number of incoming and resolved cases is due to limitations of operation of courts due to the Covid-19 pandemics.
Employment dismissal cases – the number of incoming cases increased by 29% in 2020 (increase by 1% in 2019), which is likely connected to Covid-19 (downsizing of businesses as a consequence of the impact of Covid-19 pandemics to some economy sectors e.g. tourism, restaurants and bars, catering, etc.), while the number of resolved cases decreased by 7%, due to limitations of operation of courts due to the Covid-19 pandemics. Consequently, the number of pending cases has increased by 61%. Insolvency cases - The number of incoming cases is decreasing (personal bankruptcy from 2014 on and bankruptcy of legal persons from 2018 on), therefore the number of resolved and pending cases is also decreasing.
The discrepancies regarding other categories are due to a small (absolute) number of cases.

Q101 (2019): The change in case-flow of cases related to asylum seekers and cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens cannot be contribuited to legislature or organisational changes, but rather to the enforcement of policies of the state regarding the general immigration situation in the region.
The absolute number of these cases are low. In 2018, the clearance rate for cases related to asylum seekers had been 94% (for cases related to aliens above 100%) and in 2019 the clearance ratio had been very close to 100% for both types of cases.

Q101 (2018): Employment dismissal cases- No special reason for decreased number of incoming cases can be given. The decreased number of incoming cases affecte the number of resolved and pending cases.
Insolvency- Personal insolvency accounts for more than half of the insolvency cases. The decrease in incoming insolvency cases reflects the smaller number of new personal insolvency cases (we can speculate that the higher number of personal insolvency cases in previous years was the effect of the past economic crisis). The increase in resolved cases can be explained by the elapse of probation periods (typically 2-5 years) in personal insolvency cases and more efficient liquidation of assets in cases of business subject insolvency. The number of insolvency cases for business subjects did not vary significantly in recent years.
Cases related to asylum seekers - A decreased number of incoming cases can be attributed to the immigration crisis. The increased number of incoming cases affecte the number of resolved and pending cases.
Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens - No special reason for decreased number of incoming cases can be given. The decreased number of incoming cases affecte the number of resolved cases.
Robbery - The difference in number of resolved cases can be attributed to small (absolute) number of cases.
Intentional homicide - The difference in number of resolved cases can be attributed to small (absolute) number of cases.

Q101 (2017): Personal insolvency accounts for more than half of the insolvency cases (61% new cases in 2017 and 75% in 2015). The decrease in incoming insolvency cases reflects the smaller number of new personal insolvency cases (we can speculate that the higher number of personal insolvency cases in previous years was the effect of the past economic crisis). The increase in resolved cases can be explained by the elapse of probation periods (typically 2-5 years) in personal insolvency cases and more efficient liquidation of assets in cases of business subject insolvency. The number of insolvency cases for business subjects (approx 34% of all new cases in 2017) did not vary significantly in recent years.

Q101 (2016): Differences (insolvency cases):
The effects of the past economic situation are still producing a high number of incoming insolvency cases, with a high percentage of personal bankruptcies. Following the legislation changes, introducing new, simplified types of (preventive) compulsory settlement, there has been an increase in pending cases due to the overburdening of courts with new cases, as well as lengthy procedures (the case cannot be resolved until the debtor's assets are liquidated – corporate; the case cannot be resolved until the end of probation period for the discharge of debt – personal insolvency; in this period the court cannot influence the duration and the case is still classified as not finished).

Q101 (2015): The effect of the economic situation are still effecting a high number of incoming insolvency cases, with a high percentage of personal bankruptcies (approx. 70%). The recent legislation changes introduced new, simplified types of (preventive) compulsory settlement which also led to new incoming cases.
The increase in pending cases is due to the overburdening of courts with new cases, as well as lengthy procedures (the case cannot be resolved until the debtor's assets are liquidated – corporate; the case cannot be resolved until the end of probation period for the discharge of debt – 2-5 years; in this period the court cannot influence the duration and the case is still classified as not finished).
Differences for robbery and intentional homicide is due to the small absolute number of cases.

Q101 (2014): The number of incoming insolvency cases is still high due to the effect of financial crisis. Besides, legislative amendments (2013) abolished the right for legal persons to apply for legal aid for financing the advances of the costs of the bankruptcy proceedings (legal persons are now exempt from paying such advance in all cases). The insolvency case is deemed resolved when the assets are liquidated and the creditors are paid (or in case of personal bankruptcy, if the dismissal of debts was requested, until such decision takes place). In cases of big companies as debtors, the sale of all assets can take years; and in cases of physical persons the "probation" period (between 2 and 5 years) must elapse, before the court can decide on dismissal of the debts.

Q101 (2013): The number of incoming insolvency cases constantly rises due to the effect of general economic crisis which resulted in a higher number of insolvent companies. The increase in the number of unresolved cases can also be attributed to a high number of proceedings of bankruptcies of physical persons. In these cases most debtors apply for conditional release of debt, where the trial period can last from 2-5 years.
Q101 (2012): The number of pending employment dismissal cases on 1 January 2012 decreased because employment dismissal cases are priority cases within labour courts. As robbery cases, are included criminal offences defined in the Criminal Code as Robbery and Larceny in the Form of Robbery. As intentional homicide, are included criminal offences defined in the Criminal Code as Murder, Voluntary Manslaughter and Infanticide. The data includes criminal cases against adult and juvenile offenders and excludes attempts.

Spain

Q091 (General Comment): Regarding registry cases, Spain Land Registry and Commercial Registry do not depend on Courts. But, if one disagrees with a decission of the Register (Land or Commercial) or of the Directorate General of Legal Security and Public Faith, he/she can appeal the decision before Courts.
When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called "alarde"), but in general, in any case in which the Judicial Counsellor detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

Q091 (2021): The recovery of activity, after the most severe restrictions of the pandemic, may have contributed to the improvement in efficiency and increased number of resolved cases.
Q091 (2020): Regarding registry cases, Spain Land Registry and Commercial Registry do not depend on Courts. But, if one disagrees with a decission
of the Register (Land or Commercial) or of the Directorate General for Registers and Notaries, he/she can appeal the decision against
Courts.

Q091 (2018): The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) of December 21, 2016 and other previous Judgments have meant a massive interposition of lawsuits based on that doctrine, for the civil challenge of general conditions included in financing contracts with real estate guarantees in which the borrower is a natural person. Measures, referred to in previous CEPEJ questionnaires, of specialization of certain judicial bodies have been adopted.
Regarding registry cases, Spain Land Registry and Commercial Registry do not depend on Courts. But, if one disagrees with a decission of the Register (Land or Commercial) or of the Directorate General for Registers and Notaries, he/she can appeal the decision against Courts.

Q091 (2016): Concerning the Administrative Law cases, between 2014 and 2016, the decrease of 'Pending cases' is probably because the number of resolved cases, both in 2015 and 2016 has been higher than the number of incoming cases (reinforcement measures have been applied).

Q091 (2015): The horizontal consistency can not be respected because of reopened, cumulated and regularised cases.
Law 10/2012 governing certain fees in the area of the Administration of Justice could explain (especially in Administrative Law cases) the decrease in the number of incoming administrative cases, and logically the decrease in the number of resolved and pending cases.

Q091 (2014): The number of “civil and commercial litigious cases” decreased for 2 reasons. Since the payment order procedures do not need a decision made by a judge but are of the competence of the judicial counsellor, they have been subsumed in the category of non-litigious civil and commercial cases. Since paying court fees for natural persons has been compulsory until March this year, there has been a decrease in the incoming cases. In respect of the category "administrative law cases", it should be recalled that in 2012, there was a decrease in the number of files related to the Public Administration owing to two parameters: plaintiffs have been sentenced to pay the court fees; since 2012, they have to be assisted by a lawyer to file an administrative case, on the other hand.

Q091 (2012): Inspection services are entitled to correct the number each time they find it inaccurate. The data encompasses restarted procedures. Owing to the economic crisis, the number of civil cases increased significantly, particularly this of small claims. The number of “incoming administrative law cases” increased in 2010, due to the reduction of the salaries of civil servants. In 2012, this number decreased with the decrease in the number of files related to the Public Administration for 2 main reasons: plaintiffs are sentenced to pay the court fees; since 2012, they have to be assisted by a lawyer to file an administrative case, on the other hand.
Q092 (2014): For the 2014 exercise, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” encompasses payment order procedures and requests for undisputed matters such as settlement proceedings and divorce with mutual consent.

Q092 (2012): For the 2010 and 2012 exercises, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes non-litigious divorces and cases of voluntary jurisdiction and internments as well.
Q094 (General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Judicial Counsellor detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

Q094 (2021): The number of incoming severe criminal cases increased in comparison with 2020, because that was the year in which the pandemic forced mobility restrictions. The recovery of activity, after the most severe restrictions of the pandemic, may have contributed to the improvement in efficiency and increased number of resolved cases.

Q094 (2020): Possibly the pandemic, and the restrictions it entailed, have had an impact on the decrease of the number of resolved cases.
Q094 (2016): The Organic Law 1/2015 eliminated 'faltas' (misdemeanour) of the Criminal Code, qualifying some of them as minor offenses, and others as administrative infractions. Accordingly, we can observe decreases in the numbers of misdemeanour cases which also affects the total of criminal law cases.
Q094 (2014): The Law 41/2015 has amended the Criminal Procedural Law in the sense that those files opened by the police concerning crimes committed by an unknown person will not be submitted to courts but will remain at the police offices at the disposal of the judge and prosecutor, with the exception of those crimes affecting life, sexual integrity, freedom or corruption, in which case the police report will necessarily be referred to the criminal court. As a result, it is expected that the number of incoming cases before the criminal courts will decrease. In addition, the law 1/2015 amended the Penal Code by suppressing the misdemeanors which now will be judged as administrative or civil matters according to their nature or as minor crimes.

Q094 (2012): Restarted procedures were not counted because they are not really incoming cases. Besides, there was a readjustment of the statistical data in the period between 2010 and 2012. The final data on pending cases is the real data at December 2012.

Q097 (General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Lawyer of the Administration of Justice detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies. It is noteworthy that the small (probably insignificant) number of Registry cases that arrive to the Second Instance is not distinguished of the Litigious cases. This is why, the total number of cases can be provided.
Regarding "other non-litigious cases", the most correct answer is NA (because we can appeal against certain decisions of 'voluntary jurisdiction' not included in the CEPEJ categories).

Q097 (2021): For civil and commercial litigious cases the number of incoming cases increased in comparison with 2020, because that was the year in which the pandemic forced mobility restrictions. This also affected the increases of the number of pending cases at the end of the year.
Q097 (2020): There is an increase in the number of incoming administrative appeal cases in the Autonomous Regions High Courts. It is possible that certain modifications in the Contentious Administrative Jurisdiction, as well as the Judgement of the Constitutional Court in 2015 that eliminated the fees to appeal, have had an impact on the number of incoming cases.

Q097 (2019): "Civil and commercial litigious cases": the increased number of pending cases at the beginning of the year is partly due to the low clearance rate in 2018. In general there is an increase in incoming issues. In civil law many appeals are related to cases of general conditions included in financing contracts with real estate guarantees in which the borrower is a natural person (object of massive cases in Spain since the doctrine of the CJEU).
"Administrative cases": The increase of administrative appeals may probably be due to Aliens (inmigration) cases, which had a strong increase in resolution in 2018.

Q097 (2018): The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) of December 21, 2016 and other previous Judgments have meant a massive interposition of lawsuits based on that doctrine, for the civil challenge of general conditions included in financing contracts with real estate guarantees whose Borrower is a natural person. Measures, referred to in previous assessments, of spatialization of certain judicial bodies have been adopted. In 2018, the appeales to the judgments in matters of individual suitcases against general conditions included in financing contracts with real estate guarantees whose borrower is a natural person have reached the Provincial Courts (second Instance). The small (probably insignificant) number of Registry cases that arrive to the Second Instance is not distinguished of the Litigious cases. This is why the total number of cases can be provided

Q097 (2016): In respect of the increase in the number of incoming civil and commercial litigious cases as well as the increase of the total of incoming cases between 2014 and 2016, it should be mentioned that since March 2015 the fees to bring a case to the court were abolished in case of natural persons. Besides, in July 2016, the Constitutional Court declared the nullity of the fees to appeal.
Q097 (2015): Law 10/2012 governing certain fees in the area of the Administration of Justice could explain (especially in Administrative Law cases) the decrease in the number of incoming administrative cases, and logically the decrease in the number of resolved and pending cases.
Q097 (2014): For the 2014 exercise, the decrease of the number of pending administrative law cases in the beginning and in the end of the year is the result of the decreases observed and explained in fist instance.
Q097 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, the lack of horizontal consistency with regard to the total number of pending cases on 31 December has been explained by the fact that inspection services are entitled to correct the number each time they find it inaccurate. Moreover, the horizontal inconsistency is also a result of the inclusion within the table of data related to restarted procedures, while there is not a specific item dedicated to this category of cases.

Q098 (General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Lawyer of the Administration of Justice detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

Q098 (2021): The number of incoming and pending cases for both severe and minor criminal case categories increased in comparison with 2020, because that was the year in which the pandemic forced mobility restrictions. The recovery of activity, after the most severe restrictions of the pandemic, may have contributed to the improvement in efficiency and increased number of resolved minor criminal cases.

Q098 (2020): The reduction in criminal appeals during 2020 may be an effect of the pandemic.

Q098 (2016): The number of pending severe criminal cases decreased due to the decrease in the number of incoming cases. The decreases observed in respect of the numbers of Misdemeanour cases can be due to the elimination of "Faltas" (Misdemeanour cases) by the Organic Law 1/2015. Some of theme were transformed in minor offences, but other disappeared or were transformed in administrative infractions.

Q098 (2012): The lack of horizontal consistency in 2012 was due to the number of restarted procedures that were not counted in the boxes of the questions because they are not really incoming cases. Besides, there was a readjustment of the statistical data in the period between 2010 and 2012. The final data provided in the questionnaire, and shown in the box of pending cases is the real data at December 2012.

Q099 (General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Lawyer of the Administration of Justice detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error. These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

Q099 (2021): The recovery of activity, after the most severe restrictions of the pandemic, may have contributed to the entry of more cases, as well as to greater efficiency and increased number of resolved cases. The comparison is with 2020, the year in which the pandemic forced mobility restrictions.

Q099 (2020): In administrative law cases, judgements based on the unified doctrine related Tax on the Retail Sales of Certain Hydrocarbons facilitated the resolution of cases in previous years and partly caused the good clearance rate of the Supreme Court Administrative Room in 2019. However, there were fewer of these cases in 2020, so the number of resolved cases decreased.

Q099 (2019): In respect of administrative law cases, the very positive clearance rate in 2018, added to the trend that continues being positive in 2019, explains the decrease in pending cases.

Q099 (2018): The Administrative Procedural Law allows the inadmissibility of the cassation appeal by resolution of a lower level than Civil Procedural Law. This explains partially the different clearance rate between this two rooms.
In relation to the good resolution rate in Administrative is due in part to this cause: In previous years, a Judgement of the Court of Justice of the European Union declared Spanish law contrary to Community law authorizing the tax on retail sales of certain hydrocarbons. This fact meant the massive presentation of claims for the patrimonial responsibility of the State for the undue payment of the so-called "sanitary cent". Once the Supreme Court established jurisprudence, many of these cases were resolved more quickly.

Q099 (2017): The cause of the raise of administrative cases (pending at the beginning of 2017 and resolved) in the Supreme Court is the reform of the cassation appeal by the Final Disposition Third of the Organic Law 7/2015, and, on the other hand, a new organisation of the Third Courtroom.

Q099 (2016): As concerns the variations observed between 2014 and 2016 regarding the categories "total of other than criminal law cases"; "civil and commercial litigious cases"; "administrative law cases", it should be noted that:
- the increase in the number of cases in civil matters is due to the increase in conflicts of competence entered and resolved as well as the increase in the number of resolutions of appeals for unification of doctrine.
- the high increase in administrative matters is due to the massive presentation of claims for the State's patrimonial responsibility for the undue payment of the called "sanitary cent", because of the Judgement of the Court of Justice of the European Union that declared contrary to the Community law the Spanish law that authorized the Tax on Retail Sales of Certain Hydrocarbons.

Q099 (2015): Regarding administrative cases in 2015, there was a significant flow of incoming cases related with tax on retail sales of certain hydrocarbons. But before that, since 2011, the incoming administrative cases dropped due to the Law of courts' fees.

Q099 (2014): For the 2014 exercise, the decreases observed in respect of the number of pending administrative law cases in the beginning of the year and the number of resolved administrative law cases, are the result of the decreases observed and explained in fist instance.
The increase in the number of pending civil and commercial litigious cases on 31 December between 2012 and 2014 is due to the economic crisis which resulted in the increase of the number of cases in the civil jurisdiction.

Q099 (2012): For the 2012 evaluation cycle, the category of civil and commercial litigious cases includes data on labour matters, special matters and military matters.

Q100 (General Comment): The Criminal Procedure Law was amended by Law 41/2015, and thus the scope of the cassation appeal that reach the Supreme Court in Criminal Matters was broadened. The objective of the Law was to try to homogenize the doctrine in criminal matters, since previously, in cases that had not criteria of Supreme Court, the criteria of the Provincial Courts could be different.
When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Lawyer of the Administration of Justice detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

Q100 (2021): In 2021, the recovery of greater activity (after the restrictions of the pandemic) has been able to contribute to greater efficiency and increased number of resolved cases.
Q100 (2020): Considering the broadening the scope of the cassation appeal that reach the Supreme Court, the number of cases has been increasing. Already in 2018, the final pending cases were higher than the initial. In 2019, those incoming also increased. All this resulted in significant increase in the number of pending cases at the end of 2020.

Q100 (2014): The number of total criminal pending cases on 31 December has decreased of 30% between 2012 and 2014. It has to be noted that both in 2013 and 2014, the Supreme Court has resolved more cases than the number of incoming cases.

Q101 (General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Judicial Counsellor detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

Q101 (2021): Explanation of the increased number of resolved employment dismissal cases: The recovery of greater activity (after the restrictions of the pandemic) has been able to contribute to greater efficiency.
Explanation of the increased number of incoming insolvency cases: The complex economic context, derived in part from the pandemic.
Explanation of the increased number of resolved insolvency cases: The recovery of greater activity (after the restrictions of the pandemic) has been able to contribute to greater efficiency.

Q101 (2020): The decreasing number of resolved divorces cases has been parallel to that of incoming cases, which has also decreased, with a special decrease in 2020 in part as effect of pandemic on work of courts.
Increase in dismissal cases is observed since 2019.
The increase in incoming and resolved insolvency cases is mainly focused on the cases of insolvency of natural persons.

Q101 (2019): Concerning cases relating to asylum seekers and cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens, the increased number of pending cases at the beginning of 2019 is coherent with the increase in incoming cases in previous cycle.

Q101 (2018): Variations in respect of cases relating to asylum seekers and cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens are due to the migration crisis
Q101 (2017): Migratory crisis can explain the raise of asylum seekers judicial cases.
Q101 (2016): As concerns employment dismissal cases: in 2014, 2015 and 2016 an important decrease in the number of incoming cases has been observed. While the resolved cases have kept similar numbers, so, every year the number of resolved cases has been higher than the number of incoming cases. As concerns insolvency cases: the decrease in the number of incoming cases may be due to a certain decrease in some effects of the economic crisis.

Q101 (2015): The horizontal consistency can not be respected because of reopened, cumulated and regularised cases. Because of the economic restrictions and the increasing number of companies with financing problems, the number of employment dismissal cases and the number of insolvency cases brought to courts have remarkably increased in 2014.

Q101 (2014): Because of the economic restrictions and the increasing number of companies with financing problems, the number of employment dismissal cases and the number of insolvency cases brought to courts have remarkably increased in 2014.

Indicator 3: The performance of courts at all stages of the proceedings

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

Question 091. First instance courts: number of other than criminal law cases.
Question 092. If courts deal with "civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases", please indicate the case categories included:

Question 093. Please indicate the case categories included in the category "other cases":
Question 094. First instance courts: number of criminal law cases.
Question 097. Second instance courts (appeal): Number of "other than criminal law" cases.
Question 098. Second instance courts (appeal): Number of criminal law cases.
Question 099. Highest instance courts (Supreme Court): Number of "other than criminal law" cases:
Question 100. Highest instance courts (Supreme Court): Number of criminal law cases.
Question 101. Number of specific litigious cases received and processed by first instance courts.

Question 091

Austria

(General Comment): Due to a change in calculation in the underlying statistics, the "pending cases on 1st Jan ref year" may differ compared to the "pending cases on 31st Dec" of the previous year.

(2021): "Non litigious business registry cases": Sec. 3a para. 2 of the COVID-19 act concerning corporate law ("Gesellschaftsrechtliches COVID-19-Gesetz") allows corporations to file their annual accounts and other documents, that have to be published by law, not only within 9 but within 12 months from the account date (mostly: December 31st of a year). Usually, the duty to file these reports within 9 months leads to a high number of incoming files in September. 2020 and 2021 the special rules lead to such high incoming file numbers in December and thereby to an increase in pending cases at the end of the year.

(2020): "Non litigious business registry cases": Sec. 3a para. 2 of the COVID-19 act concerning corporate law ("Gesellschaftsrechtliches COVID-19-Gesetz") allows corporations to file their annual accounts and other documents, that have to be published by law, not only within 9 but within 12 months from the account date (mostly: December 31st of a year). Usually, the duty to file these reports within 9 months leads to a high number of incoming files in September. 2020 the special rules lead to such high incoming file numbers in December and thereby to an increase in pending cases at the end of the year. "4. Other cases": The number of incoming and resolved cases surged due to an increase of "general civil proceedings, that are not allocated to other categories of cases" because the district administrative authorities (Bezirksverwaltungsbehörden) had to notify the district courts of every single person against which a quarantine measure (SARS-CoV-2) had been taken. In concerns of statistical data every such notification resulted in an incoming (and resolved) case.
Generally, no courts were closed during the lockdowns. During the first lockdown (middle of March until the end of April 2020) the number of incoming cases dropped significantly. Nearly all court hearings had to be postponed during the first lockdown. In total (all case types) in April 2020 there were 89.25 % less court hearings than in April 2019. In general litigious civil matters of first instance there were even 94.59 % less hearings. A comparison of the total number of court hearings held in the period of March 2019 to February 2020 on the one hand and of March 2020 to February 2021 on the other hand shows that there were 22.22 % less hearings since the first lockdown. The significant drop in incoming cases and held court hearings in April 2020 resulted in the opportunity to concentrate on finishing pending cases in which all hearings had already been held. The statistical data shows that the number of judgments pending more than 2 months since the final hearing declined considerably (1st of July 2020: -75 % compared to 1st of April 2020). Judges did always (even before the Covid-19 pandemic) have the opportunity to work from home. Many have made use of this option during the lockdowns. The Federal Ministry of Justice does not keep statistics on this matter (number of judges working from home) since judges are not obliged to record their working times or places.

(2019): There is a lack of horizontal consistency concerning the catgeory "general civil and commercial non-litigious cases". Figures provided by the statistical system were double checked in this respect and are correct.

(2017): Due to the absolut low numbers of pending cases on 1 Jan./31 Dec. high deviations in percentage are normal.
Note to 2.1.1.: Because of an inaccuracy by analysing pending non-litigious business registry cases the count had to be corrected on 1st December 2017. Therefore the pending cases on 31.12.2016 do not comply with those of 01.01.2017.

(2016): Due to the low absolute numbers of pending cases on 1 Jan./31 Dec. high deviations in percentage are normal.

(2015): In the category litigious are counted all proceedings (in civil matters, labour and social security cases at first instance courts) which are marked as being litigious in the court register (f.e. from the second court hearing on).

Civil and commercial non-litigious cases include commence of bankruptcy proceedings, Bankruptcy proceedings, composition proceedings, non-litigious proceedings about rent, non profit cooperative association for housing, home ownership, proceedings about Lease of farm land, wardship cases in connection with administration of assets, custody and maintenance, uncontested payment orders, enforcement cases.

Category "other" includes Probate Proceedings, cases concerning the Administration of justice, Cancellation proceedings and proceedings in connection with [official] declaration of death
authentication of signatures, proceedings to render legal assistance in civil matters for other courts (also international ones), General civil proceedings, that are not allocated to other categories of cases, Some Non litigious family matters.

(2012): In 2012, a legislative reform entailed more obligations for companies to register.

Belgium

(General Comment): Civil and commercial cases include cases from the Justices of the peace, first instance courts, civil, family and youth sections, labour courts and company courts (commercial courts). It should be noted that courts are not able to provide data on pending cases in civil, family and youth matters. Similarly, in the company courts, pending and resolved cases cannot be counted for insolvency cases because of a too low degree of reliability.
Administrative law cases are those of the Council of State acting as first instance court, the Aliens Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen. Concerning the number of administrative cases pending at the end of the year: the lack of horizontal consistency is due to the fact that the number of judgments does not necessarily correspond to the number of closed cases. For example, a judgment that closes two cases is recorded as one judgment.
Registry cases are immediate acts, which is why the number of incoming cases is equal to the number of resolved cases. Uncontested payment orders are counted as litigious cases because courts are not able to distinguish between uncontested and contested payment orders.
Insolvency cases (company courts): incoming cases - these are all cases registered based on a code “nature of the case” and that concern insolvency cases, cases that have been assigned an insolvency number, or cases entered in a specific insolvency roll. Only cases registered in the computer application of the company courts, called TCKH, are counted in these figures. There are also cases dealt with by company courts and which are solely registered in the computer application RegSol (since mid-2017) in insolvency proceedings, for example, between the curator and the juge-commissaire. Cases only registered in RegSol are not counted in these figures, which leads to an underestimation. It would therefore appear that the number of insolvency cases has decreased in recent years, whereas this is not the case. For your information, below is the number of new insolvency filings (attention: does not correspond to the number of bankruptcies pronounced) which shows a constant increase until 2019 (an impact of the coronavirus crisis is to be noted in 2020): 2016: 12,560; 2017: 13,301; 2018: 13,917; 2019: 14,567; 2020: 9516). Liquidation/dissolution, ECL, and commercial investigation cases (not resulting in bankruptcy) are not counted.

(2021): Administrative law cases are those of the Council of State, the Aliens Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen. However, the figure 1 428 (in the last column “Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court”) concerns the sole Council of State. Thus, with regard to the Councul of State, the figures are the following: 4 936; 2 191; 2 208; 4 420 and 1 428; with regard to the Aliens Litigation Council: 14 415; 14 124 (one judgment can close several cases which may result in a lack of horizontal consistency); 19 256; 9 273 and NA.
Juvenile cases are not counted in the category “other cases”. In fact, this case type includes both civil and criminal litigation.

(2020):
"The health crisis has impacted the numbers.
*Justice of the Peace: no pending cases (start + end). The way justice of the peace cases are counted has been adapted and unlike previous cycles, all dockets have also been taken into account for 2020. *Civil courts of first instance: no pending cases (start + end). The same counting method was applied as last year. Omissions as well as so-called "dormant cases" are counted in the closed cases. *Corporate courts: same counting method as last year. Only cases registered in the corporate court computer application, called TCKH, are counted in these figures. There are also corporate court cases that are only recorded in the RegSol computer application (since mid-2017) in bankruptcy proceedings, for example, between the receiver and the bankruptcy judge. Cases only registered in RegSol are not counted in these figures, which induces an underestimation. Commercial investigations (chambers of distressed companies) are not taken into account as the figures are unreliable due to the very disparate registration methods in the different company courts. No pending cases.
*As far as administrative cases are concerned, the total number of cases includes the figures for the Council of State, the Aliens Litigation Council and the Flemish administrative courts Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege and Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen. However, the figure of 1489 (in the last column ""Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date on which the case is brought before the courts of first instance") concerns only the Council of State. Thus, - for the Council of State, the figures are: 4,564; 2,119; 2,019; 4,936 and 1,489; for the Conseil du Contentieux des Etrangers: 16,009; 14,238 (a judgment can close different cases hence the absence of complete horizontal logic); 15,769; 14,451 and NA.
"

(2019): Regarding the category "4. other cases" which refers to "protection cases", the statistical service does not have figures for 2019, following discussions on the counting rules between the courts. However, we kept the total for “other than criminal” cases since protection cases represent more or less 10,000 cases, or 1% of the total. Their actual number will not change the total figure significantly.
"Administrative cases pending at the end of the year": the lack of horizontal consistency is due to the fact that the number of judgments does not necessarily correspond to the number of closed cases. For example, a judgement that closes two cases is recorded as one stop

(2018): Civil and commercial cases include cases of justices of the peace, courts of first instance, civil, family and youth sections, labour courts and company courts (known as "commercial courts")
Civil and family courts: no data for pending cases. New rules for counting and recording cases mean that the statistics are not comparable to previous years. In particular, cases where there is a permanent referral are now counted as a case.
Concerning juvenile courts: no data for completed or pending cases due to the lack of uniform practice and low registration of completed cases.
Concerning registry cases: these are immediate acts, which is why the number of incoming cases is equal to the number of resolved cases. Administrative affairs: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.

(2017): The difference with the 2016 data is due to the lack of data on justices of the peace cases. In respect of justices of the peace, from July 2017 to June 2018, a deployment of new codes was carried out at the national level. The support service of the College of Courts and Tribunals is currently in the process of defining accounting rules for justices of the peace. For this reason, no figures were issued in 2018 pertaining to 2017 data.
Civil data are not included or only partially included for 5 courts; Youth courts: no data from Brussels (Dutch-speaking); no data for resolved cases and pending cases; No data for civil cases from police courts; Commercial courts: no data for pending cases + new counting rules for resolved cases. For this reason, comparison with previous data is made difficult; not all activities carried out in commercial courts are reflected in the statistics provided. Indeed, the following services are not covered: commercial investigation service, business continuity law, bankruptcy and dissolutions/liquidations.

(2016): Administrative cases: Council of State, Aliens Litigation Council, Raad voor Vergunningsbetwistingen, het Milieuhandhavingscollege en de Raad voor Verkiezingsbetwistingen.
The sharp decrease in administrative cases is due to immigration cases. There are 5 administrative courts, two of which are at federal (national) level: the State Council and the Aliens Litigation Council. It is within the latter that there has been a decrease in the number of cases. Immigration and asylum cases are handled by the Conseil du Contentieux des Etrangers. The Aliens Litigation Council is an independent administrative court, which deals with cases "in the first instance", i.e. full substantive litigation or "in cassation", i.e. a decision "in annulment" or "suspension". The Council may be seized with appeals against decisions of the "Commissariat général aux Réfugiés et aux Apatrides", against decisions of the "Office des Etrangers" and against all other individual decisions taken pursuant to the Act of 15 December 1980 on access to the territory, residence, establishment and removal of aliens (Aliens Act).
Please also note that figures for juvenile courts as well as figures for civil cases treated by the police courts are not included in this cycle. These figure present very small number from the total number of cases.

(2015): The pending cases of commercial courts, first instance (civil, youth, family) and justice of the peace are not included. Included in pending cases are: labor courts, police courts, courts of appeal.

(2014): With regard to non-litigious business registry cases, the central register of notices of seizure, delegation, transfer, collective debt settlement and loan is managed by the National Chamber of Bailiffs. Administrative cases are handled by the State Council (except for cassationrulings), the Alien Litigation Council and the Flemish regional administrative colleges, "Raad voor verkiezingsbetwistingen, Raad voor milieuhandhaving by Raad voor vergunningenbetwistingen".

(2012): The category 1 "civil (and commercial) litigious cases" refers to cases tried by first instance courts, commercial courts and justices of peace, and civil cases dealt with by the police courts. Civil cases concerning youth are not included, as well as cases tried in second instance by courts of first instance. For 2010, there are no available data on the labour courts because the project to build a data warehouse 'Statistics labour courts' is not yet finalised. Cases from categories 1 and 2 cannot be distinguished and are all grouped in category 1.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The division by types of cases in the statistical forms published by the Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria is quite different from the CEPEJ categorisation and for that reason breakdown cannot be made. Only administrative cases are possible to differentiate due to existence of administrative courts. Furthermore, in Bulgaria registry cases are not resolved by courts. They are under the competence of the Registry agency where is the property register, the commercial register, the BULSTAD register and the Register of the Property Relations between spouses.
We should mention though that under current legislation Sofia City Court keeps a public register of political parties (https://sgs.justice.bg/bg/14755) and a public register of religious denominations having the status of legal entities. Sofia City Court is a Provincial/ Regional Court and as other regional courts acts as court of first and second instance. As far as registry cases are concerned Sofia City Court acts as first instance. So, there are some “other registry cases”, however, their number is insignificant. The special place and status of the Sofia City Court among the regional courts is determined by its competences, the most important of which are: claims for the recognition and enforcement of decisions of foreign courts, as well as requests for the recognition of a decision of a foreign court by an interested party that does not have a permanent address or seat on the territory of the Republic of Bulgaria.

(2020): As it is impossible to distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases for the present, for 2020 the following data is available as to the sum of all civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases: pending at the beginning 85 460; incoming 282 768, resolved 285 461 and pending at the end of the year 82 767. It is noteworthy that since 2020, the Unified Court Information System (UIS) has been gradually introduced in all courts, developed within the project “Creating a Model for Optimizing the Court Card of Bulgarian Courts and Prosecutor's Offices and Developing a Unified Court Information System” with the financial support of Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020. Depending on the functionalities of the system, it is possible to collect information on the next cycle according to the indicators in question 91.

(2018): The observed increase in the number of incoming administrative law cases and accordingly in the number of pending administrative law cases at the end of 2018, is a consequence of an increase characterizing the period 2016-2017. As explained in the comment accompanying 2017 data, there is no specific reason for the increase in the number of incoming administrative law cases between 2016 and 2017. During this period there was an increase in the number of cases before the administrative courts (mainly claims under the Administrative Procedure Code, Management of Resources from the European Structural and Investment Funds Act, Tax and Social Insurance Procedure Code, Competition Protection Act, etc.).

(2017): 02/11/2018 7:17:04 AM There is no specific reason for the increase in the number of incoming administrative law cases between 2016 and 2017. During this period there was an increase in the number of cases before the administrative courts (mainly claims under the Administrative Procedure Code, Management of Resources from the European Structural and Investment Funds Act, Tax and Social Insurance Procedure Code, Competition Protection Act, etc.).

(2014): The number of all civil cases (litigious and non-litigious) considered as an overall category could be obtained by extracting from the total the number of administrative cases (67 513 pending cases on 1 January 2014; 294 657 incoming cases; 300 799 resolved cases; 61 371 pending cases on 31 December 2014.

(2012): The number of pending administrative law cases on 31 December 2012 has increased because of the increase of the number of incoming cases in 2010 and 2012. Administrative courts resolved about 72% on average of the cases during the year.

Croatia

(2021): Between 2020 and 2021, there was an increase of incoming civil and commercial cases caused by the receipt of a large number of civil cases, namely lawsuits in labor disputes due to payment based on rights arising from the collective agreement, which occurred in the first quarter of 2021 and continued, to a somewhat lesser extent, throughout the rest of the year. Also there was an increase of the number of incoming enforcement cases that courts received during the last quarter of 2021, which was caused by a change of legislative framework in September 2021.

(2020): Regarding your comment about decreased number of incoming cases (except business registry cases) shown in this table: Due to the pandemic caused by COVID-19, in 2020., court proceedings for limited period in 2020 were submitted under specific conditions and measures, which contributed to decreased number of incoming cases, as well as court hearings especially in litigious cases.
Regarding the number of incoming non-litigious business registry cases - New article added by the Act on Amendments to the Court Register Act (Official Gazette No. 40/19) which came into force at the end of 2019., stipulated the obligation of companies to submit a request for entry of at least one e-mail address to the courts managing business registry. This was the reason for temporarily increased number of requests (cases), which were all resolved by the end of January 31, 2021.

(2019): In 2019 new amendments to the Personal Bankruptcy Law came into force. That caused significant income of other than criminal cases to the municipal courts. There was an increase in the number of land registry incoming cases too. The increased number of incoming land registry cases is caused by intensified economic activities and activities on the real property market. With the same number of employees working on these cases, pending cases increased at the end of the year. Additionally, a large number of citizens started civil lawsuits against banks regarding loans in Swiss currency. These factors combined led to the increase of pending cases at the end of the year as well. The decrease in the number of civil and commercial non litigious cases is due to enforcement cases: courts solved a significant amount of these cases during 2018, while the number of incoming cases decreased as well. For that reason, at the end of 2018 /beginning of 2019 there are fewer cases than at the end of 2017/ beginning of 2018.
As regards "administrative cases", administrative courts resolved more cases during 2018. That decreased the pending stock of the cases at the end of 2018/beginning of 2019.

(2018): Decrease of the number of incoming cases (34%) in category 2.1. in comparison to previous cycle is due to the significant decrease of enforcement cases which are calculated in this category. Majority of enforcement cases are aimed at debtor’s monetary assets based on trustworthy documents – i.e. documents that make the existence of debt highly plausible (such as regular utility bills, telecom operators’ invoices, credit card invoices, unpaid installments of bank loans, etc.). Those cases were removed from jurisdiction of courts to public notaries already in 2012., and since then there is year after year decrease of enforcement cases in municipal courts - enforcement based on other types of enforcement titles (other than trustworthy document), as well as enforcement against real property.

(2017): The cases relative to the Personal Bankruptcy Act which came into force on 1st January 2016 are handled by the 1st instance Municipal Courts. The data about these cases was not available in the moment of completing the questionnaire for the Evaluation (CEPEJ study for EU Scoreboard) (data 2016) but the data is now available within the ICMS system for the year 2017 and they are incorporated in the category 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases (including litigious enforcement cases and if possible without administrative law cases, see category 3). There were 268 pending Personal Bankruptcy cases on January 1st 2017, 377 incoming cases in 2017, 281 cases resolved in 2017 and 365 pending cases on 31st December 2017.
"Registry cases": In this category there is more than 20% increase of pending cases at the beginning of reference year in comparison to the beginning 2016. The reason are land registry cases. As stated in the previous cycle, the reason for the increased number of pending land registry cases is the significant income of these cases during 2016 and the difficulty for courts to cope with this income in same amount as in 2015. This all reflects on data for 2017.
The reason for the decrease in the number of pending administrative cases at the end of the 2017 is laying in the fact that administrative courts received almost 18% less cases than in 2016. Although judges resolved less cases than in previous year, in relation to the income, it was enough to decrease the number of pending cases at the end of 2017 for more than 20%.

(2016): More land registry cases has been received in 2016 than in 2014 so the total number of registry cases has increased as well.
During the two-year period (through 2014 and 2015), administrative courts accumulated unresolved cases - they solved significantly less than they received, which led to 15024 pending cases at the beginning of 2016. By the end of 2015, a total of 5 judges were transferred to administrative courts from other legal branches, which resulted in better results in 2016 (more resolved cases).

(2015): In 2015 the reorganization of the judicial system in the Republic of Croatia, which is partly related to the reorganization of the second instance proceedings, has been carried out. Consequently, in the county courts there has been a harmonization of case registers and case codes (litigious, non-litigious and other) in a way that in 2015 courts carried out the alignment and correction of the indication of certain types of second-instance civil cases. For this reason, in 2015 the correction of the category of cases according to the new methodology of monitoring has been carried out.

The total of all categories is aligned with the continuity of previous cycle (horizontal consistency), whereas the individual categories in the column “Pending cases on Jan. 1 2015” are presented under the new revised indication of the types of cases. For example, some cases that have been categorized in previous cycles under category 'Other', the courts have categorized according to the certain types of dispute which was possible after new case registers were open (e.g. Enforcement – Security by lien on the basis of an agreement of the parties).

(2014): In 2014, a new methodology of monitoring unresolved land registry cases was introduced, in a way that regular land registry cases (i.e. registration, note, caution) are not being monitored anymore and are not presented in the total. Other land registry cases (i.e. objections, appeals, specific corrections,etc.) are still being monitored. The overall number of enforcement cases is subsumed in the category “general civil and commercial non-litigious cases”. The Municipal Civil Court undertook the harmonization of data due to data migration. After the new standardization of the audit, the Supreme Court has started to be less up-to-date since the number of received cases is far beyond the number of cases which may be resolved (priority is given to urgent and old cases).

(2013): The implementation of the ICMS system resulted in unification of data into one reporting system. The category “general civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes inheritance cases but excludes company registry cases. The increase of the incoming “civil and commercial litigious cases” was mostly due to the continuity of the negative economic situation, while the efforts of judges, as well as broadening the scope of powers of court advisors resulted in the increase of resolved cases. The implementation of the enforcement on pecuniary means carried out by the Financial Agency (FINA) led to decreases in respect of “non-litigious enforcement cases”. Since 2013, court advisors deliver a decision in land registry cases, while the judge supervises its content. The competence of other persons for issuing land registry was also established, electronic delivery of submissions and e-notice board were introduced.

(2012): Till December 2011, “administrative law cases” were adjudicated at the Administrative Court. Provided that the latter was overburdened, a two-instance administrative adjudication was introduced in January 2012. 4 regional administrative courts were established as first instance courts, while the former Administrative Court became second-instance High Administrative Court. Since 2012, there is a mandatory oral court hearing of the parties before the first-instance courts.

Cyprus

(General Comment): The reason for not having data for the subcategories of cases is that there was no electronic filing system that would enable us to have statistical data on different types of cases.

(2021): In the administrative cases, the applications for international protection are included and there was an increase in these applications in 2021, as a result of more asylum seekers coming into Cyprus. From 1 January 2021, the Review authority for refugees was abolished.

(2020): In the previous cycle a big number of cases were tried together. This is the reason why number of resolved cases in 2020 might appear lower than in 2019.
Reducing delays in the disposition time is part of the reform process. The difference in the pending cases in administrative cases compared with previous year is that in this figure we included the cases filed before the Administrative court of international protection which was set up.

(2019): In the previous campaigns the number of cases filled and resolved was increased as a result of a big number of cases filed together (in one bundle) and tried together.

(2018): The increase in the number of resolved cases is a consequence of the cases tried together. For number of administrative cases, it should be taken into account that cases were consolidated and that 2724 consolidated cases were withdrawn.

(2017): The variation concerning incoming (total) and resolved (total and administrative) cases (decrease) is due to the fact that, in 2016, cases were filed and tried in a bundle but each was considered separately for statistical purposes. Put differently, cases were joined together and therefore there was an increase in the number of resolved cases. Accordingly, we can observe a decrease in the number of resolved cases between 2016 and 2017.

(2015): Variations: The increase in the number of pending cases between 2010 and 2015 is a result of the bail in Cyprus a lot of administrative cases had been filed against that decision.
The reason for the decrease in the number of resolved cases is that the bail in cases had been consolidated and was tried jointly after 31st of December 2014.

(2014): The increase in the number of pending cases is a result of the bail in Cyprus; a lot of administrative cases had been filed against that decision. The reason for the decrease in the number of resolved cases is that the bail in cases had been consolidated and was tried jointly after 31st of December 2014.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): For years 2010, 2012 and 2013, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts (question 97). On the contrary, since 2014, administrative cases, business registry cases and insolvency cases (and also some litigious cases) which are still decided by the second instance courts acting as first instance courts, are subsumed within the table of question 91 (which was already the case for the 2008 exercise). Methodology has been changed in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases. There are no further changes expected.

(2021): Business registry cases are very quickly resolved and there is quite a variance between years. The number of cases is probably affected by many factors – new laws, economic situation and much more. This is also reflected in the number of pending cases.
2.3 Other non-litigious cases - It is relatively minor and “not very important” case type. The number of cases is quite small. It follows that there is big variance in the data between years.

(2020): The registry cases are very quickly resolved and the numbers can vary between years significantly. In 2019, courts managed to resolve more cases than was the number of incoming cases, which led to decrease in pending cases. The same explanation applies to “other non-litigious cases”. The number of cases is quite small. It follows that there is big variance in the data between years. Furthermore, during 2019 courts managed to resolve significantly more cases than in 2018, no special reasons were reported other than a fact that number of cases is relatively small and the cases are not complex. This also resulted in further redaction of the number of cases at the end of 2019. In 2020, the courts again managed to resolve more cases than was the numer of incoming cases for both registry cases and other non-litigious cases.
Bussiness registry cases are very quickly resolved and there is quite a variance between years. The number of cases is probably affected by many factors – new laws, economic situation and much more.
Other cases: The number of incoming cases has grown, probably due to changes in insolvency legislation.

(2019): The registry cases are very quickly resolved and the numbers can vary between years significantly. Last year, courts managed to resolve more cases than was the number of incoming cases, which led to decrease in pending cases at 1 January of the reference year. For Other non-litigious cases the same reasons apply for the number of cases at the beginning of the year. Furthermore, during 2019 courts managed to resolve significantly more cases than last year, no special reasons were reported other than a fact that number of cases is relatively small and the cases are not hard. This also resulted in further redaction of the number of cases at the end of the reference year. For incoming Other cases, there was a legislative change in insolvency law that is probably a reason for the significant grow in the number of incoming cases.

(2018): Methodology has been changed in 2.1 and 2. (civil and commercial non-litigious cases) in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases.

(2017): Methodology has been changed in 2.1 and 2. (civil and commercial non-litigious cases) in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases. Generally the number of incoming cases is decreasing, more use of ADR.
In the previous year the number of resolved cases greatly exceeded the number of incoming cases for other non-litigious cases, which led to huge drop in pending cases and discrepancy appeared.
Non-litigious business registry cases are very easy to resolve and the variance between years in the number of cases (incoming, resolved and pending) is quite big in general. Thus the annual change could easily be (and is) greater than 25 %.
Courts have problems with resolving administrative cases. It follows that number of incoming cases was last year much bigger than number of incoming cases. Thus number of pending cases increased greatly cases and discrepancy appeared.
As to Other cases, insolvency cases are reported. This is relatively new and very specific agenda, which usually takes 5 years to resolve. There was an increase in case fillings five years ago, which resulted in growth in the number of resolved cases nowadays. On the other hand, for various reasons (including legislative changes) the number of incoming cases is decreasing.

(2016): Methodology has been changed in 2.1 and 2. (civil and commercial non-litigious cases) in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases. Generally the number of incoming cases is decreasing, more use of ADR.

(2015): Methodology has been changed in 2.1 in year 2015 – more case types have been included, which led to the big increment in the number of cases.

Civil and commercial non-litigious cases include: 2.1 - uncontested payment orders, cases of the upbringing and maintenance of a minor, declaration of admissibility of taking or keeping of a person in a medical (health care) institution, declaration of the death of a person, inheritance proceedings, judicial deposit cases

Category "other includes: insolvency cases and incidence disputes

(2014): For 2014, business register cases, administrative cases, insolvency registry cases and also some litigious cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts are subsumed within the table of question 91.

For 2014 the category “other” encompasses insolvency cases.

In 2014, the high increase of insolvency cases is due to numerous cases of personal bankruptcies as well as to an unfavourable economic situation.

(2013): For 2013, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts. In 2014, these cases (and also some litigious cases) are subsumed within the table of question 91.

For 2012, the category of enforcement cases concerns exclusively enforcement carried out by the court itself, while for 2013, this category encompasses also enforcement ensured by private executors (in this procedure, the court authorizes the private executor to proceed to the enforcement and decides about remedial measures against executor’s decision). For 2012, the category “other” includes electronic payment orders and probate proceedings, while for 2013 it encompasses only electronic payment proceedings. Moreover, in respect of the electronic payment orders, there was a switchover to another register and 174.067 cases were transferred to a new register. The discribes evolutions affect the total.

(2012): For 2012, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts. In 2014, these cases (and also some litigious cases) are subsumed within the table of question 91.

Variations between 2010 and 2012 concerning the number of pending cases on 1st January, the number of incoming cases and the number of pending cases on 31 December stem from the high number of incoming electronic payment orders in 2011. Besides, more enforcement cases are handled by private executors.

Denmark

(General Comment): As concerns "non-litigious business registry cases", it is important to note that pending cases always may vary a lot as it is a residual figure when pending prior to the period, received and resolved cases are counted. Furthermore, the reason for the discrepancy is that we do not have pending figures from the Maritime and Commercial High Court. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious is encompassed in the number of “civil and commercial litigious cases”..
With regard to "non litigious land registry cases", it should be pointed out that due to the high amount of incoming and resolved cases, the residual figure of pending cases prior and after the period may vary..

(2020): 2020 was an unusual year because of the Covid-19 related close down of society, including close down of courts. It created more pending cases as the prosecution continued to forward new cases to the courts that could not deal with it. Land registration is the major source of incoming cases. It fluctuates a lot depending on interest rates, loan rescheduling etc.
2.1. General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases: The courts have successfully reduced the number of pending cases.
As concerns "2.2.2. Non-litigious business registry cases", it is important that because of new regulations/laws, it is possible to start a new company with no prior capital. This causes many more companies and many more closures in some categories and also affect number of pending cases, like for non-litigious business registry cases. The courts received many extra backlogged cased from the Danish Commerce and Companies Agency reenforced closure of companies that were still backlogged in the early 2020. The courts were closed for 3 weeks except for vital cases and government assistant to companies helped them and reduced bankruptcies and closures of companies that would normally have happened.

(2019): Variation in land registration (loans etc) as market and interest rates always vary from year to year.
For non-litigious business registry cases: Received markedly fewer enforced cases re enforced closure in 2019 than in 2018; Solved many extra insolvency cases in the beginning of year 2019 received in late autumn / winter 2018; pending cases on 31 December - It is important to understand the figure, that we succeeded to include pending cases from the Maritime and Commercial court.

(2018): As concerns "non-litigious business registry cases", it is important that because of new regulations/laws, it is possible to start a new company with no prior capital. This causes many more companies and many more closures in some categories and also affect number of pending cases, like for non-litigious business registry cases. Besides from that it is important to note that pending cases always may vary a lot as it is a residual figure when pending prior to the period, received and resolved cases are counted. Furthermore, the reason for the discrepancy is that we do not have pending figures from the Maritime and Commercial High Court. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious is encompassed in the number of “civil and commercial litigious cases”.
With regard to "non litigious land registry cases", it should be pointed out that due to the high amount of incoming and resolved cases, the residual figure of pending cases prior and after the period may vary.

(2017): The figures provided in respect of this question are not fully consistent. The Maritime and Commercial Court only measures incoming and resolved insolvency cases but not pending cases. Accordingly, when the data on processed/resolved cases from this court are included, there will always be a small inconsistency. Therefore, vertical and horizontal figures are not totally consistent.
Concerning the category "land registry cases", the number of pending cases on 1 January 2017 is a residual figure from received, finalized and pending cases ultimo the year; it may deviate from pending cases ultimo 2016, but it is a residual figure. The number of pending cases on 31 December 2017 is an actual figure. Concerning the category "registry cases", it is specified that the Maritime and Commercial Court does not publish pending cases which results in a discrepancy.

(2016): As concerns "non-litigious business registry cases", it is important that because of new regulations/laws, it is possible to start a new company with no prior capital. This causes many more companies and many more closures in some categories and also affect number of pending cases, like for non-litigious business registry cases. Besides from that it is important to note that pending cases always may vary a lot as it is a residual figure when pending prior to the period, received and resolved cases are counted. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious is encompassed in the number of “civil and commercial litigious cases”.
With regard to "non litigious land registry cases", it should be pointed out that due to the high amount of incoming and resolved cases, the residual figure of pending cases prior and after the period may vary.

(2014): Due to an improved business situation, courts at all levels receive fewer cases, i.e. civil cases, enforcement cases, forced sales, insolvency cases; pending cases are also reduced thereby. Non-litigious business registry cases follow the overall tendency.

(2013): The successive decrease observed in the number of civil and commercial litigious cases stems from the possibility to reopen cases and the missing data on pending cases before the Maritime and Commercial Court. As for the land registry cases, following the digitalizing in 2009 of land registry, the number of pending cases decreased markedly.

Estonia

(General Comment): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

(2021): The increased number of administrative law cases pending at the end of 2021 is due to COVID-19 related cases that have taken more time to be solved.
Concerning general civil and commercial non litigious cases, it should be mentioned that during the second Covid-19 year, courts processed cases that they were not able to process during the first Covid-19 year.

(2020): MoJ
In 2020, there have been difficulties with filling the vacancies of judge positions in the biggest county court (judges going on maternity leave or retirement), which may have resulted in an increase in pending cases older than 2 years in general.

(2019): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

(2018): The variations in total and in the non litigious cases are due to the number of entrepreneurs that has grown every year, so the number of incoming case is also increasing. Furthermore, the number of real estate transactions has increased and the market is active.The number pending cases end of 2017 is different because the numbers are taken later and the data has been corrected.

(2017): There are not any particular reasons to explain variations in the number of non-litigious business registry cases, causing variations in respect of the category "registry cases" and "non-litigious cases". As regards item 2.1 “general civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, there is an important discrepancy between the number of pending cases on 31 December 2016 and the number of pending cases on 1 January 2017. The reason is related to the time the numbers have been taken out of the system (see general comment). The fifth column “pending cases older than 2 years”, includes cases that are suspended (part 9 of our Code of Civil Procedure, https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/506022018001/consolide). The proceedings may be suspended for example if the one of the parties dies or fells seriously ill; or if in order to solve the dispute the court needs a resolution of an another case.

(2016): The decrease in the number of incoming administrative court cases is due to the decrease in the number of inmate complaints. The variations in total and in the non litigious cases are due to increase of incoming business and land registry cases.

(2014): The increase in the number of incoming administrative law cases is due to a rise of complaints of prisoners. As to the decrease in the total of pending other than criminal law cases on 1 January 2014, the performance indicators of courts have justified supplementary budget resources. Agreements between the Ministry of Justice and courts are expected concerning the efforts that need to be undertaken in court to clear the backlog and accelerate proceedings. For 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases are included in the category “general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”.

(2013): As to non-litigious business registry cases and the observed decreases, in 2012 it was impossible to separate supervisory proceedings from general proceedings and therefore 2012 data included supervisory proceedings as well. The number of pending “civil and commercial litigious cases” decreased on account of the enhanced efficiency of the first instance courts, while the decrease in the number of incoming cases is due to the reestablishment of the normal case-flow after the economic crises.

(2012): The land register (together with the marital property register) and the commercial register (together with the non-profit associations and foundations register, commercial pledge register and ship register) are part of the county courts. “Land registry cases” and “business registry cases” refer to the registration procedure, including supervisory proceedings over undertakings. Disputes arising from the registration procedure are subsumed in “general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“. The dynamics of the “civil and commercial non litigious cases” is considerably influenced by the payment order proceedings that form the largest part of this category and are dealt with by only one courthouse. The 2012 data includes enforcement, land and business registry cases.

Finland

(General Comment): The pending cases older than two years are not collected in Finland.

(2021): Comments The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 12.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt by the administrative courts, the Market Court and the Insurance Court.

(2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available
data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases
managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts). The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt by the administrative courts, the Market Court and the Insurance Court.

(2019): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 22.1.2020 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is:
1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts). The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt by the administrative courts, the Market Court and the Insurance
Court.
The number of administrative cases increased dramatically in 2016 due to the asylum crisis. Accordingly, more judges were hired to deal with cases and make the procedure more effective. The limits in which cases have to be handled have also been shortened in order to reduce the number of pending cases. To tackle this crisis, a legislative reform decentralized the asylum cases from one administrative court (Helsinki) to three other administrative courts as well.
As to “civil and commercial litigious cases”, we can notice a very high Clearance Rate for 2016 due to the fact that in 2016 the number
of incoming civil cases decreased and courts were able to deal with pending cases. Accordingly, the number of pending cases decreased between 2016 and 2019.
“General civil and commercial non-litigious cases”: the number of pending cases at the end of 2019 increased slightly between 2018 and 2019. In this respect, it should be noticed that the partial switch to the new case management system AIPA (as for example divorce cases are already processed in this system) can be the explanation as some initial challenges in the reporting tool has been noted recently.

(2018): The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt by the administrative courts, the Market Court and the Insurance Court.
The number of administrative cases increased dramatically in 2016 due to the asylum crisis. Accordingly, more judges were hired to deal with cases and make the procedure more effective. The limits in which cases have to be handled have also been shortened in order to reduce the number of pending cases. To tackle this crisis, a legislative reform decentralized the asylum cases from one administrative court (Helsinki) to three other administrative courts as well.
As to “civil and commercial litigious cases”, we can notice a very high Clearance Rate for 2016 due to the fact that in 2016 the number of incoming civil cases decreased and courts were able to deal with pending cases. Accordingly, the number of pending cases decreased between 2016 and 2018.

(2017): 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: in 2016 the number of incoming civil cases decreased and courts were able to deal with pending cases; accordingly, the number of pending civil litigious cases at the beginning of 2017 has decreased.
2.2.1 From the beginning of the year 2010 Land register cases were transferred to National Land Survey of Finland.
3. Administrative law cases: On appeal, the administrative court reviews the legality of the decision of the authority. The number mentioned in category 3 includes cases dealt with by Administrative Courts, Market Court and Insurance Court.
It is worth mentioning that in 2016 the number of administrative cases increased dramatically due to the asylum crisis. As a result, the number of pending administrative cases at the beginning of 2017 increased considerably. Against this background, Finland had adopted different measures to face the asylum crisis (e.g. decentralisation of the competence in respect of asylum cases from one administrative court (Helsinki) to three other administrative courts). Accordingly, the number of incoming administrative cases for 2017 decreased (28%).

(2016): In 2016 the number of incoming civil cases decreased and courts were able to deal with pending cases. The number of administrative cases increased dramatically due to the asylum crisis. Accordingly, more judges were hired to deal with cases and make the procedure more effective. The limits in which cases have to be handled have also been shortened in order to reduce the number of pending cases. To tackle this crisis, a legislative reform decentralized the asylum cases from one administrative court (Helsinki) to three other administrative courts as well. For that reason, statistics show variations as concerns the number of pending administrative law cases in 2016. The number of pending administrative law cases on 1.1.2016 was 20 4775, but due to the decentralization around 5000 cases were transferred from Helsinki to these other courts. In the statistics, these cases do not appear as pending anymore. It is not possible to say how many of them have been resolved, but they are included in the number of resolved administrative law cases.

(2014): Non-litigious enforcement cases are subsumed in the category “general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”. The enforcement is of the competence of the enforcement authorities, not of this of courts. Cases mentioned here are appeals in execution proceedings before district courts.

(2012): The increase in the number of pending civil and commercial litigious cases is the result of an exceptionally high number of incoming litigious civil cases in 2011.

France

(2021): Source SDSE
Source Council of State

(2020): Comments on volumes.
Completed cases are down more than new cases, both civil/2019 and felonies/2018 (contravention are surprisingly up / 2018). The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer misdemeanors committed, fewer cases brought to court). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly affected the TAs.
Commentary provided by the highest adminsitrative Court concerning the administrative order: the measures derogating from the ordinary law of contentious administrative procedure adopted to respond to the situation arising from the health crisis caused by the Covid-19 epidemic were provided for by order no. 2020-305 of March 25, 2020, then by order no. 2020-1402 of November 18, 2020, and decree no. 2020-1406 of the same day. I - Concerning the rules relating to the organization or holding of hearings 1°) Use of audiovisual or any other means of electronic communication
The two orders of March 25 and November 18, 2020 provided for the possibility of using an audiovisual means of telecommunication for the holding of hearings or any other means of electronic communication.
When this device was used, it was used, in almost all the jurisdictions that had recourse to it, for less than 10% of the cases judged in collegiality during the same period.
The most common configuration used was that in which one or more members of the panel were at a distance and the president, the other members of the panel, and the parties and their counsel were in the courtroom (approximately 75% of the courts that used videoconferencing chose this configuration and 53% of them used it for less than 10% of the cases tried by the panel). Very few courts have used video-conferencing with remote parties. The reasons for which the courts have used video-conferencing are linked to the constraints linked to the health crisis, in particular the difficulties encountered by lawyers to travel, especially in overseas territories, and the isolation imposed on certain people (judges or lawyers) declared to be in contact or recognized as fragile.
As regards single judges, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions allowing the use of an audiovisual means of telecommunication, since only 6 administrative courts out of 35 have indicated that they have used it. The administrative courts indicated that they had used videoconferencing, as a single judge, for the processing of emergency proceedings in matters concerning foreigners, particularly in cases where the foreigner was in administrative detention. Finally, 15 administrative courts indicated that they held summary proceedings by videoconference. For almost all of these courts, the summary proceedings judge was in the courtroom and the parties were at a distance, and less than 10% of summary proceedings cases were judged in this configuration. Travel difficulties were the main reasons why the courts of first instance held summary proceedings by videoconference. The texts applicable during the state of health emergency allowed the use of any means of electronic communication, other than videoconferencing, in case of impossibility to use it. Only a few TAs used this procedure and for less than 10% of the cases in the courts that used it.
Generally speaking, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions of the orders allowing hearings to be held by videoconference and this use was justified by the constraints and difficulties linked to the health crisis. 2°) The provisions allowing to limit the number of persons attending the hearing were applied by a large number of courts and in a frequent manner. On the other hand, the provisions allowing the president of the court to decide that the hearing will be held without the presence of the public have been used very little. 3°) The dispensation of the public rapporteur's conclusions has

(2019): Administrative law cases pending for more than 2 years: in contrast with previous cycle, 2019 data are expressed in net figures, excluding serial cases presenting the same legal issue for trial.

(2018): With regard to the reduction of the number of non-contentious cases, this corresponds both to the impossibility of including data relating to adults under protection in 2018, due to a technical problem, and to the abolition of the approval of over-indebtedness plans by the judge of the Court of First Instance, the proceedings before which are processed by the Over-indebtedness Commission, as from 1 January 2018. Act No. 2016-1547 of 18 November 2016 on the modernization of 21st century justice, known as the "Justice 21 Act" and the Act of 9 December 2016, abolished judicial approval of the measures recommended by the over-indebtedness commission. As a reminder, divorces by mutual consent no longer fall within the competence of the family court.

(2016): The important increase in the number of pending non-litigious cases is due to the increased number of requests for ending unions - 60% (especially in 2016) and the increased number of pending cases before execution judges within the TGI in respect of a third party (without significant increase in the number of incoming cases, but a regular increase, namely for the last two years in the number of cases under consideration).

(2014): In civil litigation, cases relating to the activity of the liberty and custody judge amount to 98 300 cases in 2014 and have increased by 6.8% compared to 2013. These cases have significantly increased in 2012 (+ 65.5%), due to the law No. 2011-803 of July 2011 on the rights and protection of persons under psychiatric care. The reform systematised the control of psychiatric hospitalisations without the consent of the liberty and custody judge.

Germany

(General Comment): General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys only count the number of received cases.
2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases: The figure represents the number of non-litigious enforcement cases. In the monthly survey for the statistics of the civil courts, these cases fall into the category of "other caseload". This is the reason why only the number of incoming cases is available.
2.2.1. Non litigious land registry cases: The figure represents the number of incoming requests with regard to entries, change of entries or deletion of entries in the land registry. This data is not part of the statistics of the civil courts but was taken from the statistics on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction (according to the Act on Proceedings in Family Matters and in Matters of Non-contentious Jurisdiction - FamFG). The number of pending and resolved land registry cases is not collected within the framework of this statistic.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistencies with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occur in the statistics published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this is, that courts submit count corrections for the monthly surveys at the end of the year.

(2021): 2.2.2: data represents - the number of registrations in the business registry (Handelsregister) at the end of the previous year
- the number of new registrations during the reference year
- the number of deleted registrations during the reference year
- the number of registrations at the end of the reference year
"other cases" include: family and labour law cases

(2020): There is no special reason explaining the slight decrease in the number of incoming administrative law cases.

(2019): The horizontal consistency in the table is not ensured because the data are continuously checked.

(2018): The high number of administrative pending cases on January 1st and December 31st is a result from the numerous unresolved cases in 2017 due to the rise of asylum seekers since 2015.
Cases of guardianship law in 2018 are not included in the "other cases " category, because changeover of data collections by the Lander.

(2017): Source: Federal Statistical Office (DESTATIS)
No. 4 - Other cases: Cases of guardianship law in 2017 are not included, because changeover of data collections by the Länder.

(2016): Source: Federal Statistical Office (DESTATIS)

(2015): For civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office for 2015. As for the category “other”, it refers to the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and encompasses information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. However, some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding this category. Accordingly, the information for this category remains incomplete. The category "other" refers to: local court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

(2014): For civil and commercial litigious and administrative cases, the updated data is solely based on the statistics on the administration of justice published by the Federal Statistical Office for 2014. As for the category “other”, it refers to the most recent available data at the closing date of the CEPEJ data collection and encompasses information provided by the 16 Länder on the basis of the query lodged with the judicial administrations of the Länder. However, some of the Länder were unable to provide complete data regarding this category. Accordingly, the information for this category is incomplete and is not comparable. The category "other" includes: local court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

(2013): Two Lander did not provide data with regard to the number of other than criminal law cases, while one Land did not provide information about the number of non-litigious land registry cases.The information is incomplete and the following legal cases were not taken into account: Incoming cases - payment order procedure (civil courts: 4 751 355 cases; labour courts: 56 053 cases), insolvency cases (143 662), cases concerning the civil registry office, wills, estates, accommodations, agriculture, escrow, and public notice proceedings (1 469 273); Pending legal cases on 31 December 2013 - guardianship and curator cases (12 795); insolvency cases (303 654).

(2012): The data was not available for 1 Land and remained incomplete for 4 Lander.

Greece

(2021): The data has been collected from the 63/63 First Instance courts of Greece.

(2020): The courts from March 2020 due to Covid 2019 operated under special conditions and dealt with priority mainly criminal cases, this is the reason for the differentiation of pending cases of civil and administrative nature.
Civil cases are answered NA, because not all courts could provide the data.

(2019): The Council of State did not provide the Ministry of Justice with data regarding the Administrative law cases

(2018): -

(2017): The divergence between 31.12.2016 and 1.1.2017 regarding the Civil and Commercial cases (First column of this year's data) is mainly due to the recent operation of the NEW system (integrated Civil and Criminal Court case management system -OSDDY PP) in the Court of First Instance of Pireaus (1587 more cases on 1.1.2017 than those on 31.12.2016). In 2017, the number of “incoming” and “resolved” civil and commercial litigious cases at first instance courts increased due to the fact that in 2017 the function of the courts was not affected by the strike of lawyers, which took place in 2016. The horizontal consistency of the table is not ensured with regard to civil and commercial litigious cases because in 2017 some of the courts which do not yet have an automated system had to make minor adjustments in the statistical data provided to the MoJ. Concerning administrative law cases, any deviations from the 2016 figures, regarding the number of cases on 31.12.2016 and of 1.1.2017 (240650) are due to a number of factors that the General Commission of the State is trying to track down and gradually eliminate. A slight deviation has been noticed for the 2017 data of the administrative first instance courts of Athens and Piraeus, which is due to the data migration to a new information technology (IT) system called "Integrated Court Management System for the Administrative Justice (OSDDY-DD)". This deviation that has already been taken into account by the Central Organizational Committee for the due implementation of OSDDY-DD, is expected to lapse gradually within the next years. Furthermore, deviations have also emerged from the new way of collecting statistical data that the central Organizational Committee is trying to establish in order to ensure the uniform input of data by each court and from recent verifications of relevant numerical data that were subsequently sent by the courts. Finally, discrepancies are also due to errors of the information system itself, for which an effort is being made to identify and inform about, the contractor of the system. The deviation regarding the Number of resolved cases of 2017 from 2016 is due to the fact that in 2017 the function of the courts was not affected by the strike of the lawyers, which took place in 2016. Regarding the new integrated court management system, for administrative cases it has been implemented at all court levels since autumn 2016 and for civil and commercial cases and more especially in the Court of First Instance of Piraeus, the integrated court management system was gradually implemented from March 2016 resulting to an accurate calculation of pending cases of 1/1/2017.

(2016): Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics. In fact, in 2016, a working group was set up to update and simplify the content of the statistical data requested by the judicial services of the country. The working group created tables followed by detailed instructions and training in relation to the requested information. According to the instructions given to the courts, some procedures they handle, in those which there is no participation of a judge, are not included in the data collected. In addition, in 2016 a long-term abstention by the lawyers of the country took place, resulting in reduction in the number of cases (especially civil and commercial litigious cases).
The number 79.872 of resolved administrative law cases does not include joint cases, i.e. decisions that refer to more than one case. Furthermore, for the 2016 data of the administrative First Instance Courts of Athens and Piraeus a slight deviation has been noted which is due to the data migration to a new information technology (IT) system called “Integrated Court Management System for Administrative Justice (OSDDY-DD)”. This deviation that has already been taken into account by the Central Organizational Committee for the due implementation of OSDDY – DD is expected to lapse gradually within the next years.
As concerns the category "civil and commercial litigious cases" - incoming and resolved - in 2016 a long-term abstention by the lawyers of the country took place, resulting in reduction of numbers regarding the cases.

(2014): The significant increase in the number of pending cases on 1 January for the total of “other than criminal law cases” is due to lawyers’ abstention in the years 2013 and 2014.

(2012): The system of collecting data does not comply with the CEPEJ methodology. Besides, recent law changes have altered the jurisdiction of courts, so the figures communicated for 2012 could not be compared with these provided for the previous evaluation cycles.

Hungary

(2021): The number of incoming cases decreased in general and the situation was the same for administrative cases. As the number of incoming cases decreased and the courts were able to finish more cases than the number of the "new" cases, the backlog was reduced.

(2020): The pandemic situation had a huge effect on the case flow of the courts on every level of the court system. Special regulations were adopted by the legislator to promote videoconferencing and the courts were "closed between the 16th of March and the 31th of March (during this period no procedural events could be performed at the courts). Although the courts carried out their main activities, many cases were prolonged e.g. because the parties were not able to attend the hearings. Regarding administrative cases the re-organization of administrative jurisdiction also could have an effect on the case-flow.

(2018): One of the reasons of the decreasing number of incoming cases is the new civil procedural code coming into force on the 1st of January 2018. This resulted that many of those parties (especially those who were represented by lawyer) who had the chance to do so, filed their petition before the end of 2017 under the scope of the old and well-known procedural code. Regarding the discrepancy between 2017 and 2018 in the number of registry cases, it is due to the fact that for the first time in 2018, the number of non-litigious business registry cases is available.

(2017): Regarding the categories “2.1 general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”, and "4. other cases" the number of pending cases on 1st of January differ from the closing number of the previous year because of data collection problems at certain regional courts.
In the category "registry cases" the higher number of incoming and resolved cases in 2016 was the result of a large number of involuntary dissolution cases. As the courts finished these cases and backlog cases from previous years the number of resolved cases in 2016 was higher than incoming cases in contrast with 2017.

(2016): In category "4. other cases" there is a difference between the number of pending cases on 31 December 2015 and the number of pending cases on 1 January 2016. The cause of this difference is the change of the IT system and the cleansing of the database.
2.1 General civil and commercial non-litigious cases: there was a change in the statistical methodology at the largest regional court that caused a difference in the figures pertaining to pending cases on 1 January 2016.
2.2.3. “other registry cases” include registration of civil societies.
The increase in the number of general civil (commercial) non litigious cases pending on 1 January 2016 is due to the change in the statistical methodology at the largest regional court that caused a difference in the figures.
The number of incoming “other registry cases” increased between 2014 and 2016 because of the increasing number of registry cases of civil societies. Accordingly, the number of resolved “other registry cases” increased also for the same period. With regard to the category “other non-litigious cases”, the increased numbers characterizing the period 2014-2016 are the consequence of the increasing number of court mediation cases and non-litigious labour cases.

(2015): There is a difference between the number of pending cases on 31 December 2014 and the number of pending cases on 1 January 2015. The cause of this difference is the change of the calculation method at some regional courts.

The category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes all cases that are not concluded through the rules of the civil procedure, but through a more or less simplified procedure. Thus, there is a very wide range of related categories set forth by the Civil Procedure Code or other acts. For example, a reference was made to: exclusion of a judge; preliminary verification; issuance of a restraining order and review of that; declaration of dead; declaration of missing; revision of the medical care of mentally disordered patients, deposit at the court; company registration procedures; registration of associations, foundations etc.

The category “other registry cases” include registration of civil societies.

The category “other non-litigious cases” include court mediation and non-litigious labour cases.

The category "other" include Insolvency cases and labour cases.

(2014): In 2014, in contrast with the 2013 evaluation, some registration cases as well as non-litigious enforcement cases were also included within the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”. The item “other registry cases” includes registration of civil societies. The item “other non-litigious cases” includes court mediation and non-litigious labour cases. Before 2013, non-litigious administrative law cases were counted as “non-litigious civil and commercial cases”. Since 2013, non-litigious and litigious administrative law cases are provided together. The increased number of investigations conducted by administrative authorities (e.g. tax authorities) resulted in an increased number of reviews against these decisions.

(2013): Till 2013, the data-provider for non-litigious enforcement cases was the Ministry of Justice. Since 2013, the data-collecting system of courts covers also this group of cases (general non-litigious cases). Before 2013, non-litigious administrative law cases were counted as “non-litigious civil and commercial cases”. Since 2013, non-litigious and litigious administrative law cases are provided together. As for the subcategory “civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, it encompasses different categories of cases for 2012 and 2013.

Ireland

(General Comment): Historically, the number of pending civil cases has not been recorded in caseload data, as many cases initiated before the Irish courts either settle out of court or are not proceeded with by the plaintiff/applicant without there being any procedural requirement that the parties inform the court of either a settlement or an intention not to proceed with the case.
Civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases include proceedings not resolved inter partes, such as undefended pecuniary claims, deed poll applications, probate (grants of representation), wardship proceedings, registrations of enduring powers of attorney, appointment of care representatives, unopposed personal and corporate insolvency proceedings, liquor licencing applications and marriage notice exemption applications.
Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

(2021): As the Courts Service is not in a position to confirm to increase or decrease, we can note the following: There was a decrease in over 2,500 in personal injuries cases, recovery of debt cases overall decreased by about 1,500 cases and small claims decreased by 40 percent to 2,134, licensing was down 18 percent to 10,764. We can say it is very likely that ongoing covid restrictions contributed to this in licensing.

(2020): Reduction in non-litigious cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. This included domestic violence and criminal proceedings. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie.
Attendance at Court offices was by appointment only to ensure that footfall could be safely managed.

(2017): We are not in a position to offer further comment on the figure for resolved Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.
We are not in a position to offer further comment on variations in the number of incoming and resolved "other" cases.

(2016): The decrease in the number of incoming and resolved "other cases" observed for the period 2014 - 2016 is due to a sharp reduction on taxations of legal costs since 2014.

(2015): Category "other" includes: Taxation of bills of costs.

(2014): A substantial number of cases which have been completed (through settlement or non-pursuit of the case by the plaintiff without notice to the court) are not recorded and counted as completed. Consequently, the clearance rate appearing from the case flow data provided is considered to understate significantly the actual case clearance rate.

(2013): The number of enforcement cases has been reported for the first time. The Courts Service has sought to create a category of cases under the Irish system that would be equivalent to non-litigious enforcement cases under other justice systems. The figure consists of the following steps leading to enforcement measures by court judgments and orders: Execution orders, Registered Judgments, Judgment Mortgage Certificates.

Italy

(General Comment): A different methodology of classification of civil cases is used since 2012. The result is an improved classification and a better split between litigious and non-litigious cases. For 2010, 2012 and 2013, the category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases has an identical content, namely: separation and divorce by mutual consent, interdiction and incapacitation, protective measures for underage, guardianship and trusteeship etc. Since 2014, it subsumes uncontested payment orders, uncontested divorces, technical appraisals, judicial interdiction and incapacitation, hereditament, etc.

(2020): In 2020 the case flow was highly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent temporary shutdown of courts. This had an impact on both incoming and resolved cases, which fell quite considerably compared to 2019. However, the fall in the number of resolved cases was less drastic than that of incoming cases, resulting in a clearance rate (CR) higher than 100% and, hence, in a reduction in the number of the unresolved cases (i.e. the pending cases at the end of the period). The COVID-19 pandemic also had a strong impact on the disposition time (DT). The number of pending older than 2 years is not available because figures include the activity of both tribunals and justice of peace offices and for the latter this information is not available.

(2019): Number of "pending cases older than 2 years" is not available because it refers to first instance causes which also include the activity of Justice of peace offices, for which this information is no available.

(2018): Administrative cases. – It should be noted that fast-track simplified proceedings are available for dispute resolution in important areas of administrative law, such as public procurement ("rito appalti"). In 2018, the disposition time for such disputes was 237 days in the first instance and 274 days before the Consiglio di Stato (CDS). Furthermore, requests of interim measures are frequent in administrative law cases (about one third of the cases in first instance and half of the cases before the CDS). They provide fast legal protection of the claimant's rights, often anticipating the final judgment on the merits.

(2015): Figures at Q.91 (points 1 and 2) have been extracted from a new IT system called "Civil Data warehouse". This new system allows us to get in-depth information on single proceedings. Before the implementation of such data warehouse, statistics were based on aggregated variables that only partially could distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases.

As far as figures at Q.91 (point 3), please consider that Administrative Justice doesn't fall under the umbrella of the Ministry of Justice as it is administered by the Council of State (Consiglio di Stato). However, figures at Q.91 (point 3) were not provided by the Council of State, they were rather taken from a public document available online at https://www.giustizia-amministrativa.it/cdsintra/cdsintra/Notiziasingola/index.html?p=NSIGA_3826149
Since the administrative cases (Q.91 point 3) refers to a different administration, it wouldn't be reasonable to compare these numbers against the number of judges provided at Q.46.

Civil and commercial non-litigious cases include: Uncontested payment orders, uncontested divorces, technical appraisals, judicial interdiction and incapacitation, hereditament, etc.

(2014): In 2014, figures for the category "administrative law cases" have been submitted for the first time. The administrative justice doesn't fall under the umbrella of the Ministry of Justice as it is a completely different administration.

(2013): In 2013 and 2014, the Italian judicial system has gone through a historical geographic reorganization with the closing of almost 1000 courts. Thus, the statistics regarding flows of cases at the end of 2013 may show some anomalies that will be adjusted with the following data gathering. A constant reduction in the incoming civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases is observed from the end of 2009. The number of ADR cases is constantly increasing with a filter effect on the litigious incoming files.

Latvia

(General Comment): Data from the first and appeal instance courts are compiled by the Court Administration, and the Court Information System is a living database that allows data to be corrected, so changes between previous periods are possible. Within the Court Information System, submissions received in the previous year but registered the next year are considered as incoming cases for the new year. "Non-litigious enforcement cases" and "non-litigious business registry cases" are not defined in the Civil Code and both are not within the competence of courts in the first instance (similar to "non-litigious land registry cases").
The category "civil and commercial non-litigious cases" encompasses: applications for securing claim prior to initiation of the matter in a court; applications for securing of evidence prior to initiation of the matter in a court; applications for execution of obligations through the court; undisputed compulsory execution of obligations; execution of obligations in accordance with warning procedures; voluntary sale of immovable property at auction through the court; submitting the subject-matter of an obligation for safekeeping in the court; applications for Commercial Court adjudication execution procedures; applications for arbitrary court decision compulsory execution; applications for property protection if there is no inheritance case; applications concerning execution of court adjudications.

(2021): The number of pending cases on January differs from pending cases on December, 2020 registered data due the living Court information system database. The number of pending cases on Jan. is higher than previous year due high number of pending non-litigious cases. See comments from previous campaigns. Every year from 2019, a significant increase in the number of non-litigious civil cases has been observed. Compared to the previous period, the number of cases increases by 25%. According to the Civil Procedure Law, judge should examine application within seven days. The consideration time determined by the law also affects the amount of resolved cases, and accordingly indicates a direct connection with the amount of incoming cases.
Administrative cases: At the end of 2021, the number of cases received, (which were directed against the Covid-19 restrictive measure - mandatory vaccination), increased significantly, and it was not possible to resolve these cases until the end of the year
The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has decreased. The reduction of pending cases is related to the increased interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending civil and administrative cases.

(2020): The number of resolved and incoming cases of general civil (commercial) non litigious cases are higher because there was significant increase on applications for the undisputed enforcements. Usually, cases on the undisputed enforcement are submitted electronically and solved in written procedure. The increment of such cases are probably closely connected with activities of creditors` intensity.
We cannot find the main reason why pending cases older than 2 years are resolved more than in previous years. Representatives of courts point out the effect of Covid19 restrictions because many old cases were re-classified from oral to written procedure if it was possible and if parties of case agreed to that.

(2019): In 2018 there were several stages of court system reform. Several District courts were merged, and The Land Register offices appended to the District courts. Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – unresolved. The reform of the judiciary could also have affected the backlog of cases pending for more than 2 years, as it is undoubtedly that when transferring a backlog from one court to another, another judge needs extra time to go into the case file. However, the methodology for processing statistical data must also be taken into account, i.e. the functionality of the database, that the period of suspension of proceedings is taken into account during the proceedings and other external economic factors could have affected the number of long-standing civil cases. Taking into account also the peculiarities of litigation in our country, for example, that commercial cases are not separated from civil cases and that one civil case may contain several claims which are considered in one procedure, this generally means that the case takes longer to process.

(2018): In 2018 there were several stages of court system reform. Several District courts were merged, and The Land Register offices appended to the District courts. Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – unresolved.

(2017): Data updated after court reorganisation in 2018.

(2016): Data updated after court reorganisation in 2018.

(2014): Variations concerning administrative law cases over the period 2012-2014 are due to a change in the legislation. Namely, from July2012, appealed administrative decisions of institutions are handed to District courts.

(2013): Amendments to the Civil Procedure Law introduce new long-pending forms for insolvency cases such as judicial protection proceedings, insolvency proceedings for individuals, etc., whose proportion increased. The insolvency process begins with a court ruling but the case cannot be closed until the end of the insolvency process. Besides, quick pending cases have been transferred from courts to the Land Registry offices from January 2012. The micro-enterprise development opportunities have increased the number of long-pending insolvency cases in the court. From July 2012, appealed administrative decisions of institutions are handed to District courts.

(2012): Decreases in the values are due to external (socio-economic) and internal (court system) factors: the gradual exit from the economic crisis; transfer of the majority of the non-litigious civil cases (land registry, business registry and non-litigious enforcement cases) from first instance courts to the competent Land Registry Department; transfer of the appealed decisions against administrative authorities from the Administrative court to the Regional courts of general jurisdiction (thus, only cases of the special jurisdiction of the administrative courts are counted).

Lithuania

(2021): in 2021 July 1 the amendments to the Code of Administrative Misdemeanors entered into force, by which the cases of administrative offenses were transferred to be examined (except for the cases referred to in Article 614, paragraph 1, point 3) from district courts out of court to pre-trial institutions.
in 2021 in the district courts, there was a noticeable decrease in the number of civil cases examined by the first instance due to the bankruptcy of legal entities - 1,212 cases (1,624 in 2020, 2,787 in 2019). Compared to 2019, such cases decreased by more than half. It can be assumed that such a decrease in cases in this category could have been caused by the 2020 initiative adopted by the Council of Judges. The impact of the consequences of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) on Lithuania entered into force Law no. XIII-2861, which was temporarily (until December 2020 31) the initiation of the insolvency process was suspended. It is noteworthy that out of 1212 civil cases on bankruptcy of legal entities, which examined in 2021, the majority - 860 cases - were received by 2020.

(2020): "Pending non-litigious cases": general decrease of number of cases and application of administrative means.
The number of resolved civil and commercial litigious cases might have been affected by the pandemic as not all the categories of cases could have been adjudicated remotely. The number of administrative cases, sa well as for civil and commercial litigious cases could have decreased because of the need for some period to adapt IT and video conference equipment in the situation emerged. The increase of number of pending administrative cases older than 2 years is related to decisions of courts in environmental law cases to stay proceedings pending a decision in a related case, which will be a preliminary ruling in another case:legal entities are challenging a decision requiring them to pay a tax on the pollution of packaging waste from which they were exempted because they had concluded a contract for the organization of waste management. As the documents proving the waste management issued by the licensed recycler were canceled, the documents certifying the waste management of other entities were canceled, which obliged the entities (which had a contract with the waste manager to organize packaging waste management) to pay this fee. The cases are suspended and pending a decision in a case challenging a decision declaring waste management documents issued to applicants invalid because it will have a preliminary ruling in these cases.

(2019): In 2019 there is a downward trend in the backlog of incoming and resolved cases. At the end of the year, the backlog of pending cases at the district, county (I instance) and county administrative courts amounted to 29 898 cases, at the end of 2018 – 33 233 cases; at the end 2017 - 36 419 cases (10 percent less than in 2018 and 18 percent less than in 2017).
In 2019 the number of court order cases has decreased. This decrease may have been caused by the general decrease of debtors' natural persons in 2017–2019. According to the information provided by the credit bureau Creditinfo data, on 1st January 2020 there were 163 929 debtors (natural persons), on 1st January 2019 -177 055, on 1st January 2018 - 207 000 debtors (natural persons).
In 2018, the number of administrative cases received increased by 27.35% compared to 2017 (e.g. the number of cases concerning conditions and detention of prisoners, cases concerning the legal status of aliens have significantly increased) and this led to the growth in the number of pending cases at the end of 2018 (and to the beginning of the reference year 2019).
In 2019, compared to 2018, the number of administrative cases heard in regional administrative courts increased by 14 percent. The change in the increase was due to a 34 percent increase compared to 2018 in the number of applications for a local fee for the collection and treatment of municipal waste. In 2019 a further upward trend in tax cases, enforcement cases and arrest cases, but there has been a significant reduction in civil liability for damage caused by illegal actions by public authorities.
In 2019, as compared to 2018, the number of administrative misconduct cases investigated in district courts increased by 16 percent. The change was due to a 64 percent increase in the number of cases of administrative offenses related to transport and road transport (370-463 Articles of the Code of Administrative Offenses). In 2019 significantly increased the number of cases of driving under the influence of drugs, psychotropic or other psychoactive substances without driving license. The number of cases related to trade, the financial system and statistics has also increased.

(2018): The decrease in general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases (2.1.) may have been due to the overall decrease in debtors' natural persons in 2017 and 2018. The latter suggestion is based in data from the credit bureau Creditinfo (1 January, 2019 number of debtors natural persons was 177,055; 1 January - 207,000; 1 January, 2017 - 252 479). Credit Bureau “Creditinfo“ stores information about credit risk for businesses and private entities, forms the credit history and establishes credit ratings.
The decrease in "other non-litigious cases" (2.3.): civil cases in process of enforcement (execution) in all district courts was due to changes in the law that came into effect in 2017 July 1, on the basis of which the bailiff, rather than the court of first instance, is responsible for dealing with the succession in enforcement proceedings.
The decrease in "other cases" (4): administrative offence cases (including cases in process of enforcement (execution) in 2017-2018 period was due to to the entry into force of the Code of Administrative Offenses on 1 January, 2017 which left the handling of a large proportion of administrative misconduct and the imposition of penalties to various public administration entities (out of court). This could also be due to the expanded list of circumstances in which the person is not prosecuted under the Code of Administrative Offenses. The decrease in these cases was also influenced by the Amendments to the Criminal Code (on 1 January, 2017) that criminalized persons who drove a road vehicle or taught practical driving while under the influence of alcohol with more than 1.5 ounces of alcohol. In 2018, compared to 2017, the number of cases of administrative offences investigated in district courts decreased by 15.66%, compared to 2016, a decrease of 75.83%. Concerning administrative cases (3): in 2018, the number of cases received increased by 27.35% compared to 2017 (e.g. the number of cases concerning conditions and detention of prisoners, cases concerning the legal status of aliens have significantly increased) and this led to the growth in the number of pending cases at the end of the reference year.

(2017): Other non-litigious cases: civil cases in process of enforcement (execution).
Concerning the category “non-litigious cases” the number of pending cases on 1 January 2017 increased considerably compared to their number on 1 January 2016. The same increase characterises the categories “general civil and commercial non litigious cases” and “other non- litigious cases” (pending cases at the beginning of 2017). However, we can observe that at the end of 2017 the number of pending cases decreased concerning the category “non-litigious cases” and the sub-category “other non-litigious cases”. Only with regard to “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” the number of pending cases at the end of 2017 increased. We can see that these variations are the result of variations in the number of incoming cases for the period 2015-2017. Besides, as the numbers are small, variations appear important. The main reason for increased pending cases is the increased number of incoming other non-litigious civil cases, i.e. enforcement cases, in 2017. More precisely, in 2017, the number of civil cases in enforcement procedure – requests to change the recoverer, increased. There is no particular reason, besides the fact that some companies were buying the recoverers‘ rights from other natural persons or legal entities.
As regards the category "other cases", it refers to cases of administrative offences and cases of administrative offences in process of enforcement (execution). Following the entry into force of a new Code of Administrative Offence (1 January 2017), the number of incoming cases of administrative offences decreased. The decrease in the number of incoming administrative law cases in 2017 is explained by the increased number of incoming administrative cases in previous years (due to the decisions of the Constitutional Court).
Registry cases cannot be identified among the overall number of general civil cases.
Administrative law cases: courts received less administrative cases; they are fighting backlogs from previous years.

(2016): Administrative law cases - courts are fighting backlogs. This led to the growth in the number of resolved cases and consequently to the decrease in the number of pending cases 31 December 2016.
Other non-litigious cases: civil cases in process of enforcement (execution). The increased number of these incoming cases also results in the increase of number of incoming non-litigious cases. The number of increased incoming other non-litigious cases (enforcement) may be due to the number of the resolved civil cases in 2015 (the number of pending cases on 1 January 2016 decreased). As regards registry cases: the answer should be NA, the NAP was chosen for the calculation purposes: it is not possible to identify those cases among all other general civil cases.

(2015): Civil and commercial non-litigious cases include court orders

Category "other" includes: Cases of administrative offences and cases of administrative offences in process of enforcement (execution).

(2014): The number of incoming administrative cases increased which affected the total. They were mostly cases on remuneration of public servants due to the decision of the Constitutional Court declaring the laws on the reduction of the remuneration of State servants and judges unconstitutional. For the same reason, the number of cases of administrative offence (in execution process) increased, which affected the category "other". As to the significant decrease in the number of general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases (pending 31 Dec) in 2014, civil cases on deliver of judicial orders are resolved quickly and such residues are normal.

Luxembourg

(2021): The comment provided for 2020 data remains relevant in respect of cases pending at the end of 2020. It should be recalled that since the law of 27 July 2018 establishing the Judge for family law litigation (JAF), which came into force on 1.11. 2018, cases under the jurisdiction of the JAF are included in the category "civil litigious cases". These are cases previously dealt with by the civil chambers, but also cases dealt with by the youth and guardianship court (e.g., cases relating to parental responsibility with regard to a natural child or a child whose parents are divorced) or at the level of the justice of the peace (maintenance cases). Moreover, it can be observed that the number of incoming cases in these matters has increased since they are within the JAF competence. This is explained by the simplification of the access to justice for the litigant, who, in procedures other than divorce, can refer to the JAF by a simple letter; by the emergence of cases on the basis of new legal provisions (e.g., application by the minor); and by all the litigation generated by the new legal provision establishing the institution of generalized joint parental authority. Moreover, since proceedings before the JAF take much less time than before the reform introducing the JAF, motions to modify decisions taken are filed more quickly and thus increase the volume of cases.

(2020): "The law of July 27, 2018 establishing the family court judge (JAF) went into effect on 1.11. 2018. The cases currently under the jurisdiction of the JAF were included for the first time in the category "contentious civil cases" for the year 2020 which explains the observed increases in the number of new, completed and pending cases compared to the previous data. These are cases previously handled by the civil chambers, but also cases handled by the juvenile and guardianship court (e.g., parental responsibility cases involving a natural child or a child whose parents are divorced) or at the justice of the peace level (alimony cases). In addition, there has been an increase in the number of new cases in these areas since they were handled by the Family Court. This fact can be explained by the simplification of access to justice for the litigant, who, in procedures other than divorce, can refer to the JAF by a simple letter, by the emergence of cases based on new legal provisions (e.g. request emanating from the minor) and by all the litigation generated by the new legal provision of the institution of a generalized joint parental authority? Moreover, since proceedings before the JAF take much less time than proceedings before the introduction of the JAF law, motions to modify decisions are filed more quickly and thus increase the volume of cases.
Including JAF cases, for 2019, new cases would be 7,626 (up from 5,038) while completed cases were 6,714 (up from 5,098).
Including JAF cases, for 2018, 91.1 new cases would be 5,248 (up from 4,807) while completed cases were 4,905(up from 4,857).
Regarding pending cases in 2018, at the end of the years JAF cases constituted a plus of 453, which corresponds to 1,649 pending cases at the end of the 2018 period in item 91.1. instead of the 1,256 cases informed. Taking into account horizontal consistency, the changes in new and completed cases discussed above, imply that at the end of the 2019 period, pending cases (91.1) totaled 2,561 (instead of 1,196).
The figures for previous years remain unchanged.
""Other non-contentious cases"" pending at year-end: Due to containment during the COVID-19 pandemic the number of public hearings was reduced to a minimum, allowing courts to prioritize work on cases not requiring such hearings. In addition, special crisis legislation allowed cases to be taken under advisement without a public hearing, with the agreement of the parties.
"

(2018): The pending cases at the date of 31/12/2017 had to be adapted, since there were 27 cases of vacation court, which were no longer pending at the end of the year. These 27 cases were withdrawn from the 1,341 pending cases indicated in the Scoreboard 2017 to reach 1,314 other pending non-litigious cases on 01/01/2018.

(2016): For question 91.1 the new data collection system revealed a higher number of pending cases, previously not considered by those in charge of counting.
For question 91.2.2, the new data collection system provides now information on other non-litigious cases, previously unavailable.

(2015): The figures given (with the exception of those for the administrative court) are those of the two district courts (Luxembourg and Diekirch).

The three justices of the peace totalized 78.273 national as well as 285 European payment orders.

(2014): The data (except for the Administrative Court) are those of the district courts. Uniform statistical data for both types of courts are not yet available. The three justices of peace ruled 75 411 national payment orders, 260 european payment orders and resolved a total of 6386 cases for a total of 65840 new cases. The implementation of statistics counters for civil and commercial cases resulted in variations. The applied criteria have been refined and give a more accurate image.

(2013): Data concerns (except for the Administrative Court) district courts. Uniform statistical data for both types of courts (district courts and justice of peace) are not yet available. The District Court of Diekirch rendered 580 decisions and registered 664 new cases. The three justices of peace ruled 69 859 payment orders and resolved a total of 5 682 cases for a total of 6 508 new cases. The increase in the number of civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases between 2010 and 2013 is partly explained by the establishment in 2011 of the judiciary statistics office. The increase in the number of administrative law cases mainly stems from the increase in the asylum-related disputes.

(2012): The data provided (except for the Administrative Court) are those of the district courts. Uniform statistical data for both types of courts (district courts and justice of peace) are not yet available. The District Court of Diekirch rendered 591 decisions and registered 688 new cases. The three justices of peace ruled 63 651 payment orders and resolved a total of 8041 cases for a total of 9310 new cases. The 2012 data encompasses civil and commercial cases of both district tribunals (Luxembourg and Diekirch).

Malta

(General Comment): The vast majority of cases heard before the courts of Malta are litigious cases. Nevertheless, there is the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction which deals with adoptions, appointment of tutor, curators and other administrators, interdiction and incapacitation and opening of secret wills.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the efficiency data are mainly derived from discrepancies in data inputting methodology. Data is also collected at a particular point in time and this means that eventual changes are not captured at the time of the submission of this information.

(2021): As from 2021, the civil litigious category includes the data of the Civil Court (Asset Recovery Section) that was established in 2021. A spike in the incoming caseload of civil litigious cases has resulted in the courts not managing to resolve enough cases in order to retain the previous levels of efficiency, despite a marginal increase in the number of resolved cases.

(2020): The lack of horizontal consistency results from recounts that happen throughout the year, and that ensure that the data is always as up to date as possible. However when taken as a global figure, horizontal consistency might then be lost.

(2019): Non litigious cases - incoming cases: The data was provided by the case managment system of the Court Services Agency and shows an increase in the incoming caseload of these cases over that of the previous year.
Non litigious cases - pending cases at the end of the reference year: The relative high number of pending cases at the end of the year compared by the previous year is the result of the increase of incoming cases but a retention in the number of resolved cases. As a result, efficiency, as expressed as a higher number of pending cases, has suffered.

(2018): This evaluation cycle contains for the first time the efficiency data of the First Hall, Commercial Section which is a new court established in April 2018. Furthermore there was a registered increase in the incoming caseload particularly of the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction and in cases of dissolution of marriage.
The lack of horizontal consistency results from recounts that happen throughout the year, and that ensure that the data is always as up to date as possible. However when taken as a global figure, horizontal consistency might then be lost.

(2017): Apart from the provision of the new non-litigious data captured by sub-section 2.1 above, this year we also introduced the data for another civil, litigious court, namely, the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction, established by the Civil Courts (Establishment of Sections) Order 2003, in terms of Art 2 of the Code of Organisation and Civil Procedure (Chp 12 of the Laws of Malta). The Court has jurisdiction to deal with, amongst other matters, applications related to adoptions, interdictions and incapacitations, matters related to wills and to trusts, and to specific cases falling under the Foster Care Act (Chp 491 of the laws of Malta).
As concerns pending cases at the beginning of the year, information is not available for the newly provided data, namely data from the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction and the non-litigious data. These data will be available for the next cycle. Increases observed between 2016 and 2017 in the total of incoming and resolved cases result from the fact that new data has been added (data on non-litigious cases and data from the Court of Voluntary Jurisdiction).

(2016): Horizontal consistency: This is a problem encountered also in previous evaluations. Unfortunately this inconsistency results from the way that the data is logged, and it is practically impossible to resolve it at present. Concerning the variations between cycles: In reality, in 2015 the Administrative Review Tribunal worked real hard to reduce the pending caseload and also resolved one set of interrelated cases that translated in the conclusion of about 150 separate cases. So 2015 was a very good year in which the efficiency parameters of the Tribunal spiked. In 2016, the rhythm by which cases were being resolved went back to 2014 figures, hence the apparent decrease in the number of resolved cases between 2015 and 2016. The reduction in the pending caseload is also the result of the additional 150 odd cases that were resolved in 2015 and that dramatically reduced the pending caseload for good, even if the resolved caseload of 2016 was less than that of 2015. Concerning Administrative cases: These figures reflect the pending balance at the beginning of 2016. Throughout 2015, the Tribunal resolved one batch of related cases that resulted in a drop in the number of pending cases and a spike in the number of resolved cases.

(2014): The category “civil litigious cases” covers family mediation cases and cases before the Court of revision of notarial acts and the Small Claims Tribunal. In 2014, another magistrate started presiding over the Administrative Review Tribunal thereby increasing the judicial complement by 2 members. This change resulted in an increase in the number of resolved cases. Following an internal exercise carried out by the Court Administration, cases that have been prescribed, have been cleaned from the system.

(2013): In 2013, the number of administrative law cases continued increasing. The Administrative Court was created in 2010. Over the time, the number of areas of competence of the Administrative Court has increased, which resulted in an increased caseload.

(2012): The Administrative Court was set up in late 2010, as a result of which, figure given in the previous report reflected the operation of the Court over a couple of months only. For 2012, the communicated figures reflect the operation of the Court over a twelve month period.

Netherlands

(General Comment): In the Netherlands, some registers are kept by the judiciary. Those do not include a land- or business registry, see www.rechtspraak.nl/registers. Most registers are related to debt, bankruptcy and help or surveillance of people who are unable to handle their financial situations. Also, there is a register with ‘nevenfuncties’ (jobs and positions held by judges next to their judgeship). Mutations in these registers are not counted as court cases. The Dutch system does not count mutations in the registers as court cases, so ‘other registry cases’ is NAP.

(2021): In previous years, we were able to produce the number of incoming and pending cases for categories 1, 2 and 2.1, but not this year. The Judiciary has decided on a different norm for one of the components needed for this number, so these numbers are no longer available.

(2020): Administrative law cases include tax cases and immigration / asylum cases.
First instance cases at Council of State, Court of Appeal, including trade tribunal, are excluded.
In the Netherlands, there are some registers that are kept by the judiciary. Those do not include a land- or business registry, see www.rechtspraak.nl/registers. Most registers are related to debt, bankruptcy and help or surveillance of people who are unable to handle their financial situation. There is also a register with so-called ‘nevenfuncties’ (a list of jobs and positions held by judges next to their judgeship). Mutations in these registers are not counted as court cases. For the category ‘other registry cases’ the answer is NAP, as the Dutch system does not count mutations in the registers as court cases.

(2019): In The Netherlands, there are some registers which are kept by the judiciary. These do not include a land- or business registry (see www.rechtspraak.nl/registers). Most registers are related to debt, bankruptcy and help or surveillance of people who are unable to handle their financial situation. There is also a register with so-called 'nevenfuncties' (a list of jobs and positions held by judges next to their judgeship). Mutations in these registers are not counted as court cases. For the category 'other registry cases', the answer is NAP, as the Dutch system does not count mutations in the registers as court cases.

(2018): In the Netherlands, there are some registers that are kept by the judiciary. Those do not include a land- of business registry. See: https://www.rechtspraak.nl/Registers
Most registers are related to debt, bankruptcy and help or surveillance of people that are unable to handle their financial situation. There is also a register of ‘nevenfuncties’, which lists all the jobs/positions that judges fulfill next to being a judge. Mutations in these registers are not counted as court cases. For the category "other registry cases", since the Dutch system does not count mutations in the registers as court cases, the answer is NAP.

(2017): None

(2016): Number of administrative law cases litigious plus non-litigious.
In 2016, there has been a strong decrease in numbers of cases compared to 2014. This decrease pertains to the group of misdemeanours, in particular the group of traffic offences ("Mulder Law"). The cases of "vorderingen dwangsom" (coercive detainment) are no longer treated by the Public Prosecution. This following complaints at the Ombudsman. These coercive detainment cases increased at first strongly in 2013 and 2014. But after that decision of the Public Prosecution The "Mulder Law" cases decreased from 200.000 in 2014, via 100.000 in 2015 to 40.000 in 2016.

Poland

(2021): * administrative law cases - It is difficult to identify, apart from the COVID-19 pandemic, any particular reason for the increase in the number of cases brought before provincial administrative courts. A particularly large increase in the number of cases submitted to administrative courts concerned complaints about the inaction of public administration bodies and the protracted conduct of proceedings by these bodies. The increase in the receipt of such complaints in 2021 was 73.2 % compared to 2020. This may also be indicative of some backlog in public administration due to the numerous pandemic restrictions in 2020.

(2020): Comments: The discrepancies in Table 91. First instance courts: number of other than criminal law cases - compared to the previous periods (2018 and 2019) are mainly due to combinations of two reasons. First - the COVID19 pandemic, which significantly reduced case inflow to the courts (in some type of cases even by several dozen of percent), reduced the number of resolved cases and pendig cases as well. The second factor, which in contrary - caused increase in the volume of cases registered in court system was the inflow of cases related with conversion of the right of perpetual use of built-up land for residential purposes into land ownership (2.2.1 - Non litigious land registry cases). In 2020, there were more than a million incoming cases of this type (in 2019 – more than 2,5 million), which also resulted in an increase in the number of resolved cases in this area, as well as pending cases for the next reporting period.
Administrative law cases: the main reason for the slight slowdown in casework was the pandemic.

(2019): The discrepancies in section 4.2.2. Case flow management - first instance - compared to the previous period mainly concern the data shown in point 2.2.1 Non-litigious land registry cases.
In explaining the above, it should be emphasized that the general state of cases in courts of first instance in 2019 was related to cases brought to the land registry departments with regard to the conversion of the right of perpetual use of built-up land for residential purposes into land ownership. In 2019, more than 2 million incoming cases of this type, which also resulted in an increase in the number of resolved cases in this area, as well as pending cases for the next reporting period.
It should be noted that after excluding from the analysis all cases considered in Land Registry Departments, the impact of cases and settlements in 2019 were almost at the same level as in the previous year.

(2018): The discrepancy between 2016 and 2018 was realised in 2017 due to the increasing number of mostly non-litigious cases. More details in 2017 data.
Number of pending cases in the category 2.1. General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases has dropped slightly. That situation is caused by high effectiveness of courts. Number of resolved cases is higher than number of incoming cases. That situation has maintained since 2017.
Higher number of pending cases in Non-litigious business registry cases is temporary and it is a result of higher number of initiated compulsory proceedings. If it is ascertained that the application for entry in the Register or compulsory documents have not been submitted despite expiry of the deadline, the registry court shall call on the obliged parties to submit them.
We observed that the effectiveness of courts has increased and therefore number of pending cases in mentioned category has dropped at the end of the year.
In regard to non litigious land registry cases we observe in Divisions of Land and Mortgage higher staff turnover. It contributes to problems with solving cases, therefore number of pending cases has increased.
In regard to "other" cases we have observed significant increasing of incoming cases without specified category. In this category we include following cases: exemption from costs, reconstruction of files, affidavit of assets, excluding judge etc.
Higher number of pending cases on 31 Dec. is a consequence of high number of in incoming cases during the year. It was probably temporary situation.

(2017): As to a general explanation for discrepancies in 2016 to 2017 data, it has to be stated that in 2016, there was a substantial number of incoming non-litigious cases, mostly general civil cases, but also registry cases (around 700k cases total).
This important number of cases was not resolved and the backlog remained important at the end of the year. This could explain the large difference of pending cases between 1 Jan 2016 and 1 Jan 2017.

2.1. In 2016 there were serious problems with the information system which is in use in electronic proceedings therefore the number of pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year has increased. In 2017 we did not notice any problems with mentioned system, so the number of resolved cases has increased significantly. At the same reason the number of pending cases on 31 Dec. 2017 has dropped.
We indicate that fluctuation of the number of cases can be also caused by implemented organizational changes in courts (changes in staff, changes in the organization of work). 2.2. Registry cases (2.2.1+2.2.2+2.2.3) discrepancies are justified in points 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.
2.2.1. Non litigious land registry cases. Higher number of pending cases (on 1 Jan. ref. year and on 31 Dec. ref. year) is caused by Higher number of incoming cases than resolved cases. This situation is related to large-scale investments in infrastructure in Poland Building new roads is closely connected with changes in land registry. We need to indicate that courts have to cope with large number of difficult cases. (Mentioned reason is related to resolved / incoming cases)
2.2.2. Within the changes in business registry cases we can observe significant increase in all types of Application for registration
(first registration) cases, but there is also considerable increase in general business cases (changes in the registry, including cases of
removing from registry). We indicate that it could be caused by fluctuation in compulsory proceedings. Mentioned proceedings are carried on in the cases where it is found that an application for an entry in the National Court Register or the documents whose submission is obligatory were not submitted despite the lapse of the time limit. The registry court shall summon the obliged persons to submit them, and shall set an additional 7-day time limit. We emphasize, that the registry court shall discontinue the compulsory proceedings, if it can be concluded from the circumstances of the case that the proceedings will not lead to the fulfilment of the mentioned obligation. (Mentioned reason is related to resolved / incoming and pending cases)
2.2.3. and 2.3. - Categories do not exist in our judicial system.

(2016): Within the changes in business registry cases we can observe significant increse in all types of Application for registration (first registration) cases, but there is also considerable increse in general business cases (changes in the registry, including cases of removing from registry).
In 2016 there were serious problems with the information system which is in use in electronic proceedings therefore the number of pending cases had incresed.

Portugal

(General Comment): The question 91_1 "Civil (and commercial) litigious cases", includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases.

(2021): The increase in the number of cases resolved on 1 January 2021 should be contextualised, in our view, within the framework of the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent confinement, with a reflection on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.

(2020): The decrease in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases reflects the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent lockdown, that had an impact on the functioning of the courts, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services have been interrupted or conditioned.
On 1 September 2013, the new Code of civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigma, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly – those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. This new model, which enables a new way of organizing tasks, of work monitoring ando f differentiating responsabilities is provided for in Article 551, paragraph 5 of the new Code of Civil Procedure. This new system follows more closely the current model in other countries and, without prejudice to the specificities of each planning and method of statistical production, will facilitate the future approach to a comparision of the Portuguese system with that of other countries. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still ongoingaimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. Since is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases fot the year 2020 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2020: 521224; Incoming cases: 96047; Resolved cases: 159616; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2020: 457655. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2020, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma.
For this reason, the alerts and notes transmitted in previous years with regard to comparisons between countries still remain. A comparative Reading of these values must, as we have repeatedly drawn attention, be very cautious, refraining from any comparison in terms of volume or duration of cases and should be limited to the evaluation of the development indicators.
In the scope of Working Group within the Ministry of Justice that monitors the development of the procedural processing system of the 1st instance judicial courts (Citius System), work is underway to implement the mechanism in question, in order to allow for autonomous accounting of cases that are awaiting the performance of an act that falls within the competence of the registry or the judge. At the moment, it is not yet possible to estimate a date for the conclusion of the work. The question 91_3 “Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases. The number of Pending cases on 1 Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 44542. The number Incoming cases that correspond only to taxcases is 44329. The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 48704. The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. That correspond only to tax cases is 40167. In what concerns this typ of cases, in 2020 there were 68,467 new cases and 73,880 completed cases. However, of these totals, only 20,731 new cases and 26,144 completed cases corresponded to real movements of the beginning and end of cases. The remaining 47,736 cases refer to cases that were internally transferred between units, namely due to the establishment of specialised courts in September 2020 (which are not independent legal entities), or that were subject to changes in the subject matter. Considering that in 2020 the number of cases transferred between organizational units was very high in the 1st instance administrative and tax courts, for this cycle we indicated in the table only the numbers of cases opened and closed, without including transferred cases. In previous editions, the figures included transferred cases, which could impair the comparative reading.

(2019): 91.1 The decrease of the number of pending cases older than 2 years follows the general trend of decrease of pending cases for this category. There were no legislative changes that can explain this decrease.

(2018): The question 91_1 “Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases.
On 1 September 2013, the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigm, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly - those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. This new model, which enables a new way of organizing tasks, of work monitoring and of differentiating responsibilities is provided for in Article 551, paragraph 5 of the new Code of Civil Procedure. This new system follows more closely the current model in other countries and, without prejudice to the specificities of each planning and method of statistical production, will facilitate the future approach to a comparison of the Portuguese system with that of other countries. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still ongoing aimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. Since is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2018 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2018 700.638; Incoming cases:127.646; Resolved cases:222.480; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2018: 605.804 This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2018, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma.
For this reason, the alerts and notes transmitted in previous years with regard to comparisons between countries still remain. A comparative reading of these values must, as we have repeatedly drawn attention, be very cautious, refraining from any comparison in terms of volume or duration of cases and should be limited to the evaluation of the development indicators.
The question 91_3 ”Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.
The number of Pending cases on 1Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 47931
The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 14895
The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 16828
The number of pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 45998
91.1 Due to increased efficiency of first instance courts, we can notice for the last several cycles a down-word trend in respect of the number of pending cases, namely civil and commercial litigious cases

(2017): Q 91.1 - the decrease of pending cases older than 2 years can be explained by the global decrease of theses cases. There were no legislative changes that could explain this decrease.
The question 91_1 “Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases.
On 1 September 2013, the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigm, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly - those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. This new model, which enables a new way of organizing tasks, of work monitoring and of differentiating responsibilities is provided for in Article 551, paragraph 5 of the new Code of Civil Procedure. This new system follows more closely the current model in other countries and, without prejudice to the specificities of each planning and method of statistical production, will facilitate the future approach to a comparison of the Portuguese system with that of other countries. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still ongoing aimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. Since is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred above (the technical work is still on going), the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The number of enforcement cases for the year 2017 are: Pending cases on 1 Jan. 2017: 804.423; Incoming cases: 148.713; Resolved cases: 249.837; Pending cases on 31 Dec. 2017: 703.299. This numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2017, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma.
For this reason, the alerts and notes transmitted in previous years with regard to comparisons between countries still remain. A comparative reading of these values must, as we have repeatedly drawn attention, be very cautious, refraining from any comparison in terms of volume or duration of cases and should be limited to the evaluation of the development indicators.
The question 91_3 ”Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.
The number of Pending cases on 1Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 49.943
The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 14.707
The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 16.811
The number of pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 47.839

(2016): " Item 91-1 “Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”, includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. On 1 September 2013, the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigm, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly - those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. This new model, which enables a new way of organizing tasks, of work monitoring and of differentiating responsibilities is provided for in Article 551, paragraph 5 of the new Code of Civil Procedure. This new system follows more closely the current model in other countries and, without prejudice to the specificities of each planning and method of statistical production, will facilitate the future approach to a comparison of the Portuguese system with that of other countries. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still on-going aimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. Since is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred above, the data does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. The data on enforcement cases for the year 2016 is: pending cases on 1 Jan. 2016: 934.860; incoming cases: 158.164; resolved cases: 289.402; pending cases on 31 Dec. 2016: 803.622. These numbers correspond to the total number of existing procedures in Portugal in 2016, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma. For this reason, the alerts and notes transmitted in previous years with regard to comparisons between countries still remain. A comparative reading of these values must, as we have repeatedly drawn attention, be very cautious, refraining from any comparison in terms of volume or duration of cases and should be limited to the evaluation of the development indicators. Item 91_3 ”Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases. The separate data on tax cases is as follows: pending cases on 1Jan. - 53.597; incoming cases - 16.445; resolved cases - 20.222; pending cases on 31 Dec. - 49.820. Regarding the decrease in the number of incoming administrative law cases, it results from the decrease in the number of incoming tax law cases, in particular in what concerns misdemeanour appeals".

(2015): The category “civil (and commercial) litigious cases” includes the case-flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice. It does not include civil and labour enforcement cases. On 1 September 2013, the new Code of Civil Procedure entered into force, establishing a new regime for the enforcement action in Portugal, based on a new paradigm, which states that the processes that run in court must stand out clearly - those who are dependent on the commission of an act of the judge or the secretary – from those who run out of court. From a statistical point of view, this new model has not yet however been reflected in numbers, as work is still ongoing aimed at demarcating the procedures that are in court, waiting for an act, from those that are being handled by other entities. It is not yet possible to provide figures that reflect the amount of work taken on by the courts as referred in that table. Just for information, the data on the total number of existing enforcement procedures in Portugal in 2015, following the existing model prior to the entry into force of the said legal diploma is the following: pending cases on 1 Jan. 2015: 1.000.446; incoming cases: 199.359; resolved cases: 272.191; pending cases on 31 Dec. 2015: 927.614.
The category “administrative law cases” includes administrative and tax cases. The separate data on tax cases is the following: pending cases on 1Jan - 47.866; incoming cases - 24.808; resolved cases - 19.164; pending cases on 31 Dec. - 53.510.

(2014): For 2014, data are not available due to technical constraints.

(2013): Portugal took important measures in order to improve the courts clearance rate and backlogs which resulted in an increased number of resolved non-criminal and enforcement cases. Some measures were focused primarily on enforcement cases, since they represent 70% of the total of pending cases. For example, the government adopted measures with the purpose to eliminate cases where there are no assets to execute or no procedural momentum, as well as measures with the aim to limit the number of incoming cases, establishing initial court fees. Courts with excessive number of pending cases were subject to particular assistance of specialized teams.

(2012): As for the number of incoming non-criminal and enforcement cases, the 2012 data reflect the effects of the entry into force of Decree 113-A/2011, which proceeded to a major judiciary reorganization. The figures reflect the corresponding movement of cases between organizational units. As a result, in 2012, a higher number of cases that have not entered ex novo in the Portuguese courts were taken into account. These cases have ended in the unit/court where they left and entered into the new courts where they were transferred.

Romania

(General Comment): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.

(2021): As presented in the comments to the data communicated in the previous CEPEJ cycle, the measures taken in the pandemic period led to an increase in the stock of cases, that explain the number of pending cases on Jan 1st and also some of the values of the pending cases in courts for 2 years. At the same time, as shown in some of the data on resolved cases, although the stock at the beginning of 2021 was considerable by the enhanced activity the number of resolved cases increased

(2020): The decrease in the number of resolved cases in 2020 was caused by the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. The activity of al the courts was partially suspended between the 15-th of March until the end of May 2020 because a state of emergency was declared. During that period only few urgent cases were adjudicated. Some courts instituted preventive mesures even before the 15-th of March 2020 which included postponing non-urgent cases. After the state of emergency ended there were still in place measures that affected the normal activity of the courts like: the introduction of specific timeframes for each case, hearings through video conference, a strict limitation of human interaction at the auxiliary compartments of the courts that dealt directly with public like the Archive and the Registry office, so that requests and documents had to be submitted by post, fax or e-mail. These measures affected not only the court staff but all court users that had to adapt to the new circumstances and led to the postponement of many cases. There were also gaps in activity caused by cases of Covid-19 among the personnel of the courts. The same explanation is valid for the increased Disposition time which led to an increased numer of pending cases older than 3 years.

(2019): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
Referring to the non-litigious business registry cases,the differences in the statistical data are given by the dynamics in the business environment and the interactions at economic level and do not relate to any manifestation at the level of public authority. By referring to total requests that are the object of registration in the trade register, the influence is insignificant.
Referring to the administartive cases, the decrease in the number of pending cases in administrative matters can be determined by aspects such as: certain types of cases that have been exhausted before courts (e.g cases on salary rights of public servants initiated in 2010) or cases such as those on pollution taxes that were mostly exhausted before courts and for which administrative procedures have been expressly regulated as to discharge the huge workload in courts that they have generated. In terms of incoming administrative cases, when referring to a decrease in their number, similar reasons that justify the decrease in the number of pending administrative cases should be taken into consideration, namely, for example, those referring to the administrative procedures that have been expressly regulated as to discharge the huge workload in courts (e.g. regarding to the cases on pollution taxes). There is no particular explanation on the increased number of general civil and commercial non-litigious cases in 2019, resulting in a slight decrease of the CR for this category. However, it should be noticed that the operatitivity and volume of solved cases has increased.

(2018): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
Referring to the non-litigious business registry cases,the differences in the statistical data are given by the dynamics in the business environment and the interactions at economic level and do not relate to any manifestation at the level of public authority. By referring to total requests that are the object of registration in the trade register, the influence is insignificant.
Referring to the administartive cases, the decrease in the number of pending cases in administrative matters can be determined by aspects such as: certain types of cases that have been exhausted before courts (e.g cases on salary rights of public servants initiated in 2010) or cases such as those on pollution taxes that were mostly exhausted before courts and for which administrative procedures have been expressly regulated as to discharge the huge workload in courts that they have generated. In terms of incoming administrative cases, when referring to a decrease in their number, similar reasons that justify the decrease in the number of pending administrative cases should be taken into consideration, namely, for example, those referring to the administrative procedures that have been expressly regulated as to discharge the huge workload in courts (e.g. regarding to the cases on pollution taxes).

(2017): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
“Administrative law cases”: indeed, the data are correct, namely there is a significant increase in the number of incoming cases in 2017 that could be explained by the changes brought in 2013 to the Law no. 554/2004 of administrative litigations; the amendments resulted in a high number of second appeals in this matter (by number of second appeals we understand all second appeals under the competence of both the Supreme Court (High Court of Cassation and Justice) and of the courts of appeal, because in this matter some of the cases shall be judged in first instance by tribunals and others by the courts of appeals).

(2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
The high clearance rate of administrative cases in previous cycles has led to lower significantly the number pending cases. The increase of the number of incoming cases is a consequence of a higher number of requests filed in administrative domain that also triggers an increase in the number of resolved cases. The decrease in the number of non-litigious pending cases as well as "other" pending cases is mostly due to lower number of incomming ases.

(2014): By the decision n° 46/2012, the Superior Council of Magistracy has decided that all the courts will implement by 1 January 2014 the IT system of collecting data. The new method is based on new definitions of the indicators. Accordingly, a case is transferred from the field “stocks” to the field “closed” only when the final decision, including its reasoning is drafted signed and communicated to the parties. For that reason, the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 cannot be identical with the number of pending cases on 1st January 2014.
The initial total number of pending cases has increased as a result of reporting the data into Ecris database. The number of incoming cases and this of resolved cases are comparable from one year to another for the period 2010-2013. The stocks at the end of the period is in relation to the adjustment of the stocks at the beginning of the period, but comparable with 2012. Concerning the number of administrative law cases the workload has constantly decreased starting with 2012. The increase of stocks initially communicated for 2013 comes from the high number of incoming cases in 2012. The final stock of 2014 is lower also because of the lower number of the new cases in 2013. It may also be noticed that the new cases closed in 2013 was higher than in 2012. The high decrease in the number of incoming, resolved and pending administrative law cases on 31 December between 2013 and 2014 is progressive and is caused by the social climate.

(2013): With regard to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, because of the delays between hearings that are often very long (usually the first hearing is determined by an electronic system after a long period of time, in relation with the actual workload of judges), the new entered files are not usually finalised within a year.
With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, all the indicators kept a growing trend in 2012 and 2013. As for the stock of files (pending on 31.12), the increase between 2012 and 2013 is due to the fact that during the same period the number of resolved files has also decreased.
As to the trends observed in 2013 in respect of the “non-litigious enforcement cases” and “non-litigious land registry cases”, data are correct.
As to the category “administrative law cases”, the big differences have always been a reason for concern and continuous analysis. In the report on the status of Judiciary on 2012, it was noted that “in the administrative contentious and fiscal matters, the most of the cases were related to the restitution of the tax for pollution, but also to the obligation of the authorities to register the vehicles, without the payment of the tax for pollution (obligation to perform)”. It should be mentioned that the actions of the legislative have led to the growth of the number of administrative cases in the past 5 years, at tribunals with more than 400% and at the courts of appeal with around 200%.

(2012): With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, all the indicators kept a growing trend in 2012.
As to the category “administrative law cases”, the big differences have always been a reason for concern and continuous analysis. In the report on the status of Judiciary on 2012, it was noted that “in the administrative contentious and fiscal matters, the most of the cases were related to the restitution of the tax for pollution, but also to the obligation of the authorities to register vehicles, without the payment of the tax for pollution (obligation to perform)”. It should be mentioned that the actions of the legislative have led to the growth of the number of administrative cases to be solved in the past 5 years, at tribunals with more than 400% and at the courts of appeal with around 200%.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): For 2016 data, new methodology was implemented based on the working group's conclusions and CEPEJ mission's recommendation (06/2016). Former reporting structure was not consistent with the methodology of CEPEJ, which could lead to inappropriate comparison of Slovak Republic (SR) with other countries. Also, the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) realized that evaluation of courts' performance by disposed and unresolved (decided and undecided) cases is discriminating SR in comparison with other countries in European Union (EU) as this methodology is not counting a decision of first instance court as disposed until the case becomes valid. This results into reporting such case as unresolved despite respective court has already made a decision and it is no longer in its disposition how - and more importantly when - the case will be resolved (disposed) by the second instance court. This is the nature of reporting of many "unresolved" cases on courts despite court already decided, in fact. Newly proposed way of reporting extracts the numbers of decided cases in respective court instances from "unresolved" and allocates these numbers to those court instances that made an actual decision in respective time. This means that decision validity state is not being awaited for as it could potentially contain an appeal and thus also a time that a case spends on second instance court. Upon decision's validity the case would become „disposed/resolved" at the first instance court but most probably it would not be disposed in the same period when it was decided by the (first instance) court. This past methodology (applied by 2016) resulted (visually) in accumulation of unresolved cases while some of them were already decided by first instance court.

(2021): An erroneous reporting of decided cases at the courts in 2020 had to be corrected in Pending cases at 1st January 2021 by 1128 cases (line 2. and Total of other than criminal law cases).
2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases - the increase in cases comming to the courts in 2019 due to the new legislation gradually stabilized over the course of the year 2020, 2021.
The category "other" encompasses bankruptcy and debt restructuring cases, including the debt elimination procedure (bankruptcy of the natural persons),inheritance proceedings and other. In covid years especialy the number of cases inheritance proceedings rose.
3. Administrative law cases - new reform of Administrative courts was expected and the clearance rate of the regional courts dropted to 80 %.

(2020): Exolanation of the discrepancies:
In the category 2.2.3. Other registry cases was added register "RPVS" - Register of public sector partners. The Register of public sector partners has the character of a register of legal and natural persons, which receives from the state, local-government and other public sector entities public financing or property above the limit specified by law. The persons who conclude a contract, framework agreement or concession contract pursuant to public procurement regulations, healthcare providers and so on. The classification of the registry in category 2.2.3. was consulted with CEPEJ organization.
In the category 2.2.2 and consequently in the category 2.2. - at the end of year 2019, the incoming cases into the business register was enormously increased due to new applied legislation, which caused high level of the pending cases at the beginning of the year 2020.
Administrative law cases - keeps the high level of pending cases.
Non-litigious business registry cases - the cause of the increase is explained below:
The Commercial Code (Act No. 513/1991 Coll) was amended by the Act No. 390/2019 Coll, which became effective from the 1st of October 2020. This amendment brought following changes (also changes to the Commercial register):
1.From October 1, 2020, it is possible to submit an application for registration of data in the Commercial Register only in electronic form (including objections to the refusal of registration)
2.Obligation of the company´s founders to submit the consent of the real-estate owner to setting up a registered seat of the company with verified signature of the owner.
3.The list of the information is being expanded in order to identify these persons more precisely. In the case of natural persons, a date of birth and a birth number must be given, if it was assigned. In the case of legal persons, their registration number must be given. The existing companies are required to complete this information by September 30, 2021.
4.The amendment also covers one of the reasons why the court is entitled to dissolve a company without liquidation. It is a breach of the obligation filing the financial statement into the collection of deeds within the specified period of 9 months from its preparation. This means, that if a company doesn't deposit this financial statement in the collection of documents within 15 months from its preparation, the registry court will decide on its dissolution without a proposal.
The other discrepancies are mainly caused by the situation in 2020 due to Covid-19 pamdemic situation.
The emergency situation due to COVID 19 has been ongoing since March 2020. Since then, hearings have been held to the necessary extent, which is determined by a decree of the Ministry of Justice. The decree was amended 4 times according to the development of the epidemic situation.
Thus, the courts were not closed in 2020, but operated in a restricted regime, and that restricted regime depended on the development of the epidemic situation. There were situations where hearings were organised to the absolute minimum, for example in April 2020, almost no hearings were held. Since May 2020, it has been up to the courts to ensure hearings to the extent necessary and in accordance with other regulations related to the pandemic situation.
In several measures in 2020, the Ministry of Justice recommended that courts organize work so that court staff and judges work from home.As for an access to the file for lawyers, it was provided.

(2019): The changes in the total number of Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year - the courts, which did not comply with the established methodology for reporting bankruptcy and restructuring, corrected the data in 2019 and thus the initial state of 2019, which causes differences compared to 2018 pending cases. Similar situation is in the other non-litigious cases, where the methodology for the cases (acceptance of things into custody of court) was changed due the legislation changes in the court register during the year 2019.
Line 2; 2.1;2.2;2.2.2: According to the act. no. 390/2019 Coll. on the end user of benefits for entrepreneurs, the entrepreneurs became obliged to make the corresponding entry in the Business Register by 31 December 2019. The increase in new-coming cases was mainly in the last three months of 2019 by 117 thousand cases in business register courts.
The deadline for processing proposals for the registration of end-user benefit data by the court has been postponed to 30 June 2020, due to the large expected new-coming cases of business records at the end of the year.

(2018): 1. Differences in the initial states of things as of 1 January 2018 different from the final states as of 31 December 2017 are due to the introduction of electronic data collection through the Data Collection Application (hereinafter referred to as AZU). When introducing electronic data collection in 2018, the courts were allowed to record the actual state of pending cases as of 1 January 2018 with the aim of not transmitting any inaccuracies from paper collection of previous periods. These differences should not occur in the next year due to the introduction of automatic transfer of the number of undecided cases from the end of the previous period in the electronic data collection.
2. Another reason for the differences in the opening cases as of 1 January 2018 from the closing stocks as of 31 December 2017 is the change in the classification of some court registers between rows in the table in question 91. The change of classification was carried out on the basis of the recommendation of the national correspondent for the SR and after its thorough consultation with the members of the working group GT CEPEJ - EVAL

(2017): The data in the table are not horizontally consistent. This is caused by the fact, that the data on pending cases on 1. January 2017 (the same as data on 31. December 2016 given for the previous cycle) were collected in a one-shot collection for the Justice Scoreboard 2017 and were not bound by control patterns of horizontal consistency as it is in the new electronic data collection active since January 2018. The improper initial number of unresolved cases taken from a “paper” collection of data in 2016 caused such differences. Likewise, the transition from 2015 final numbers to 2016 initial numbers were counted up manually from paper collections. We cannot therefore consider the initial numbers as of 1 January as reliable. The transition between the old system of collecting the statistical data to new one is more complicated than was expected, with the setting up of Analytical centre of the MoJ, application of CEPEJ methodology and its tools is one of the targets in the ongoing project between CEPEj and Ministry of justice of the Slovak republic.
There are still two different IT tools used to collect the statistical data from the courts to Analytical centre. Some inconsistencies in data between the old and new system persist.
The Analytical centre makes every effort to complete the transition between two systems as soon as possible to get reliable data as soon as possible.
As to administrative cases, until the 30. June 2016 the case-jurisdiction in administrative matters in the first instance stipulated by law was divided between Regional courts and the district courts. The general rule was, that the general jurisdiction in first instance lies at the Regional courts. However, there was a small number of proceedings (enumerated in law) where the District courts had the jurisdiction to act as a court of first instance. In reality, more than 90% of all administrative cases were tried by the Regional court as the courts of first instance.
Since 1. July 2016 the new Code of the administrative procedure came into force. According to this new law the Regional courts have the exclusive jurisdiction to try administrative cases as the courts of first instance.
As for the appeal procedure, there is the general rule that the appellate court is the court one level above in the structure of the court system. It means that the appeals against the decisions of the District courts are processed at the Regional courts and the appeals against the decisions of Regional court are processed at the Supreme court as the court of appeal.
In our data for administrative cases in the year 2017 there were some appeal procedures pending at Regional courts as the courts of appeal as the result of application of the previous procedural rules described in point 1. Those appeal proceedings were indicated in table to Q 97
All appeals against the decisions of Regional court (as the courts of first instance) were always tried by the Supreme court and we are presenting this data for all evaluation cycles in the table to Q 99

(2016): The new structure of data presented by the Ministry of Justice is the reason for the discrepancies and incompatibility of the data with the previous cycles. As regards the category "general civil non-litigious cases" we notice a decrease of incoming cases as of the year 2013.
In this cycle the succession cases were classified as "Other non litigious cases" while in previous years they were classified as "general civil (and commercial) non litigious cases.

(2014): The increase in the number of incoming and pending other than criminal law cases at all levels of the judiciary is due to the increase in the number of litigious cases. The Slovak judicial system for a several years faces significant increases of claims filed with the courts by debt-collecting companies and non-bank loan companies against consumers, as well as class actions of one private company against the State for alleged damages etc. The higher number of resolved administrative cases was achieved by the intensive effort to reduce the existing backlogs in administrative matters.

(2013): The Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called “non-bank loan companies” where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

(2012): The number of pending enforcement and business registry cases was gradually and considerably decreasing over the period 2011-2012. As concerns the variation noticed in respect of the number of incoming and resolved administrative law cases, it was due to the fact that in 2010 a meaningful number of specific collective claims were filed and resolved.

Slovenia

(General Comment): Category 1. 'Civil (and commercial) litigious cases' at first instance includes: civil litigious cases at local and district courts, various civil cases at local and district courts, legal aid at local and district courts, international legal aid at district courts, commercial litigious cases at district courts, labour law cases at labour courts, social law cases at social court, various labour and social law at labour and social courts, legal aid at labour and social courts. insolvency cases including compulsory composition, bankruptcy of legal person, bankruptcy of physical person, bankruptcy of inheritance, compulsory dissolution, simplified compulsory composition and preventive restructuring at district courts. The number includes the labour law and social law cases (before specialised labour and social law courts) due to their similarity to litigious cases in material and procedural aspects.
Q91 - Category 2.1. 'General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases': see Q92.
Q91 - Category 2.2.1. 'Non litigious land registry cases' at first instance includes (at local courts): land registry cases, decisions on appeals at first instance and various land registry cases.
Q91 - Category 2.2.2 'Non-litigious business registry cases ' at first instance includes (at district courts): business registry cases and various business registry cases.
Q91 - Category 2.2.3. 'Other registry cases': No cases were included in this category.
Q91 - Category 2.3. 'Other non-litigious cases': No cases were included in this category.
Q91 -Category 3. 'Administrative law cases' at first instance include (at the Administrative court): - administrative cases and various administrative cases.
Q91 - Category 4. 'Other cases': see Q93.
The above listed cases are classified into CEPEJ categories slightly differently over the years.
Q 91, 97, 99, 101 - Inconsistencies:
Inconsistencies within the tables are possible due to the peculiarity of the Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse (used in the Slovenian judiciary as the official source of data since January 1st 2012, at every court, and for providing data to the Ministry of Justice and at the Judicial Council).
It is a "live" system (dynamic reporting), meaning that the reported figures for a specific date or period of time inevitably vary for different reasons (e.g. the data was not promptly entered into the CMS; in some instances, the decision, in which category some specific new cases should be included, may be subsequently changed and when data are unified some figures change; there is also the possibility that a mistake was done when entering the data and was later detected in the quality check and corrected.)
In Data warehouse reports, every category (column in the table) is calculated (counted) separately, therefore the „Pending on 31 Dec“ may not equal to the formula (Pending 1 Jan + Incoming – Resolved) due to fore mentioned influences."

(2021): 2.2 Registry cases and 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: decrease by approx. 50%
In 2020, the number of incoming cases decreased due to Covid-19 pandemics and its effect on the sales of real estate. Consequently, the number of pending cases at the beginning of 2021 decreased. 2.2 Registry cases and 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry cases - Incoming cases/Resolved cases: increase by approx. 25%
In 2021, the number of incoming (and consequently resolved) cases increased, most likely due to the loosening of Covid-19 restrictions and its effect on the real estate market.
2.2 Registry cases and 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry cases - Pending cases on 31 Dec.:
In 2021, the number of incoming and resolved cases increased (see above). However, the increase in resolved cases was slightly lower, hence the increase in pending cases at the end of the year (Disposition time in register cases is low – approx. 0,2 months; ratio of Resolved vs. Pending cases is approx. 65:1).
2.2.2. Non litigious business registry cases – Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court: decrease by 200%:
Please note the small (absolute) number of cases (less than 5 cases).
4. Other cases - Pending cases on 31 Dec.: decrease 38%
The majority of cases in this category are enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters before the writ for the execution became final (all cases processed at the Central Department for Authentic Document at the Local Court in Ljubljana – exclusive jurisdiction), where the trend of decrease of pending cases is observable in 2021 and 2022. More factors could have contributed to the decrease, but no specific major reason can be identified.
4. Other cases - Pending cases older than 2 years: increase by 58%
The majority of cases in this category are enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters before the writ for the execution became final (all cases processed at the Central Department for Authentic Document at the Local Court of Ljubljana – exclusive jurisdiction). Some of those cases are waiting for inheritance cases regarding parties to finish. Please note the small number of cases (less than 100 cases), compared to incoming cases (more than 100.000 per year).

(2020): The decrease in the number of resolved cases at 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases and 4. Other cases is due to the limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics.
The decrease in the number of pending cases at the end of the year at 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry cases (and consequently at 2.2 Registry cases) is not unusual due to the high number of incoming and resolved cases in a year compared to pending cases at the end of the year (around 1-2%).
Regarding the increase in Administrative law cases - Pending cases older than 2 years: In previous years, the Administrative court was faced with the influx of new cases, due to the implementation of the ECHR judgement 60642/08 (e.g. 24,5 % of incoming cases in 2017), as well as some new competences. This caused an increase in the number of pending and resolved cases. In the aforementioned cases, the court was also faced with new legal and factual issues, as well as administrative difficulties. In recent years, the Administrative court is also dealing with a considerable number of priority or urgent cases (e.g. asylum seekers), which means a longer waiting line for “regular” cases. Though administrative and managerial actions have been taken, the number of (older) pending cases has increased due to the aforementioned difficulties and the overburdening of the court.

(2019): In general, the trend of decrease in the number of incoming cases can be observed in all types of civil cases, causing also a decrease in the number of resolved and pending cases. In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and partly to a successful introduction of new business models in the
Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Accordingly, in the last years, the clearance rate is at or slightly above 100%.
In 2019, a new Family Code and new Non-Contentious Civil Procedure Act stepped into force. The main change for district courts was establishing family law cases as non-litigious cases (before 2019 classified as litigious cases). Additionally, local courts became competent to decide in tutelage cases (before 2019 in competence of the executive branch).
This reflected in a decreased number of reported 1. Civil litigious cases, while the number of 2.1 General civil non-litigious cases did not change (an increase in new cases is similar to the decrease in the number of incoming cases that is generally observed).
Administrative cases: In previous years, the Administrative court was faced with the influx of new cases, due to the implementation of the ECHR judgement 60642/08 (e.g. 24,5 % of incoming cases in 2017), as well as some new competences. This caused an increase in the pending and resolved cases. In the aforementioned cases, the court is faced with new legal and factual issues, as well as administrative difficulties. Though administrative and managerial actions have been taken, an increase in the number of pending cases is expected due to the aforementioned difficulties and the overburdening of the court.

(2018): In general, the trend of decreasing number of incoming cases can be observed in all types of civil cases, causing also a decrease in number of resolved and pending cases. In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and partly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Accordingly, in last years, clearance rate is at or slightly above 100%.
Administrative cases: The Administrative court is faced with the influx of new cases, due to the implementation of the ECHR judgement 60642/08 (24,5 % of incoming cases in 2017). This caused an increase in the pending and resolved cases. In these cases, the court is faced with new legal and factual issues, as well as administrative difficulties - the actions are often incomplete or the information is insufficient, filled in foreign languages, the foreign parties have yet to nominate a proxy etc. The court has established a special office to perform a preliminary examination of the actions and assist in the exchange of documents between parties, however longer times for resolving cases are expected due to the aforementioned difficulties and the overburdening of the court.

(2017): In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 20%-30% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases might have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases. For discrepancies, see general comments.
The Administrative court is faced with the influx of new cases, due to the implementation of the ECHR judgement 60642/08 (24,5 % of incoming cases in 2017). In these cases, the court is faced with new legal and factual issues, as well as administrative difficulties - the actions are often incomplete or the information is insufficient, filled in foreign languages, the foreign parties have yet to nominate a proxy etc. The court has established a special office to perform a preliminary examination of the actions and assist in the exchange of documents between parties, however longer times for resolving cases are expected due to the aforementioned difficulties and the overburdening of the court. At the end of 2017, the first case was ready to be processed on the merits of the case.

(2016): In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 20%-30% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases might have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases. For discrepancies, see general comments.

(2015): In recent years, the number of incoming non-litigious cases is generally decreasing partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary. Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 15%-20% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases.

(2014): In previous cycles, insolvency cases have been accounted in former category 1. 'Civil (and commercial) litigious cases'. For 2014, they are encompassed within the item "other". The 2014 data includes labour law and social law cases decided before specialised labour and social law courts, due to their similarity to litigious cases in material (employment contract derives from civil law contract) and procedural (the court procedure in labour and social cases is based on general civil law procedure) aspects.

(2013): "Civil and commercial litigious cases" include labour law and social law cases that are proceeded by specialised labour and social law courts. Cases that do not fit exactly to the determined types of civil, commercial, non-litigious, land and business registry, enforcement and administrative law cases, were previously included in other cases. For 2014, 'Other cases' include only cases outside of the above mentioned legal fields, while the various cases are distributed among the other items. With regard to the category 'non-litigious business registry cases', the increase of the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 can be explained with the fact that there were 8.000 more incoming cases in 2013 than in 2012, but courts were not able to handle the case-load.

(2012): "Civil and commercial litigious cases" encompasse bankruptcy proceedings, which were in the previous round counted as 'other cases'. The number of incoming non-litigious business registry cases rose, probably due to the postponed effect of the financial and economic crisis. Nevertheless, courts managed to solve almost all incoming cases. The total subsumes for the first time cases processed by the Central Department for Authentic Document (part of the Local Court of Ljubljana) which has jurisdiction over all enforcement cases. The area of land registry cases is in constant improvement since a successful computerisation project in 2003. The decrease in the number of pending cases stems from a better organisation of work and of the totally electronic procedure.

Spain

(General Comment): Regarding registry cases, Spain Land Registry and Commercial Registry do not depend on Courts. But, if one disagrees with a decission of the Register (Land or Commercial) or of the Directorate General of Legal Security and Public Faith, he/she can appeal the decision before Courts.
When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Judicial Counsellor detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

(2021): The recovery of activity, after the most severe restrictions of the pandemic, may have contributed to the improvement in efficiency and increased number of resolved cases.

(2020): Regarding registry cases, Spain Land Registry and Commercial Registry do not depend on Courts. But, if one disagrees with a decission
of the Register (Land or Commercial) or of the Directorate General for Registers and Notaries, he/she can appeal the decision against
Courts.

(2018): The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) of December 21, 2016 and other previous Judgments have meant a massive interposition of lawsuits based on that doctrine, for the civil challenge of general conditions included in financing contracts with real estate guarantees in which the borrower is a natural person. Measures, referred to in previous CEPEJ questionnaires, of specialization of certain judicial bodies have been adopted.
Regarding registry cases, Spain Land Registry and Commercial Registry do not depend on Courts. But, if one disagrees with a decission of the Register (Land or Commercial) or of the Directorate General for Registers and Notaries, he/she can appeal the decision against Courts.

(2016): Concerning the Administrative Law cases, between 2014 and 2016, the decrease of 'Pending cases' is probably because the number of resolved cases, both in 2015 and 2016 has been higher than the number of incoming cases (reinforcement measures have been applied).

(2015): The horizontal consistency can not be respected because of reopened, cumulated and regularised cases.
Law 10/2012 governing certain fees in the area of the Administration of Justice could explain (especially in Administrative Law cases) the decrease in the number of incoming administrative cases, and logically the decrease in the number of resolved and pending cases.

(2014): The number of “civil and commercial litigious cases” decreased for 2 reasons. Since the payment order procedures do not need a decision made by a judge but are of the competence of the judicial counsellor, they have been subsumed in the category of non-litigious civil and commercial cases. Since paying court fees for natural persons has been compulsory until March this year, there has been a decrease in the incoming cases. In respect of the category "administrative law cases", it should be recalled that in 2012, there was a decrease in the number of files related to the Public Administration owing to two parameters: plaintiffs have been sentenced to pay the court fees; since 2012, they have to be assisted by a lawyer to file an administrative case, on the other hand.

(2012): Inspection services are entitled to correct the number each time they find it inaccurate. The data encompasses restarted procedures. Owing to the economic crisis, the number of civil cases increased significantly, particularly this of small claims. The number of “incoming administrative law cases” increased in 2010, due to the reduction of the salaries of civil servants. In 2012, this number decreased with the decrease in the number of files related to the Public Administration for 2 main reasons: plaintiffs are sentenced to pay the court fees; since 2012, they have to be assisted by a lawyer to file an administrative case, on the other hand.

Question 092

Austria

(2014): For the year 2014, this category has been extended to the enforcement cases.

Croatia

(2014): For 2013 and 2014, the provided examples concern only question 92: exercise of the parental care; meeting and spending time with parent; obtaining the capacity to exercise rights of minor that became parent; decision with whom the child will be living; issuing of the permit for entering into marriage before age of majority; deprivation/returning of capacity to exercise rights; deprivation/returning /prolongation of parental care; deprivation of parents' right to live with the child and raise the child; content of court will; security of evidence; setting-up/derogation of necessary passage; setting-up of court deposit, opening of a safe; verification of a contract on life-long support; amortization of documents; trust of a child with behavioural disorder; the recognition of foreign court decisions; declaring a missing person dead; co-ownership dissolution; meetings and spending time with grandmother, grandfather, sister, brother, half-sister, step-brother; land borders; regulation of relations between co-owners; restraining a child; providing legal aid; conclusion of court settlement; inheritance statement; proof of death; regulation of co-ownership relationships; boundaries and necessary passage; determination of extramarital union; other- family non-litigious proceedings; storage of the testament; providing international legal assistance; verification; other –the rest of non-litigious proceedings; international child abduction; other - proclamation of the deceased and proof of death; the appointment of members of the companies body; the appointment of auditors, temporary/interim administrator; the safeguard of evidence; the establishment of a court deposit; opening of the safe deposit box; registry cases; previous measures; forcible establishment of lien; temporary measure; temporary and previous measures, recognition of arbitration decisions; recognition of a foreign court decision; cases entering in the scope of Article 4 point 2 of the Companies Act; court insurance by the transfer of ownership and rights.

(2013): For 2013 and 2014, the provided examples concern only question 92: exercise of the parental care; meeting and spending time with parent; obtaining the capacity to exercise rights of minor that became parent; decision with whom the child will be living; issuing of the permit for entering into marriage before age of majority; deprivation/returning of capacity to exercise rights; deprivation/returning /prolongation of parental care; deprivation of parents' right to live with the child and raise the child; content of court will; security of evidence; setting-up/derogation of necessary passage; setting-up of court deposit, opening of a safe; verification of a contract on life-long support; amortization of documents; trust of a child with behavioural disorder; the recognition of foreign court decisions; declaring a missing person dead; co-ownership dissolution; meetings and spending time with grandmother, grandfather, sister, brother, half-sister, step-brother; land borders; regulation of relations between co-owners; restraining a child; providing legal aid; conclusion of court settlement; inheritance statement; proof of death; regulation of co-ownership relationships; boundaries and necessary passage; determination of extramarital union; other- family non-litigious proceedings; storage of the testament; providing international legal assistance; verification; other –the rest of non-litigious proceedings; international child abduction; other - proclamation of the deceased and proof of death; the appointment of members of the companies body; the appointment of auditors, temporary/interim administrator; the safeguard of evidence; the establishment of a court deposit; opening of the safe deposit box; registry cases; previous measures; forcible establishment of lien; temporary measure; temporary and previous measures, recognition of arbitration decisions; recognition of a foreign court decision; cases entering in the scope of Article 4 point 2 of the Companies Act; court insurance by the transfer of ownership and rights.

(2012): For the 2012 exercise, the provided indications constitute replies to both questions 92 and 93.
The non-litigious cases were divided in the following categories:
1. Non-litigious cases referred to issues on personal status (status law): restriction, deprivation and returning of capacity to exercise rights; prolongation of parental care; deprivation and restriction of parental care; permit for entering into marriage; confession of fatherhood; detention in the institutions for mental diseases; promulgation of vanished persons dead and proving of death;
2. Non-litigious cases referred to property issues: inheritance proceedings; regulation of co-ownership relations; division of property and voluntary transmission of common property; boundary regime/regulation; amortization of decrees; conduction of different registers;
3. In the scope of non-litigious cases there have been developed special, different units: bankruptcy proceedings; liquidations and forced settlements; land registry proceedings; enforcement proceedings.

Czech Republic

(2014): For all of the four exercises (2010, 2012, 2013 and 2014) the category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases encompasses cases of upbringing and maintenance of a minor. In 2014, it subsumes also declarations of admissibility of taking or keeping a person in a medical (health care) institution and declarations of death of persons.

Denmark

(General Comment): Paternity, adoption, guardianship and others in the same category; cases under inquisitorial procedures..

Finland

(General Comment): More information here; Sum-mary civil cases: https://oikeus.fi/tuomioistuimet/en/index/asiat/riita-asiat/summarycivilcases.html# ,and di-vorces: https://oikeus.fi/tuomioistuimet/en/index/asiat/perheasiat/avioero.html# .

France

(2014): In 2014, the category civil cases (and commercial) non-litigious are also included in non-litigious cases relating to enforcement.

Germany

(2012): In 2012, the value entered was calculated by deducting the contentious judgments from of all sets of proceedings that were resolved before the Local and the Regional Court in civil cases (not including those passed on within the court). Those sets of proceedings that are resolved other than by contentious judgment were particularly resolved by default, acknowledgement or waiver judgments, settlements, withdrawal of the charge or of the motion, staying of the proceedings or non-pursuance and orders in accordance with section 91a of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Ireland

(2014): Starting 2014 the category: “Appointment of care representatives” was added to the “Civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”

Lithuania

(2014): For 2013 and 2014, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes court orders.

(2013): For 2013 and 2014, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes court orders.

Luxembourg

(2014): 2014: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to european payment orders issued by two district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period. That is why the pending cases as well as incoming cases are classified as NAP.

(2013): 2012: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to payment orders issued by district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period.

(2012): 2012: Category 2 (civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases) refers to payment orders issued by district courts. They are handled almost immediately, so that there is no stock at the end of the period.

Malta

(General Comment): The non-litigious case category is codified under Art 166A of the Code of Organisation and Civil Procedure (COCP), Chp 12 of the Laws of Malta.

Portugal

(2013): On the occasion of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises, it has been specified that the category of civil (and commercial cases) litigious cases includes the case flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice.

(2012): On the occasion of the 2010, 2012 and 2013 exercises, it has been specified that the category of civil (and commercial cases) litigious cases includes the case flow of civil justice, labour justice and juvenile justice.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The category "civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases" includes all cases arisen from legal relationships regulated by family law (maintenance cases, custody of the child, visiting rights, guardianship, divorce cases with the ruling on rights and obligations towards the minor child etc.), cases related to assessment of the legal capacity of natural persons, reminder procedure (electronic payment orders).

Slovenia

(General Comment): Categories used in “Civil and commercial non-litigious cases”: all non-litigious civil cases at local and district courts, non-litigious commercial cases at district courts (different kinds of personal and family status, property and other disputes, provided by the Non Contentious Procedure Act or other law, procedures for issuing a payment order at local and district courts in civil matters, procedures for issuing a payment order in commercial matters at district courts, cases pursuant to the Inheritance Act at local courts, cases pursuant to the Mental Health Act at local courts; and civil enforcement cases on the basis of an enforcement title, commercial enforcement cases on the basis of an enforcement title, cases for enforcement on real-estate property, enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters after the writ for the execution became final, temporary injunctions in civil matters, temporary injunctions in commercial matters, various enforcement cases. The above listed cases are classified into CEPEJ categories slightly differently over the years.

(2014): 2014 Category 2.1 „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“at the first instance includes 1. (former category 2. „General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases“): N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D, Pr; and 2. (former category 3. ' Non litigious enforcement cases'): I, Ig, In, VL, Z, Zg and R-i.

(2013): 2013 Civil and commercial non-litigious cases at first instance include: N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D, Pr.

(2012): 2012 "Civil and commercial non-litigious cases at first instance include: N, Ng, Pl, Plg, D and P."

Spain

(2014): For the 2014 exercise, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” encompasses payment order procedures and requests for undisputed matters such as settlement proceedings and divorce with mutual consent.

(2012): For the 2010 and 2012 exercises, the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases” includes non-litigious divorces and cases of voluntary jurisdiction and internments as well.

Question 093

Bulgaria

(General Comment): Till 2014, the sum of all civil and commercial cases (litigious and not litigious) heard by first instance courts was represented within item “other”. However, in order to ensure better consistency of the comparative analyses of the CEPEJ, starting from 2014 exercise, even the category “other” is answered by “NA”.

Croatia

(2014): In 2013 and 2014 the reply NAP in respect of the category “other” is due to the fact that a bankruptcy registry has not been established in the Republic of Croatia.

(2013): In 2013 and 2014 the reply NAP in respect of the category “other” is due to the fact that a bankruptcy registry has not been established in the Republic of Croatia.

(2012): For the 2012 exercise, the provided indications constitute replies to both questions 92 and 93. Non-litigious cases were divided in the following categories:
1. Non-litigious cases referred to issues on personal status (status law): restriction, deprivation and returning of capacity to exercise rights; prolongation of parental care; deprivation and restriction of parental care; permit for entering into marriage; confession of fatherhood; detention in the institutions for mental diseases; promulgation of vanished persons dead and proving of death;
2. Non-litigious cases referred to property issues: inheritance proceedings; regulation of co-ownership relations; division of property and voluntary transmission of common property; boundary regime/regulation; amortization of decrees; conduction of different registers;
3. In the scope of non-litigious cases there have been developed special, different units: bankruptcy proceedings; liquidations and forced settlements; land registry proceedings; enforcement proceedings.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): For 2010 and 2012 the category “other” subsumes electronic payment orders and probate proceedings, while for 2013, it encompasses only electronic payment orders. By contrast, for 2014, its content covers insolvency cases. Since 2015 category "other cases" includes insolvency cases and incidence disputes.

Denmark

(General Comment): Estate after a deceased person, notary, insolvency cases not included under 2.2.2. above..

Finland

(General Comment): More information here on Bankruptcy, Restructuring of enterprises [yrityssaneeraus], Adjustment of the debts [velkajärjestely] and Enforcement [ulosotto]:
https://oikeus.fi/tuomioistuimet/en/index/asiat/velatkonkurssiyrityssaneeraus.html
More information on Land court cases [maaoikeusasia]: https://oikeus.fi/tuomioistuimet/en/index/asiat/riita-asiat/landcourtcases.html# More information on Labour Court: https://www.tyotuomioistuin.fi/en/index/labourcourt.html#

Germany

(2014): For the 2013 and 2014 exercises, the category “other” includes: Local Court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

(2013): For the 2013 and 2014 exercises, the category “other” includes: Local Court family cases; guardianship and curator cases at the family court; custodianship cases; curator cases at the custodianship court; proceedings regarding judgments and orders at the labour court.

(2012): In the ambit of the 2012 exercise the category “other” includes: family-court jurisdiction, labour courts (proceedings leading to a judgment or a decision) as well as guardianship and custodianship courts. The figures do not include 1 426 805 new legal matters related to payment proceedings before labour courts, registry office cases, inheritance cases, custody, agriculture, legal aid, deposit cases and public notice proceedings with regard to which resolution or the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of the year are not recorded. The figures also do not include 202 106 new legal cases related to insolvency proceedings with regard to which only resolution is recorded (292 821).

Hungary

(2013): In 2010, 2012 and 2014 the category “other” encompasses insolvency registry cases and labour litigious cases. In 2012, additionally it includes misdemeanour cases. In 2013, the category subsumes insolvency cases and non-litigious labour cases.

Ireland

(2014): From 2014, the range of 'Other cases' has been revised to incorporate the category 'certificates of taxation of legal costs issued'. This can explain the fact that different elements have been included in the category 'other' in 2013 and 2014.

Italy

(2014): In the ambit of the 2014 exercise, the category “other” encompasses the number of enforcement cases.

Lithuania

(2013): For 2010, this category encompasses only cases of administrative offence, while since 2012 it subsumes also the administrative offence cases in the process of execution.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The category “other” encompasses bankruptcy and debt restructuring cases, including the debt elimination procedure (bankruptcy of the natural persons), issuing of the enforcement permission for the enforcement agents, enforcement of court rulings on the visiting rights to minor child and enforcement of court fees receivables.

Slovenia

(General Comment): Category 4. „Other cases“ at first instance includes: free legal aid at district courts, labour courts and at the Administrative court, enforcement cases on the basis of authentic document in civil matters before the writ for the execution became final (all cases processed at the Central Department for Authentic Document at the Local Court of Ljubljana – exclusive jurisdiction), international attestations at district courts, attestations according to the Hague convention at district courts.

(2014): 2014 4. „Other cases“ at first instance includes: Bpp ,COVL, Ov-i, Ov-H and St [(St-01), (St-02), (St-03), (St-04) (St-05)].
In previous cycles, all the mentioned St cases have been accounted in former category 1. 'Civil (and commercial) litigious cases'."

(2013): 2013 "Other" civil law cases at first instance include: Bpp, COVL, Ov-i, Ov-H."

(2012): 2012 "Other” civil law cases at first instance include: Pom , Pom-i, R, Rg, Ov-i, Ov-H, Bpp, COVL, II Upr, I Upr.

Question 094

Austria

(General Comment): The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for the criminal courts. However, the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

(2021): The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for the ciminal courts. However the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

(2020): The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for the ciminal courts. However the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

(2018): The distinction between misdemeanour criminal cases and severe criminal cases is possible only for the criminal courts. However the total number includes administrative criminal law cases as well, where distinction is not possible.

(2016): Administrative criminal cases are included in misdemeanour and in total

Belgium

(General Comment): "Severe criminal cases": all cases that are dealt with by first instance criminal courts; "minor criminal cases": all cases that are dealt with by the Police courts.
First instance (criminal) courts: figures for homicide have not been included as our figures include cases of attempted homicide and (attempted) manslaughter (including attempted and manslaughter). Similarly, cases involving child pornography, sexual abuse, or minors cannot be uniquely identified in the general category of sexual offenses. In camera (council chamber) cases are not included; figures for pending cases are not available.

(2021): "Severe criminal cases": all cases that are dealt with by first instance criminal courts; "Minor criminal cases": all cases that are dealt with by the Police courts. Protectional cases - youth: 9 227 incoming cases in matters of youth protection. For this case category the number of resolved cases is not available for 2021. These are protectional cases dealt with by the juvenile court (in respect of parents, situations of concern, extremely urgent situations of concern, facts classified as offences).

(2020): "The health crisis has had an impact on the numbers.
"

(2016): Severe: all cases that are dealt with at first instance by the criminal courts of first instance; Minors: all cases that are dealt with by the police court
Three sites could not provide statistics for severe cases.

(2014): Offences handled by the police court (although this court can pronounce prison sentences) are considered as minor offences.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): For most of the crimes, the Bulgarian Criminal Code provides for a deprivation of liberty, which makes the distinction hard to be made. The offences could be divided into two categories: common offences and offences subject to private prosecution. For the common offences, the search of responsibility is subordinated to the common regime (there is a public interest concerned or public interest and personal goods). Such are the crimes against individuals (homicide, grievous or intermediate bodily harm, rape, fornication and etc.), crimes against the property (the list is not exhaustive). As to the offences subject to private prosecution, the criminal proceedings are initiated upon a complaint by the affected person (personal interests of the affected person, and usually the affected person and the perpetrator are close relatives). Those offences have a lower degree of public danger and affect less the rights of the concerned person. Such offences are the minor bodily injury, the insult, the slander and etc.

(2020): It should be noticed that since 2020, the Unified Court Information System (UIS) has been gradually introduced in all courts, developed within the project “Creating a Model for Optimizing the Court Card of Bulgarian Courts and Prosecutor's Offices and Developing a Unified Court Information System” with the financial support of Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020.
Depending on the functionalities of the system, it may be possible to collect information on the next cycle according to the indicators mentioned in question 94.

Croatia

(2021): In category "Other cases" are included (from last cycle) cases related to criminal matters in first instance: execution of sanctions (imprisonment), investigation actions of a judge, cases connected to procedural matters (e.g. panel of judges decision about detention, about prolongation of detention, about confirmation or dismissal of indictment, etc.)

(2020): In category "Other cases" are included (from last cycle) cases related to criminal matters in first instance: execution of sanctions (imprisonment), investigation actions of a judge, cases connected to procedural matters (e.g. panel of judges decision about detention, about prolongation of detention, about confirmation or dismissal of indictment, etc.)
Regarding decreased number of resolved minor criminal cases: Due to the pandemic caused by COVID-19, in 2020., court proceedings for limited period in 2020 were submitted under specific conditions and measures, which contributed to decreased number of court hearings, also in minor criminal cases.
Regarding horizontal inconsistency: For most of the categories, the full horizontal inconsistency can not be ensured, due to some adjustments and changes in the Case Management System used by courts.

(2018): In category "Other cases" are included (from this cycle) cases related to criminal matters in first instance: execution of sanctions (imprisonment), investigation actions of a judge, cases connected to procedural matters (e.g. panel of judges decision about detention, about prolongation of detention, about confirmation or dismissal of indictment, etc.)

(2016): Starting from 1 June 2013, when the Act on Amendments to the Misdemeanours Act (OG 39/2013) entered into force, the inflow of first-instance misdemeanour cases displayed in this table continuously and significantly had been reduced. The number of resolved cases reduced as well, but due to a significant decrease in inflows, the number of unresolved cases reduced by the end of the period. This reflected also on High Misdemeanours Court, whose data is shown in this table.

(2014): The new Criminal Procedure Act entered into force in September 2011, introducing the investigation conducted by the State Attorney Offices (instead of court investigation), as well as new and wider opportunities for negotiating settlements. Besides, the decrease of the total number of misdemeanour cases at all levels was the main goal of adopting the Act on the Amendments of the Misdemeanour Act in 2013. The definition of misdemeanour act was changed, the principle of opportunity as well as the simplification of the procedure were introduced, more active role was given to the plaintiff etc. The Register of Unpaid Fines was established. There is no more suspension of the proceedings because of the statute of limitations.

Cyprus

(General Comment): The reason for not having data for the subcategories of cases is that there was no electronic filing system that would enable us to have statistical data on different types of cases.

(2018): There were fewer criminal cases in 2018.

(2014): As a result of the bail in, the total number of first instance criminal pending cases on 1 January 2014 increased with 27% between 2012 and 2014.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases".

(2018): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases"

(2014): Severe criminal cases are crimes in respect of which the law provides for a minimum term of imprisonment of 5 years. They are decided by regional courts acting in first instance. Minor criminal cases are tried by district courts in first instance, regional courts being the appellate courts in such matters.

Denmark

(General Comment): Danish Court Administration has not worked out a statistics on pending cases older than 2 years. When we categorize cases as "severe", it does not mean that privation of liberty is the end result, but based on the category chosen by the court to deal with the case could include severe cases. Minor cases are typically fines that will never have as a result of privation of liberty. Probably there are too many cases under the category "severe" then, but that is the figures we have..

(2021): 2020 was an unusual year because of the Covid-19 pandemic, related close down of society, including close down of courts. It created more pending cases as the prosecution continued to forward new cases to the courts that could not deal with it.

(2020): 2020 was an unusual year because of the Covid-19 related close down of society, including close down of courts. It created more pending cases as the prosecution continued to forward new cases to the courts that could not deal with it.

(2018): Our statistics on criminal cases does not have data on pending cases older than 2 years. We can not differentiate pending cases according to age. When we categorize cases as "severe", it does not mean that privation of liberty is the end result, but based on the category chosen by the court to deal with the case could include severe cases. Minor cases are typically fines that will never have as a result of privation of liberty. Probably there are too many cases under the category "severe" then, but that is the figures we have.

(2016): Our statistics on criminal cases does not have data on pending cases older than 2 years. We can not differentiate pending cases according to age.
The reason pending cases per 31 December 2016 has decreased is that the courts have resolved more cases than incoming cases.

(2014): For the period 2010-2014, district courts have been able to resolve more cases than the number of incoming cases, especially concerning minor criminal cases (traffic offences etc.) which have been given a higher priority. In 2012, district courts received more minor criminal cases due to a new procedure according to which the police sent cases where citizens haven’t paid their fines to courts. This was changed again in the end of 2012 where warnings were sent out first and the number of minor cases dropped therefore markedly in 2013. In 2014 the number of received minor criminal cases has gone up again following a decision of the police to step up on issuing fines for traffic offences. Besides, city courts resolved more cases through the plea guilty procedure.

(2012): The Courts of Denmark received an extraordinary appropriation in 2009 specifically to bring down backlogs. This effect can be seen in 2012, among other things in the lower number of pending cases. The increase in the number of misdemeanor and/or minor criminal cases is due to the fact that a high number of cases concerning, especially, traffic fines were handled at court level.

Estonia

(General Comment): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

(2020): Other criminal cases: for example different enforcement and pretrial cases. The pandemic has affected the courts activity in criminal matters in general. The criminal procedure law was not as flexible when judges had to work online. The complete revision of the criminal procedure law is ongoing and will come into force next year.

(2018): Increase of incoming misdemeanor and minor criminal cases.

(2016): Misdemeanour cases can be joined and solved together in court. Cases that can lead to deprivation of liberty of less to five years are still included under severe criminal cases.
Because the distinction between severe and minor criminal cases is not the same with the CEPEJ, data for subcategories can be found below : Severe criminal cases : Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 803
Incoming cases : 7628
Resolved cases : 7463
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 824
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : 23
Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases :
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 1835
Incoming cases : 10032
Resolved cases : 10628
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 891
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : 3

(2014): The variations observed over the years 2010, 2012 and 2014 are most likely due to the fact that the Ministry of Justice and the biggest court in Estonia (Harju County court) had an agreement setting the target for eliminating backlogs.

(2012): Horizontal inconsistency within the table stems mainly from the joinder and severance of criminal matters. Following a law amendment of March 2011, claims against enforcement of misdemeanour decisions are brought before bailiffs and not before courts.

Finland

(General Comment): The cases are not statistically categorised in severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor cases in Finland.
"Coercive measures": these are cases that are dealt separately from a criminal case and therefore get their own case ID-number. They include telecommunications interception and electronic surveillance, confiscation, detention on remand, detention of an alien, travel ban and other coercive measures, restraint on alienation [hukkaamiskielto] and confiscation for security. When a coercive measure is dealt within an ongoing case it does not get its own case ID-number and is not counted as a separate case.
“Military trials” deal with cases of military offences (e.g. service offences, sentry offences, absence from duty offences, obedience offences, offences by a superior officer). In addition, certain crimes against soldiers are military offences as are some criminal offences stipulated in Conscription Act (Chapter 45 of the Criminal Code). The “military trial” is a case dealt with by the district courts (excluding the district court of Åland), the Court of appeal of Helsinki and the Supreme court. In a district court the case is dealt with by a judge (as a chair) and two military members. Because of this different composition of the panel, it is referred to as “military court” even though it is a composition of the district court. Similarly, the panel in the Court of appeal and the Supreme court includes two military members.

(2021): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. This year we have included military court cases and co-er-cive mea-sures which were previously not included in this number.

(2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases
managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

(2018): There is no particular explanation regarding the decreased clearance rate of criminal cases.

France

(2021): source SDSE

(2020):
"Comments on volumes.
Closed cases are down more than incoming cases cases, both civil/2019 and felonies/2018 (contravention are surprisingly up / 2018).
The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer misdemeanors committed, fewer cases brought to court). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and transportation strike had mostly affected TAs.

Germany

(General Comment): General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys only count the number of received cases.
The category “severe criminal cases” includes criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistencies with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occur in the statistics published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this is, that courts submit count corrections for the monthly surveys at the end of the year.

(2021): The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” subsumes regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
“Other criminal cases” include:
- proceedings at the penal execution chambers (concerning suspension of execution of the remainder of a sentence of life imprisonment or concerning suspension of execution of placement in a psychiatric hospital or in preventive detention, determinate custodial sentences, proceedings under sections 109, 110, 138 of the Prison Act (Strafvollzugsgesetz, StVollzG), proceedings under Part IV of the Act on International Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (Gesetz über die internationale Rechtshilfe in Strafsachen, IRG) and section 71 (4) of Part II)
- proceedings regarding supervision of conduct
- complaints about costs/fees - complaints against search/seizure orders - complaints in economic cases and tax cases
- complaints in matters concerning detention - cases in matters falling within the Regulatory Offences Act (Ordnungswidrigkeitengesetz, OWiG) registered in the complaints register - other complaints - subsequent or reserved preventive detention
- proceedings regarding the order of subsequent or reserved preventive detention - proceedings regarding the suspension of execution of a sentence where the court has reserved the order of preventive detention, in the cases covered by section 462a (2), third sentence, of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Strafprozessordnung, StPO)
- proceedings before the judicial service court
- proceedings regarding health professionals, tax consultants, agents in tax matters, patent lawyers or architects
- other disciplinary proceedings - proceedings regarding legal remedies in matters of enforcement of youth custody, youth detention and remand detention
With regard to "other criminal cases", only the number of incoming cases is recorded (exception: proceedings concerning supervision of conduct).

(2018): As only the number of resolved “other cases” is available, these will not be included in the total.

(2014): The information provided in the frame of the 2014 evaluation refers to 2013 data (the 2014 data is not available).

Greece

(2021): The courts’ function in cooperation with the prosecution's offices. For example, postponed cases get to the prosecutor offices and then to the courts, in repeat 2-3 times, during the period (year). The definition of the pending cases included postponed cases or the cases the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn’t been determined during the year. The data has been collected from 63 out of 63 First instance courts in Greece.

(2020): To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor’s Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A’, which was completed in March 2019 for 41 courts of the State, an integrated information system is implemented, which includes individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data.

(2018): To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor's Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A', which was completed in March 2019 for 41 courts of the State, an integrated information system is implemented, which includes individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data.

(2016): Filling in the requested information regarding the criminal procedure is not possible at the moment. To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor's Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A', which is expected to be completed by November 2018, an integrated information system will be implemented, which will include individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data. For 2016 the available data regarding the criminal procedure are as follows: Courts of First Instance: Criminal Cases Discussed: 473.457, Convictions/Acquittals: 206.311, Postponements: 262.433, Courts of Appeal: Criminal Cases Discussed: 59.643, Convictions/Acquittals: 24.995, Postponements: 33.601

Hungary

(General Comment): Criminal offences are severe or minor crimes. Severe crimes (bűntett) are committed intentionally and are punishable with at least two years of imprisonment. All other criminal offences are minor crimes (vétség). Crimes that are not committed intentionally are always considered as minor crimes, despite the possible punishment.
Misdemeanours (szabálysértés) are not considered as criminal offences, but are unlawful acts that are endangering the society. The authorities intervening in their respect are the police, the district office, or the National Tax and Customs Office. Their decisions can be reviewed by the relevant section of the respective district court upon request of the accused person. Generally, the court rules without oral hearings, based upon the available documents. However, it can set a hearing if it finds it necessary or if the person charged by a misdemeanor requests it. The judgment is a final and enforceable decision.
It is noteworthy that the Hungarian law identifies also the category of civil offences encompassing offences mainly against public administration. However some criminal offenses, such as property crimes involving objects of small value (under 50000 HUF), are classified in this category as well. Civil offences fall under the jurisdiction of various administrative agencies, local governments or traffic police, but not the courts.
Concerning the methodology of presentation of data, as according to the Hungarian Criminal Code not only severe crimes (bűntett), but also almost every minor crime (vétség) are punishable with imprisonment, both categories were included into the category "severe criminal cases". Thus misdemeanors (szabálysértés) were included into the category "minor criminal cases".

(2021): New types of misdemeanours were introduced into the legal system in accordance with the measures taken against the COVID-19 pandemic. As the number of incoming cases increased the number of resolved cases increased as well.

(2018): Criminal offences are severe or minor crimes. Severe crimes are commited intenitionally and are punishable with at least two years of imprisonment. All other criminal offences are minor crimes.
Misdemanours are not considered as criminal offences, but are unlawful acts that are endangering the society.

(2014): The increase in the number of incoming misdemeanour cases in 2012 and 2014 is the consequence of an amendment of the relevant legislation. This increase resulted also in higher numbers of resolved and pending cases.

(2012): For 2012, not all types of misdemeanour cases were included in the respective category. The increase in the number of incoming misdemeanour cases stems from legislative amendments. This increase resulted also in higher numbers of resolved and pending cases.

Ireland

(General Comment): Except for the Supreme Court, criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case due to the various ICT systems used. This is due to data collection/ ICT systems that are in use by the Court Service.
Akin to question 91, the number of pending criminal law cases cannot be provided within the frame of question 94, provided that it is not recorded in caseload data.
Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases include all cases triable summarily (e.g. common assault, public order offences, burglary or theft in other that aggravated circumstances).

(2021): Severe criminal cases are taken to mean indictable offences that are dealt with in the Circuit and High Court. Misdemeanour is taken to mean minor offences and indictable offences dealt with summarily in the District Court. The number of incoming cases will never equal the number of resolved cases. It is worth noting that the number of resolved cases in 2021 was a significant increase in the resolved cases from 2020. It is also worth noting that not all offences are proceeded with by the prosecutor, particularly minor offences.
Criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case due to the various ICT systems used

(2020): Misdemeanour and minor criminal cases are cases heard in the District Court. There were fewer such cases incoming and resolved because of Covid-19.

(2018): From 2016 extra judicial resources were applied by Senior Judiciary to the Courts dealing with some of the most serious criminal matters, which explains the increase of the number of resolved severe cases.

(2016): With regard to the number of resolved severe criminal cases, there is no particular reason explaining the observed discrepancy between 2014 and 2016, except for the fact that in 2014 figures were exceptionally high.

(2014): The previous data in respect of severe criminal cases were presented by reference to the defendant rather than to the offence(s) charged, whereas the data for 2014 reflects offence(s) charged, to align with the unit of measurement for minor criminal cases.

(2012): There were substantial reductions in the number of recorded traffic and public order offences between 2010 and 2012, and these categories of offences make up a significant proportion of the minor criminal cases that come before the courts.

Italy

(2021): In Italy there is no formal definition of minor criminal cases. For the purposes of this exercise, are considered as minor criminal cases those proceedings dealt with by the Justice of Peace Offices.

(2018): The reduction in the number of resolved first instance criminal cases, and consequently the increase in the Disposition Time, between 2018 and 2016 comes from the decriminalization measures introduced in 2016 that led to a sharp increase in the number of case dismissals in that year. Indeed, the data for 2017 are:
Incoming: 1.311.900
Resolved: 1.293.054
Pending: 1.282.406
Disposition time: 362 days
These figures show a positive trend of the DT between 2014 and 2017, maintained in 2018.

Latvia

(General Comment): Data from the first and appeal instance courts are compiled by the Court Administration, and the Court Information System is a living database that allows data to be corrected, so changes between previous periods are possible. According to 2014 data and pursuant to the Criminal Law, criminal offences are divided into criminal violations and crimes distinguished by their nature, degree of the harm and the threat to the interests of a person or the society. A criminal violation is an offence for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding fifteen days, but not exceeding three months (temporary deprivation of liberty), or a type of lesser punishment. Crimes are classified in the following way: less serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three months but not exceeding three years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term up to eight years); serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three years but not exceeding eight years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years); especially serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years or a life imprisonment.

(2021): Pending cases: The number of pending cases in January differs from pending cases in December 2020 registered data due the living Court information system database
Severe criminal cases include all criminal cases according to the Criminal law - it includes all cases where a harmful offense (act or failure to act) committed deliberately (intentionally) or through negligence, provided for the Criminal Law, and for the commission of which criminal punishment is set out shall be considered a criminal offense. Misdemeanor and / or minor criminal cases includes all administrative infringement cases according to the Law on Administrative liability about administrative offence of a person for which administrative liability is provided for in a law or binding regulations of local governments.
Criminal cases, which are assessed according to the Latvian Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure Law, are decreasing. The reduction from 2020 was influenced by changes in legislation. However, the tendency of the decrease in the number of criminal cases has been observed for a longer period of time, and it cannot be explained by the activities of the courts, but by assumptions about the general development trends of society.
In the summer of 2020, amendments to the Criminal Procedure Law entered into force, which stipulated that the case for minor violations of the criminal law is not referred for initiation of criminal proceedings (Section 373 An investigator with a consent of a prosecutor or a prosecutor may refuse to initiate criminal proceedings, if a misdemeanor has been committed), which affected the the total number of criminal law cases received in court. A decrease in the number of criminal cases received has been observed since 2020.
In the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming cases significantly. According to the law, if the person intends to use his right to appeal a decision, he/she needs to address the complain to the higher official from institution which has made this decision, but if there is no higher official, a decision may be appealed to a district (city) court. This is the main reason for decrease of incoming cases. The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly decreased. The reduction of pending cases is related to the increased interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending criminal cases. In 2021, courts of first instance resolved more criminal cases than in previous periods, which is related to the court's ability to adapt to resolve cases in the restrictive conditions of the Covid-19.
Data of 2020 for minor criminal cases are revised for incoming and resolved cases: 5 755 incoming cases and 6 631 resolved cases.

(2020): Data on resolved severe criminal cases is decreased because of Covid-19 restrictions. We have already pointed out the limitations of court work: written procedure, prohibition of face-to-face meetings, cancellation of court hearings etc.

(2018): There may be some change in data due to court system reform.

(2016): Severe criminal cases - All sections of The Criminal Law
Misdemeanor and / or minor criminal cases - All sections of Latvian Administrative Violations Code

(2014): According to 2014 data and pursuant to the Criminal Law, criminal offences are divided into criminal violations and crimes distinguished by their nature, degree of the harm and the threat to the interests of a person or the society. A criminal violation is an offence for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding fifteen days, but not exceeding three months (temporary deprivation of liberty), or a type of lesser punishment. Crimes are classified in the following way: less serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three months but not exceeding three years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term up to eight years); serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three years but not exceeding eight years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years); especially serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years or a life imprisonment.

(2012): According to 2012 data and pursuant to the Criminal Law, criminal offences are divided into criminal violations and crimes distinguished by their nature, degree of the harm and the threat to the interests of a person or the society. A criminal violation is an offence for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding fifteen days, but not exceeding three months (temporary deprivation of liberty), or a type of lesser punishment. Crimes are classified in the following way: less serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three months but not exceeding three years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term up to eight years); serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding three years but not exceeding eight years, as well as offences committed by negligence and for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years); especially serious crimes (intentional offences for which the law provides for a deprivation of liberty for a term exceeding eight years or a life imprisonment.

Lithuania

(General Comment): There is no separate statistical data allowing to distinguish between severe/minor/and other criminal cases. Neither the court information system is applied to this, nor the courts have obligation to provide the information on the seriousness of the crime. In the court information system offenses are described through the indication of an article (it does not show the severeness of a crime by itself).

(2018): On 1 January 2017 Amendments to the Criminal Code of the Republic of Lithuania were adopted that provide for criminal liability for persons who drove a road vehicle or taught practical driving while under the influence of alcohol more than 1,5 promilles. This change of regulation had impact on the increase of the number of criminal cases starting from 2017 (in comparison with 2016).

(2016): The crime situation changed in Lithuania - the number of registered crimes by prosecution also decreased through these years, as a result less cases were received in courts. As regards 94.1 and 94.2: the answer should be NA, the NAP was chosen for the calculation purposes.

(2012): For 2012, in contrast with the 2010 data, criminal cases in the execution process were also taken into account. The increase in the number of incoming and resolved criminal cases is due to the entry into force of the Law on Domestic Violence in December 2011. It has made compulsory the criminal investigation in respect of every single incident of domestic violence. The Lithuanian economic situation as well as the national economic priorities also account for the increase.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The unavailability of the number of pending and incoming criminal cases is explained by the specific organisation of the workflow between courts and prosecution offices. Cases are only transferred to the courts shortly before the hearing and, if a case is not heard on the given date, it is physically returned to the prosecution until the new hearing date. Thus, there are - with a few exceptions - no cases pending before the criminal courts over a long period of time, and the number of incoming cases is more or less equal to the number of resolved cases.
Minor criminal cases represent all cases resolved by criminal order in the Police court and the district court. Severe criminal cases represent all cases resolved by a judgment at first instance in the Police, Correctional or Criminal court. “Other criminal cases” are cases that are dealt with by the investigating office.

(2018): Nous avons compté parmi les infractions mineures, toutes les affaires terminées par ordonnance pénale au tribunal de police ou au tribunal d'arrondissement. Les infractions graves représentent toutes les affaires terminées par jugement en première instance au tribunal de police, correctionnel ou criminel.
L'augmentation du nombre d'affaires résolues est due au fait que, pour les cycles précédents, les ordonnances pénales des tribunaux d'arrondissement n'étaient pas prises en compte au niveau des infractions mineures, qui comptabilisaient seulement les ordonnances pénales de justices de paix. Ainsi, pour 2016, les infractions pénales mineures reportées s'élevaient à 6460 en comptant les ordonnances pénales des tribunaux d'arrondissement, au lieu de 5454. Le total des affaires terminées a considérablement augmenté puisqu'il nous est depuis la période d'évaluation 2018-2020 possible, par l'ajout de la catégorie « Autres affaires » dans le questionnaire, de renseigner les affaires dont le cabinet d'instruction a été saisi. Les chiffres inscrits dans « autres affaires » correspondent donc aux affaires dont a été saisi le cabinet d'instruction.
Regarding the unavailability of the number of pending cases and incoming cases, Due to the specific organization of the work flow between the courts and the public prosecutor's office, files are transferred to the courts only a short time before the hearing, and, if the case is not heard at the given date, are then returned to the public prosecutor's office until the new date of the hearing. Thus, there are – with very few exceptions - no cases pending before the penal courts over a longer period of time, and the number of incoming cases equals more or less the resolved cases. With regard to civil cases, we should be able to provide information on cases pending for more than two years for the next evaluation, once the new application has been used for a longer period of time.

(2012): Courts do not have a "stock" given that cases are handled at the public prosecutor's office and are only reffered to the court shortly before the hearing. The only moment when cases are pending is between the hearing and the adoption of the decision. Usually, the jugdgment is made within 3 or 4 weeks after the hearing. Thus, data concerning incoming cases is identical to data concerning resolved cases.

Malta

(General Comment): In the Maltese legal system, all proceedings which appear before the Court of Magistrates may be punishable with a fine or imprisonment, bar a few contraventions which still appear before the Court of Magistrates and it is not possible to obtain data relating to these few cases. Nevertheless, all cases which lead to an imprisonment of ten years or more can only be heard by the Criminal Court whilst cases between 2 and 12 years may be heard by the Court of Magistrates only once the procedure before it as a Court of Criminal Inquiry is completed. Since in Malta the vast majority of the cases contemplate the possibility of imprisonment, barring a few contraventions, the cases indicated as misdemeanors/minor offences, are those cases which are heard by the Court of Magistrates (excluding those being heard as a Court of Criminal Inquiry) having a maximum punishment of 2 years imprisonment while the cases indicated as 'severe criminal offences' are those having a punishment of over 2 years (Criminal Court & Court of Criminal Inquiry).

(2020): Given that the categorisation of criminal offences in Malta does not exactly match with the CEPEJ definitions provided, only the total of such cases is being reported. An actual breakdown of the figures quoted above is as follows:
- Pending 1st January 2020 = 11899 (79 cases Criminal Court and 11820 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Incoming cases 2020 = 11086 (17 cases Criminal Court and 11069 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Resolved cases 2020 = 7321 (5 cases Criminal Court and 7316 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Pending cases 31st December 2020 = 15883 (89 cases Criminal Court and 15794 cases Court of Magistrates)

The lack of horizontal consistency results from recounts that happen throughout the year, and that ensure that the data is always as up to date as possible. However when taken as a global figure, horizontal consistency might then be lost.
The decrease in the number of incoming and resolved cases, and the ensuing high number of pending cases, results from the restrictions imposed by the pandemic on the functioning of the Courts of Law.

(2018): Given that the categorisation of criminal offences in Malta does not exactly match with the CEPEJ definitions provided, only the total of such cases is being reported. An actual breakdown of the figures quoted above is as follows:
- Pending 1st January 2018 = 11887 (61 cases Criminal Court and 11826 cases Court fo Magistrates)
- Incoming cases 2018 = 13817 (19 cases Criminal Court and 13,798 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Resolved cases 2018 = 14168 (8 cases Criminal Court and 14140 cases Court of Magistrates)
- Pending cases 31st December 2018 = 11589 (72 cases Criminal Court and 11517 cases Court of Magistrates)

The lack of horizontal consistency results from recounts that happen throughout the year, and that ensure that the data is always as up to date as possible. However when taken as a global figure, horizontal consistency might then be lost.
The decrease int he number of incoming and resolved cases is a phenomenon we are observing over the past years. The discrepancy between the data of 2016 and 2018 makes sense when one looks at the 2017 data that also shows a decrease in the caseloads from 2016. It is to be noted that the incoming caseload in 2018 is actually a bit higher than that of 2017.

(2016): In the Maltese legal system, all proceedings which appear before the Court of Magistrates may be punishable with a fine or imprisonment, bar a few contraventions which still appear before the Court of Magistrates and it is not possible to obtain data relating to these few cases. Nevertheless, all cases which lead to an imprisonment of ten years or more can only be heard by the Criminal Court whilst cases between 2 and 12 years may be heard by the Court of Magistrates only once the procedure before it as a Court of Criminal Inquiry is completed. Since in Malta the vast majority of the cases contemplate the possibility of imprisonment, barring a few contraventions, the cases indicated as misdemeanors/minor offences, are those cases which are heard by the Court of Magistrates (excluding those being heard as a Court of Criminal Inquiry) having a maximum punishment of 2 years imprisonment while the cases indicated as 'severe criminal offences' are those having a punishment of over 2 years (Criminal Court & Court of Criminal Inquiry).
This definition of severe/minor-misdemeanor cases is not fully consistent with the definition built by CEPEJ and therefore a comparison is not possible with the previous cycles. According to the Maltese categorization of cases, the number for severe criminal cases in 2016 is as follows: pending on the 1st Jan of Ref Year = 3054; Incoming cases = 827; Resolved cases = 1143; Pending cases on the 31st Dec of Ref Year = 2736. The number for minor/misdemeanor criminal cases is as follows: pending on the 1st Jan of Ref Year = 10571; Incoming cases = 15887; Resolved cases = 15682; Pending cases on the 31st Dec of Ref Year = 10805.

(2013): The 2014 data is derived from the official court statistics that are also available online at www.justiceservices.com. The horizontal discrepancy in the data at point 6 cannot be verified since the data collection in the criminal courts is not as yet automated.

Netherlands

(General Comment): Classification of minor and severe cases:
Minor offences – mainly traffic offences (speeding tickets, running red lights), petty theft, vagrancy, littering, etc.
Severe offences – driving while drunk, grand theft, violent crimes, vice, drugs/narcotics etc.

(2020): Classification of severe and minor cases:
Minor offences: mainly traffic offences (speeding tickets, running red lights) and petty theft, vagrancy, littering, etc.
Severe offences: driving while drunk, grand theft, violent crimes, vice, drugs/narcotics, etc.
Effects of the pandemic:
No in person hearings happened in the period between 17 March and April 6 2020. At the start of the pandemic, not everyone was able to work remotely due to insufficient available laptops and that many files were still coming in on paper. There were some exceptions for working remotely as well, such as security, some administrative staff (people that compiled paper files, for example), etc.
Some measures were taken: hearing in other buildings, online or hybrid, and hearings in the evenings. The age restriction for judges was upped from 70 years old to 73 years old, more criminal orders were handled by the public prosecution and more cases were handled by one judge instead of more (enkelvoudig versus meervoudig)

(2016): In 2016, there has been a strong decrease in numbers of cases compared to 2014. This decrease pertains to the group of misdemeanours, in particular the group of traffic offences ("Mulder Law"). The cases of "vorderingen dwangsom" (coercive detainment) are no longer treated by the Public Prosecution. This following complaints at the Ombudsman. These coercive detainment cases increased at first strongly in 2013 and 2014. But after that decision of the Public Prosecution The "Mulder Law" cases decreased from 200.000 in 2014, via 100.000 in 2015 to 40.000 in 2016.

Poland

(General Comment): Severe criminal cases include all offences under the Penal Code, Penal Fiscal Code and offences specified in other Acts. Misdemeanours are cases conducted under the Petty Offence Code.
The category “Other cases” covers the rest of cases conducted in criminal courts which are not connected directly with the severe criminal cases or misdemeanours (mainly cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).

(2020): The discrepancies in Table 94. First instance courts: number of criminal law cases - compared to the previous period (2018) are mainly due to two reasons. First – the COVID19 pandemic which reduced the inflow of Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (p. 2). Second – in 2020 release the number of Other cases (p. 3) was added to the table. It significantly increased the number of total cases shown in the line Total of criminal cases (1+2+3).

(2014): For the 2014 evaluation, changes in the statistical forms made possible the identification of some types of misdemeanor cases (mainly the organizational ones, which were not considered in 2012). Above this, there is a constant growth in the number of incoming cases.

(2012): The increase of the total of criminal cases and the number of severe criminal cases in respect of the item “pending cases on 1st January 2012” is due to the fact that since 2010, there was a significant increase of the inflow of cases.

Portugal

(2021): The discrepancy should be contextualised, in our view, within the framework of the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent confinement, with a reflection on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.

(2020): 94.1 - The decrease in the number of cases completed in the category "Total of criminal law cases" between 2018 and 2020 is justified by the decrease in court activity in the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.
94.2 -The decrease in the number of incoming and outgoing cases in the category "Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases" between 2018 and 2020 is justified by the decrease in court activity in the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation. Still, the number of cases pending on January 1, 2020 reduced compared to the number of cases pending on January 1, 2018, since the number of cases completed from 2018 to 2019 was relatively higher than the number of cases entered in those years. 94.3 - The increase in the number of pending cases older than 2 years in the "Other criminal cases" category in 2020 compared to 2018 may be related to reduced court activity in the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.

(2018): Regarding the decrease of the numbers comparing to 2016, there were no legislative changes or others that could explain this decrease. Due to increased efficiency of first instance courts, we can notice for the last several cycles a down-word trend in respect of the number of pending cases, namely criminal law cases.

(2016): There is no specific reason explaining the decrease in the number of incoming and pending criminal cases in comparison with the values of previous cycles. There were no legislative changes or other that could explain this value. However, we can note that cases at first instance in criminal and other areas have been decreasing in the last years. In addition, this decrease may also result from the fact that the number of criminal cases registered by police forces has been decreasing.

(2012): The number of pending minor criminal cases on 1 January and 31 December 2012 decreased due to the fact that the number of misdemeanor and minor criminal resolved cases in 2010 and 2011 was significantly superior to the number of cases filed on both those years. Generally, there is a decreasing trend concerning minor offences.

Romania

(General Comment): There is no classification of severe and less severe offences in the Romanian statistics.
In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.

(2020): As stated at Q91 the context of the Covid-19 pandemic affected the activity of the courts which led to the decrease in the number of resolved cases in 2020 an increased Disposition time and an increased numer of pending cases older than 3 years. In criminal law cases postponements were reccurent in cases involving persons serving a prison senstence, because generaly they have to be brought to every court hearing which was not always possibile due to the curantine measures taken by the prison administrations.

(2018): The changes brought to the code of criminal procedure may be among the reasons for the augmentation of the total number of criminal law cases pending on January 1st between 2016 and 2018, namely for e.g. the procedure regarding the prosecutor's decision to discontinue the criminal investigation has to be confirmed by a judges/in court, according to the new provisions.

(2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on categories of pending cases as follows: - 0-1/2 years;
- 1/2-1 year;
- 1 - 1 and 1/2 years;
- 1 and 1/2 - 3 years;
- 3 - 5 years;
In the table above, last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years.
The total number of incoming criminal cases in first instance courts has substantially increased when compared to 2014 data (+41%). These figures have been confirmed by the CEPEJ National Correspondent.

(2014): The significant increase in the number of total pending cases on 1st of January within the period 2012 – 2014 is due to the new way of counting the statistical data by the application Statis. The time of reaching a decision is not equivalent to the time of drafting the decision. For the present evaluation, files where a decision is reached but is not drafted yet are not counted.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The statistical data collected by the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic does not allow the categorization of the criminal matters according to the types of criminal offences as defined in explanatory note.

(2020): Sources: Analytical center, Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic

(2018): There is a big discrepancy between pending cases on 31st of December 2016 and “Pending cases on 1st of January 2018”. This is caused of two factors: The first one and major is in delivered data in 2016. In the 2017 was the data collection still in paper form and in the old methodology, as we explained already. In the same time the project Audit with the experts from CEPEJ was already influencing the newly growing Analytical center and motivated as to try collect pending cases for 2016 backward. Since there were no electronic tools for collecting data available neither for courts nor for Ministry of Justice; the result were obviously full of mistakes. Analytical center had no chance to make data check, since pending cases were never collected before, so we had to rely on the courts data without possible checkup. After 2017, when was already available electronic tool (AZU) for collecting data from courts with implemented controlling formulas, then the mistakes from previous manual collection have occurred significantly especially in the first instance criminal agenda. The second factor is, that the Clearance rate dropped from 106, 52% in 2016 to the level 101, 81% in 2018.

(2016): For 2016 data, new methodology was implemented to make the reporting structure consistent with the CEPEJ methodology and leads to better comparison of Slovak Republic (SR) with other countries. The previous methodology was not counting a decision of first instance court as resolved until the case becomes finalised at last instance. This resulted in reporting such case as unresolved despite respective court has already made a decision. This is the nature of reporting of many “unresolved” cases on courts despite court already decided, in fact. New way of reporting extracts the numbers of decided cases in respective court instances from “unresolved” and allocates these numbers to those court instances that made an actual decision in the reference period that is in correspondence with CEPEJ methodology and better comparable with other countries.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The figures in the table include the following cases: Severe criminal cases: criminal cases at local and district courts,, criminal cases against juveniles at district courts. Misdemenour cases: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection, minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals, cancellation of validity of the driver’s licence according to the legal limit of punitive points
Other cases: criminal investigations at district courts, criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings, execution of the sanction of prison, execution of criminal sanctions of foreign courts, criminal investigation actions at local and district courts, various criminal matters at local and district courts, cases of the out-of-hearing senate, clemency procedures at local and district courts, legal aid in criminal matters, international legal aid in criminal matters, cases of decisions to permit interventions within human rights and freedoms, legal aid in minor offences, international legal aid in minor offences, search of premises, setting a task for the good of the community or the local community, various cases in minor offences, compliance detention.
Regarding criminal investigations at district courts: Slovenia has a system where the state public prosecutor can request a (first instance) court to perform a criminal investigation (or individual investigatory acts). When this procedure at court is finished, the case is returned to the state prosecutor, who can decide whether to dismiss a case or file an accusatory act at the (same) court. When the accusatroy act is filed, a criminal trial (i.e. deliberating on the responsibility and sanctioning of the offender) begins.

(2021): 1. Severe criminal cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: increase by 22%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in pending cases at the beginning of 2021.
1. Severe criminal cases - Resolved: increase by 17%
In 2020 first instance courts resolved less cases than usual due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in resolved cases in 2021.
2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases - Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court: decrease by 34%.
The decrease is due to the more efficient work of courts in resolving older cases.
3. Other criminal cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year: increase by 16%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in pending cases at the beginning of 2021.
In 2021, approx. 30% of pending cases and 7% of incoming/resolved cases were criminal investigation cases (see general comment).

(2020): Until now, at "1. Severe criminal cases" we have reported both criminal investigation and criminal trial cases (see general comment) for the same criminal offence. For 2020, we have excluded data on investigations to report data on criminal trials only, and criminal investigation is reported at 3. Other criminal cases. The main reason is the comparability of data between countries as criminal investigation is not within the juridiction of courts in most countries. Investigation cases, that were previously reported at 1. Severe criminal cases and are now reported under 3. Other cases represent 5-10% of all reported cases.
The number of incoming Severe criminal cases decreased by 1% in 2019 and the number of resolved cases decreased by 2% in 2019. However, in 2020 the number of incoming cases decreased by 1%, and the number of resolved cases decreased by 23%, mostly due to limitations of operations of courts due to the Covid-19 pandemics. Consequently, the number of pending cases has also increased by 22%.
The number of pending Severe criminal cases, older than 2 years increased in 2019 (by 15%) and stayed roughly the same in 2020, while the number of Misdemeanour cases stayed roughly the same in 2019 and increased significantly (by 128%) in 2020. No specific explanation can be given for any of the mentioned changes. This two factors resulted in increase in total number of pending cases older than 2 years.

(2018): Severe criminal law cases include all offences, listed in the Criminal Code. Such offences are punishable by either imprisonment, fine (monetary penalty) or in some cases with restricting the driving of motorized vehicles. Minor offences are set in other laws (not the Criminal Code) and the procedure is regulated by the Minor Offences Act. Minor offences cannot be punished by deprivation of liberty, but rather by a fine and/or other sanctions, provided by laws.
Discrepancies: This year, some of the cases, previously reported at Severe or Misdemeanor cases, are reported under new category - Other cases (for details, please see general comment). The metodology for the total number of cases reported did not change, and the changes for total are below 20%.

(2016): The observed decreases can be attributed to the decrease in the number of cases, processed by the police and the state prosecution (see Q107).

(2014): According to 2014 data, the category “severe criminal law cases” includes all offences, listed in the Criminal Code. Such offences are punishable by either imprisonment, fine (monetary penalty) or in some cases with restricting the driving of motorized vehicles. At first instance, this category encompasses: criminal cases at local and district courts (K); criminal investigations at district courts (Kpr); criminal cases against juveniles at district courts (Km); criminal investigation actions at local and district courts (Kpd); various criminal matters at local and district courts (Kr); clemency procedures at local and district courts (Po); criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings (Kmp); cases of the out-of-hearing senate (Ks); execution of the sanction of prison (IKZ); execution of criminal sanctions of foreign courts (IKZt); cases of decisions to permit interventions within human rights and freedoms (Pp). The attention should be drawn on the fact that the 2014 data is not comparable to pre-2014 results, because until 2014, only first 3 categories above were reported. In 2015, the reporting method was further improved, and other types of cases were also included in the reporting.
The minor offences are set in other laws (not the Criminal Code) and the procedure is regulated by the Minor Offences Act. The minor offences cannot be punished by deprivation of liberty, but rather by a fine and/or other sanctions, provided by laws. At first instance, this category subsumes: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PR-zsv); minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PR-obp); cancellation of validity of the driver’s licence according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVD); compliance detention (PRuz). This category does not include: legal aid in minor offences (PomPR); international legal aid in minor offences (PomPRi); search of premises (PRhp); setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnk) and various cases in minor offences (PRr).

(2012): The decrease in the number of “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” in 2012 is the result of the reform in law on minor offenses which transferred the jurisdiction of some cases previously tried by courts to other authorities.
According to 2012 data, the category “severe criminal law cases” at first instance included: criminal cases at local and district courts (K); criminal investigations at district courts (Kpr); and criminal cases against juveniles at district courts (Km). The category did not encompass: criminal investigation actions at local and district courts (Kpd); various criminal matters at local and district courts (Kr); clemency procedures at local and district courts (Po); criminal cases against juveniles in preparatory proceedings (Kmp); cases of the out-of-hearing senate (Ks); execution of the sanction of prison (IKZ); execution of criminal sanctions of foreign courts (IKZt); cases of decisions to permit interventions within human rights and freedoms (Pp).

The category “misdemeanour cases and minor offences cases” at first instance included: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PR-zsv); minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PR-obp); minor offences at the transition from 2004 to 2005 (PRs); minor offences, introduced in the judicial jurisdiction after the 31.12.2004 (PRv); cancellation of validity of the driver’s licence according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVD); compliance detention (PRuz). This category did not subsume: legal aid in minor offences (PomPR); international legal aid in minor offences (PomPRi); search of premises (PRhp); setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnk); and various cases in minor offences (PRr).

Spain

(General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Judicial Counsellor detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

(2021): The number of incoming severe criminal cases increased in comparison with 2020, because that was the year in which the pandemic forced mobility restrictions. The recovery of activity, after the most severe restrictions of the pandemic, may have contributed to the improvement in efficiency and increased number of resolved cases.

(2020): Possibly the pandemic, and the restrictions it entailed, have had an impact on the decrease of the number of resolved cases.

(2016): The Organic Law 1/2015 eliminated 'faltas' (misdemeanour) of the Criminal Code, qualifying some of them as minor offenses, and others as administrative infractions. Accordingly, we can observe decreases in the numbers of misdemeanour cases which also affects the total of criminal law cases.

(2014): The Law 41/2015 has amended the Criminal Procedural Law in the sense that those files opened by the police concerning crimes committed by an unknown person will not be submitted to courts but will remain at the police offices at the disposal of the judge and prosecutor, with the exception of those crimes affecting life, sexual integrity, freedom or corruption, in which case the police report will necessarily be referred to the criminal court. As a result, it is expected that the number of incoming cases before the criminal courts will decrease. In addition, the law 1/2015 amended the Penal Code by suppressing the misdemeanors which now will be judged as administrative or civil matters according to their nature or as minor crimes.

(2012): Restarted procedures were not counted because they are not really incoming cases. Besides, there was a readjustment of the statistical data in the period between 2010 and 2012. The final data on pending cases is the real data at December 2012.

Question 097

Austria

(General Comment): From January 1st, 2014 there are 11 newly found courts for administrative law in Austria, namely 9 regional administrative courts, 1 Federal Administrative Court and 1 Federal Tax Court (all courts of first instances). Furthermore, there is also the Supreme Administrative Court (final instance). With regard to administrative law cases there is no second instance. The statistical evidence of the Federal Ministry of Justice of Austria does not distinguish between the types of second instance cases mentioned under 2.1., 2.2. and 2.3. Data regarding the general categories “litigious cases” (1.) and “non-litigious cases” (2.) is available.
The number of “Other cases” (4.) is included in the category “litigious cases” (1.).

(2021): “Civil and commercial litigious cases” – the number of incoming civil litigious cases slightly increased between 2020 and 2021. The number of resolved such cases increased but to a lesser extent than incoming cases. Accordingly, the number of pending civil litigious cases at the end of the year increased. There is no explicit explanation for these variations. It should be recalled that 2020 year was a particular year due to the pandemic. In 2021, the data are back at the level of 2019.

(2017): In the area of appeal cases concerning other than criminal law cases only the categories of general civil law, labour law and social law are gathered. The administrative cases are NAP in second instance since they are presented in first and final instance.

(2016): In the area of appeal cases concerning other than criminal law cases only the categories of general civil law, labour law and social law are gathered. The administrative cases are NAP in second instance since they are presented in first and final instance.

Belgium

(General Comment): Data on pending appeals against first instance decisions of the Justices of the peace and Police courts (civil cases) are not available.

(2021): Court of appeal (civil matters): Pending cases on 1/01/2021 = 29 320 ; Pending cases on 31/12/2021 = 28 507 ; Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court = 12 133. Bron: datawarehouse (date of data extraction: 01/07/2022).

**(2020): ***Cases in the second instance courts , labor courts and cases on appeal against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts (civil matters), at the trial level.
*Court of second instance (civil matters): Cases pending as of 1/01/2020 = 30668; Cases pending as of 12/31/2020 = 29300; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 12391. *Labor Court: Cases pending as of 1/01/2020 = 6033; Cases pending as of 12/31/2020 = 5841; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 1730. Source: datawarehouse (data extraction date: 06/16/2021)
*Civil litigation cases: for 2020, there is a decrease in the number of new cases and an even greater decrease in the number of completed cases due to the pandemic that has affected the operation of the courts

(2018): Number of cases before courts of appeal, labour courts and cases of appeal against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts, at the first instance level.
Court of Appeal (civil matters): pending cases at 1/01/2018 = 33,018; pending cases at 31/12/2018 = 32,321; pending cases for more than 2 years from the date in which the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 13,507. Labour Court: pending cases at 1/01/2018 = 6236; pending cases at 31/12/2018 = 6201; pending cases for more than 2 years from the date in which the case is brought before the courts of second instance = 1535. Bron: datawarehouse (extraction 1/09/2019)
no data on pending appeals against decisions of the justices of the peace and police courts at the first instance level.
In administrative matters, there is no second instance. The Council of State is the only supreme court.

(2017): Number of cases before courts of appeal, labour courts and appeals against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts at the first instance level.
Courts of Appeal: Justice in numbers

(2016): Number of cases before courts of appeal, labour courts and cases of appeals against decisions of justices of the peace and police courts, at first instance.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The division by types of cases in the statistical forms published by Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria is quite different from the CEPEJ categorisation and for that reason breakdown cannot be made. Only administrative cases are possible to differentiate due to existence of administrative courts. In Bulgaria registry cases are under the competence of the Registry agency where is the property register, the commercial register, the BULSTAD register and the Register of the Property Relations between spouses. We should mention though that under current legislation Sofia City Court keeps a public register of political parties (https://sgs.justice.bg/bg/14755) and a public register of religious denominations having the status of legal entities. Sofia City Court is a Provincial/ Regional Court and as other regional courts acts as court of first and second instance. As far as registry cases are concerned Sofia City Court acts as first instance. So, there are some “other registry cases”, however, their number is insignificant. The special place and status of the Sofia City Court among the regional courts is determined by its competences, the most important of which are: claims for the recognition and enforcement of decisions of foreign courts, as well as requests for the recognition of a decision of a foreign court by an interested party that does not have a permanent address or seat on the territory of the Republic of Bulgaria.

(2021): As it is impossible to distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases for the present, for 2021 the following data is available as to the sum of all civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases: pending at the beginning 16 469; incoming 41 774, resolved 41 391 and pending at the end of the year 16 852.

(2020): "Total": the decreases in the number of pending cases is due to growth in civil and commercial cases in 2019 which continued in 2020, but at a slower pace. As it is impossible to distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases for the present, for 2020 the following data is available as to the sum of all civil and commercial litigious and non-litigious cases: pending at the beginning 13 612; incoming 43 927, resolved 41 070 and pending at the end of the year 16 469.

(2019): See General comments

(2018): NA

(2016): There is no particular explanation for the downward trend observed between 2014 and 2016 in respect of the number of pending cases on 1 January for the categories "total" and "administrative law cases". All the data provided is correct.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been explained that the number of pending administrative law cases on 31 December 2012 has increased because of the increase of the number of incoming cases in 2010 and 2012.

Croatia

(2019): Due to legal changes, the High Administrative Court of RoC started to receive more cases from 2016. With the same amount of judges, they did not manage to cope well with this income of case, therefore pending cases increased.

(2018): In category 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases there has been a decrease in the number of pending cases at the beginning of the period, received cases, resolved cases and also pending cases at the end of the year. This seems to be the trend for several years now. Although these courts are resolving less cases than in previous period, due to the reduced income, pending cases are still significantly decreased. Reduced number of received civil litigious and commercial cases on second instance do not have reason in for example law changes. Simply because less cases are resolved at first instance, less appeals are lodged to the second instance.
The increased number of pending administrative law cases at the beginning and at the end of the year as well as received cases is due to the extended jurisdiction of the High administrative court following law changes. The latter led to an increased inflow of cases and difficulty for the High administrative court to cope successfully with the income of second instance cases, especially since the number of judges remain the same as before law changes. This comment was provided also for last cycle. The rest of the categories which have increase or decrease in pending cases is just an effect of the incoming or resolved cases.

(2017): The increased number of pending administrative law cases at the beginning and at the end of the year is due to the extended jurisdiction of the High administrative court following law changes. The latter led to an increased inflow of cases and difficulty for the High administrative court to cope successfully with the income of second instance cases. This comment in more details was provided also for last cycle.
In this category there is more than 20% increase of pending cases at the beginning of reference year in comparison to the beginning 2016. The reason are land registry cases. Reason for increased number of pending land registry cases is decreased number of resolved cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (87%) during previous year (2016.) which affected results for 2017. In 2017, second instance courts also resolved less than received land registry cases.
The reason for the decreased number of pending business registry cases at the beginning of 2017 in comparison to the beginning of 2016 is the number of resolved cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (104%) during 2016. The lower number of received cases and Clearance rate of 106% lead to the decrease of the number of pending business registry cases at the end of 2017. The reason for the decreased number of pending "other non-litigious cases" at the beginning of 2017 in comparison to the beginning of 2016 is the significant number of resolved cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (185%!!) during 2016. Regarding the increased number of incoming cases of this type, there are in absolute numbers very few cases (154) and although there is an increase of more than 20% in comparison to previous year, we think that there is no significant explanation for this, which would affect the trends in following cycles. As for the decrease in the number of resolved "other non-litigious cases", there is no significant explanation for this, but we think that it will not influence the trend in future cycles.
The reason for the decrease of pending civil and commercial litigious cases older than 2 years in second instance courts lays in the fact that in 2017 second instance county courts and the High Commercial Court resolved significant amount of cases in relation to received cases (122%) with special focus on older cases. This led to a decrease of more than 17% of all pending cases and more than 30% of pending cases older than 2 years.
The reason for the decrease of pending non-litigious cases older than 2 years in second instance courts lays in the fact that in 2017 second instance county courts and the High Commercial Court resolved more cases than received (103%) with special focus on older cases. This led to decrease of more than 7% of all pending cases and more than 30% of pending cases older than 2 years (of which they have few in the beginning).The reason for the decrease of pending "general civil and commercial non-litigious cases" older than 2 years in second instance courts lays in the fact that in 2017 second instance county courts and the High Commercial Court resolved more cases than received (103%) with special focus on older cases. This led to decrease of more than 7% of al pending cases and more than 30% of pending cases older than 2 years (of which they have few in the beginning).The reason of the increase of pending registry cases older than 2 years in this category is entirely due to the increase of the number of pending land registry cases older than two years. The reason is already explained - the increase of pending cases in total is due to the difficulty of second instance courts to cope with the income of these cases. Finally, in respect of administrative law cases, due to the decrease of number of pending cases of this type in total, there is also decrease for 8 cases of pending cases older than 2 years (as stated before, we do not think that this is significant change taking into consideration absolute numbers and type of cases).

(2016): Second instance land registry cases, due to introducing separate case registers for certain type of cases on second instance courts,are now traceable as such in case management system. They have been taken out from Other non-litigious cases, where they were presented in previous cycles. The number of administrative cases, both in incoming and pending cases at the end of period is increasing. This is due to the law changes, which have extend jurisdiction of this court and consequently increase income of cases and unresolved cases at the end of period.

(2014): It is noteworthy that in 2012 and 2013, the ICMS could not recognize and divide cases into litigious or non-litigious. In 2014, the ICMS was improved as Croatia introduced updated and a very detailed code table, in order to extract more detailed case types from the system. Therefore, now the distinction between all cases in litigious and non-litigious cases as well as other types of cases can be made very accurately. This change of methodology of categorisation affected the difference between pending cases on 31 December 2013 and pending cases on 1 January 2014 which will disappear in the next cycle.

(2013): In the frame of the 2013 exercise it has been explained that the discrepancies that can be observed in respect of the category “total of other than criminal cases” between the number of pending cases indicated for December 2012 and the number of pending cases communicated for January 2013, result from an administrative correction of a specific small number of cases by the second instance courts after the closure of the statistic period, which the reporting system then generates as a difference concerning previously rendered data.
As to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, owing to a different methodology of presentation of data, the number of pending cases in the end of 2012 does not coincide with the number of pending cases in the beginning of 2013. The number of pending cases on 31 December 2012 included second instance-civil and commercial courts’ cases, bankruptcy cases, general non-litigious cases, enforcement cases, land registry cases and company registry cases. Since 2013, it is possible to provide data on the second-instance civil and commercial litigation cases and bankruptcy cases separately from the general non-litigious cases, enforcement cases, land registry cases and company registry cases.
The variations observed with regard to the category “total of other than non-criminal law cases” for the period 2010-2013 can be explained by the negative economic situation in Croatia, which resulted in the increase of incoming commercial and civil cases before first instance courts and consequently led to the increase of the second instance cases.

(2012): As to the variations observed in respect of the “administrative law cases”, they are justified by the reform related to the administrative justice. Basically, till December 2011, they were adjudicated at the Administrative Court of the Republic of Croatia. Provided that the latter was overburdened, the two-instance administrative adjudication was introduced in January 2012. Four regional administrative courts were established as first instance courts (Zagreb, Osijek, Rijeka and Split), and former Administrative Court became second-instance High Administrative Court (appellate court).

Cyprus

(General Comment): The case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in this question as second instance cases, although Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court.”

(2021): Increase in resolved cases: cases tried together.

(2020): Reducing delays in the disposition time is part of the reform process. In administrative cases in 2019 a big number of cases were tried together. The cases that had the same subject matter were filed individually but were consolidated and tried together but for statistical purposes they were calculated separately. This is the reason why number of resolved cases in 2020 might appear lower than in 2019. The difference in the pending cases in administrative cases compared with previous year is that in this figure we included the cases filed before the Administrative court of international protection which was set up.
The reason we do not have statistical data on subcategories of cases is that the electronic filing system was not introduced that would enable to have statistical data on such cases.

(2019): The Administrative law cases include the cases from the administrative court which was established in 2018.

(2017): appeals filed against decisions of the administrative courts which was established in 2016 should be included in the pending cases on 1.1.2017 as Other cases include family court appeals
Variation between 2016 and 2017 in administrative cases (incoming and resolved): this icludes appeals filed against decisions of the administrative court

(2016): The Supreme Court is the appeal court.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): It is noteworthy that the methodology of presentation of data has been changed since the 2014 exercise. In fact, for 2010, 2012 and 2013, business register cases, administrative cases and insolvency registry cases which are decided by the regional courts (second instance courts) acting as first instance courts, were included in the table concerning the case-load of second instance courts (question 97). On the contrary, since 2014, administrative cases, business registry cases and insolvency cases (and also some litigious cases) which are still decided by the second instance courts acting as first instance courts, are subsumed within the table of question 91 (which was already the case for the 2008 exercise). However, this change is not reflected in question 46 concerning the number of second instance judges because it is very difficult to distinguish among them judges working on administrative cases, business registry cases and insolvency cases (and also some litigious cases).

(2020): In general, number of incoming cases is decreasing and it follows that the numbers of pending cases and resolved are decreasing as well (the situation is getting better). This may result in some big yearly changes and discrepancies. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: In general, number of incoming cases is decreasing (mostly because number of first instance cases is decreasing too) and it follows that the number of pending cases is decreasing as well (the situation is getting better). This may result in some big yearly changes and discrepancies.
Other cases: The variations are the result of changes in first instance agenda. This category includes insolvency cases and there were numerous legislative changes in last years. Also, it must be noted that the number of pending cases is relatively small, thus the variance is bigger.

(2019): In "Other cases" category, insolvency cases are reported.
In general, number of incoming cases is decreasing and it follows that the numbers of pending cases and resolved are decreasing as well (the situation is getting better). This may result in some big yearly changes and discrepancies.

(2018): In "Other cases" category, insolvency cases are reported.
In general, number of incoming cases is decreasing and it follows that the numbers of pending cases and resolved are decreasing as well (the situation is getting better). This may result in some big yearly changes and discrepancies.

(2017): In "Other cases" category, insolvency cases are reported. In this year the number of resolved insolvency cases greatly exceeded the number of incoming insolvency cases, which led to huge drop in pending cases at the end of the year and discrepancy appeared. The changes are connected to changes in first instance insolvency agenda.

(2016): Increase in the number of "other cases" in 2015 and 2016 is due to the change of methodology applied to these data.

(2015): Increases in the number of "other cases" are due to the change of methodology applied to the 2015 data.

(2014): In 2014, the high increase of insolvency cases is due to numerous cases of personal bankruptcies as well as to an unfavourable economic situation.

(2013): For the 2013 exercise, the totals do not include the number of non-litigious business registry cases which is not available.

(2012): For the 2012 exercise, the totals do not include the number of non-litigious business registry cases which is not available.

Denmark

(General Comment): It is noteworthy that all appellate cases are considered as “litigious cases” which explains the reply NAP for all the other categories, as well as the fact that the total coincides with the number of civil and commercial litigious cases. The number of “administrative law cases” which are litigious is encompassed in the number of “civil and commercial litigious cases”.
Another important remark concerns cases that are not first instance cases before the two High Courts and which are included in question 97. Cases that begin as first instance at one of the two High Courts are not included in the figures in table 97.

(2016): Pending cases may vary a lot depending on the ratio of resolved cases compared to incoming cases. We can observe a decrease of about 30 % of pending cases ultimo the 2016. This is due to this "residual" nature of pending cases. The decrease in the pending cases between 2014 and 2016 is because in both calendar years 2015 and 2016 the number of resolved cases exceed the number of incoming cases.

(2014): In the ambit of the 2014 exercise, it has been emphasized that due to an improved business situation, courts on all levels receive fewer cases, i.e. civil cases, enforcement cases, forced sales, insolvency cases. Generally speaking, pending cases are also reduced thereby.

Estonia

(General Comment): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

(2021): In 2021, a general increase in the case load of circuit courts is observed.

(2019): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database.

(2015): In respect of the civil and commercial non-litigious cases, the increase from 2013 in the number of pending cases resulted from the implementation of an efficiency-raising project in 2013 in Harju County Court. Accordingly, the efficiency of the latter increased significantly in civil cases. Owing to the fact that this court is the largest 1st instance court dealing with 1/3 of all of the cases in Estonia, it had an impact on the case-flow of the second instance courts (only 2 appeal courts competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters).
As to the administrative cases, it is noteworthy that as there are only 2 appeal courts in Estonia competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters, every change in the number of 2nd instance judges influences the statistics of the Courts of appeal. Between 2010 and 2012 there were a few vacant administrative judges’ positions in one of the appeal courts which had an impact on the number of pending cases

(2014): On the occasion of the 2014 exercise, it has been emphasized that there has been an ongoing reform concerning the court budgets and judicial performance indicators. Agreements have to be adopted on the occasion of the budget negotiations between the Ministry of Justice and the courts concerning the efforts that need to be undertaken in court to clear the backlog and accelerate proceedings.
As to the increase of the total of pending other than criminal cases (beginning and end of the year), the reason is that 1st instance courts started the project of clearing backlogs and accelerating proceeding earlier. As a result, the number of incoming cases in 2nd instance courts increased in 2013 and resulted also in an increase of the number of pending cases by the end of the year 2013.
For 2014, non-litigious enforcement cases are included in the category “general civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases”.

(2013): In the frame of the 2012 and 2013 exercises, several clarifications were provided.
Firstly, in respect of the civil and commercial litigious cases, the observed variations were deemed to be normal, as a part of the ordinary dynamics of the case-flow.
Secondly, in respect of the civil and commercial non-litigious cases, the increase in the number of pending cases resulted from the implementation of an efficiency-raising project in 2013 in Harju County Court. Accordingly, the efficiency of the latter increased significantly in civil cases. Owing to the fact that this court is the largest 1st instance court dealing with 1/3 of all of the cases in Estonia, it had an impact on the case-flow of the second instance courts (only 2 appeal courts competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters). Owing to that, in 2014 one civil judge's position was given to the Tallinn Appeal Court in order to raise their efficiency.
As to the enforcement procedures, they are in the competence of public bailiffs who are completely independent from the judicial system but act as public authorities. The reply NA is justified by the impossibility to distinguish in the bailiffs' information system the enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is court decision from all the other enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is for example a fine made by police, an administrative act made by the tax authority etc.
In respect of the land registry and business registry cases, it should be recalled that they are within the competence of the 1st instance courts. If the decision of the registry is appealed, it goes to the first instance court as a regular civil case.
As to the administrative cases, it is noteworthy that as there are only 2 appeal courts in Estonia competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters, every change in the number of 2nd instance judges influences the statistics of the Courts of appeal. Between 2010 and 2012 there were a few vacant administrative judges' positions in one of the appeal courts which had an impact on the number of pending cases.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 and 2013 exercises, several clarifications were provided.
Firstly, in respect of the civil and commercial litigious cases, the observed variations were deemed to be normal, as a part of the ordinary dynamics of the case-flow.
Secondly, in respect of the civil and commercial non-litigious cases, the increase in the number of pending cases resulted from the implementation of an efficiency-raising project in 2013 in Harju County Court. Accordingly, the efficiency of the latter increased significantly in civil cases. Owing to the fact that this court is the largest 1st instance court dealing with 1/3 of all of the cases in Estonia, it had an impact on the case-flow of the second instance courts (only 2 appeal courts competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters). Owing to that, in 2014 one civil judge's position was given to the Tallinn Appeal Court in order to raise their efficiency.
As to the enforcement procedures, they are in the competence of public bailiffs who are completely independent from the judicial system but act as public authorities. The reply NA is justified by the impossibility to distinguish in the bailiffs' information system the enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is court decision from all the other enforcement proceedings where the enforcement instrument is for example a fine made by police, an administrative act made by the tax authority etc.
In respect of the land registry and business registry cases, it should be recalled that they are within the competence of the 1st instance courts. If the decision of the registry is appealed, it goes to the first instance court as a regular civil case.
As to the administrative cases, it is noteworthy that as there are only 2 appeal courts in Estonia competent in civil, criminal and administrative matters, every change in the number of 2nd instance judges influences the statistics of the Courts of appeal. Between 2010 and 2012 there were a few vacant administrative judges' positions in one of the appeal courts which had an impact on the number of pending cases.

Finland

(2021): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Other cases are: Cases dealt in Court of Appeal as first instance, military court cases, and cases related to releasing a prisoner serving a life sentence [pitkäaikaisvankien vapauttamismenettelyasiat].

(2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases
managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

(2019): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 22.1.2020 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is:
1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts).

(2018): In 2017, the number of incoming cases has decreased for example due to some procedural changes and the courts have been
able to resolve more pending cases. Accordingly, the number of pending cases at the beginning of 2018 has decreased.

(2017): In 2016, the number of incoming cases has decreased (for example due to some procedural changes) and the courts have been able to resolve more pending cases. Accordingly, the number of pending cases at the beginning of 2017 has decreased.

(2016): The number of incoming cases has decreased (for example due to some procedural changes) and the courts have been able to resolve more pending cases.

(2013): The category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases includes petitions for the 2012 exercise, divorce cases and petitions (without cases included in the other sub-categories) for the 2013 exercise. As for the category “other”, according to the provided comments, in 2012 it encompasses cases, which Appeal Courts resolve as 1st instance, military justice cases and cases concerning prisoners. In 2013 it subsumes temporary procedural remedy cases, adjustment of the debts of a private individual - cases, restructuring of enterprises cases and bankruptcy cases and complaints.

(2012): The category of civil and commercial non-litigious cases includes petitions for the 2012 exercise, divorce cases and petitions (without cases included in the other sub-categories) for the 2013 exercise. As for the category “other”, according to the provided comments, in 2012 it encompasses cases, which Appeal Courts resolve as 1st instance, military justice cases and cases concerning prisoners. In 2013 it subsumes temporary procedural remedy cases, adjustment of the debts of a private individual - cases, restructuring of enterprises cases and bankruptcy cases and complaints.

France

(2021): Source Council of State and SDSE
Administrative law cases: regarding the ageing of the stock, the output of the Administrative Courts of Appeal (CAA) fell sharply in 2020 (-10%) because of the COVID-19. When the situation returned to normal, the CAAs gave priority to foreigners' litigation, which accounts for almost 50% of their entries, and the stock therefore aged mechanically.

(2020): "The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (by reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to trial). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly affected the TAs.
Commentary provided by the highest administrative Court : As a reminder, the measures derogating from the ordinary law of contentious administrative procedure adopted to respond to the situation arising from the health crisis caused by the Covid-19 epidemic were provided for by Ordinance no. 2020-305 of March 25, 2020, and then by Ordinance no. 2020-1402 of November 18, 2020, and Decree no. 2020-1406 of the same day. I - Concerning the rules relating to the organization or holding of hearings 1°) Use of audiovisual or any other means of electronic communication
The two orders of March 25 and November 18, 2020 provided for the possibility of using an audiovisual means of telecommunication for the holding of hearings or any other means of electronic communication.
When this device was used, it was used, in almost all the jurisdictions that had recourse to it, for less than 10% of the cases judged in collegiality during the same period.
The most common configuration used was that in which one or more members of the panel were at a distance and the president, the other members of the panel, and the parties and their counsel were in the courtroom (approximately 75% of the courts that used videoconferencing chose this configuration, and 53% of them used it for less than 10% of the cases heard by the panel). Very few courts have used video-conferencing with remote parties. The reasons for which the courts have used video-conferencing are linked to the constraints linked to the health crisis, in particular the difficulties encountered by lawyers to travel, especially in overseas territories, and the isolation imposed on certain people (judges or lawyers) declared to be in contact or recognized as fragile.
In the case of single-judge hearings, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions allowing the use of an audiovisual means of telecommunication, since only 6 administrative courts out of 35 have indicated that they have used it. The administrative courts indicated that they had used videoconferencing, as a single judge, for the processing of emergency proceedings in matters concerning foreigners, particularly in cases where the foreigner was in administrative detention. Finally, 15 administrative courts indicated that they held summary proceedings by videoconference. For almost all of these courts, the summary proceedings judge was in the courtroom and the parties were at a distance, and less than 10% of summary proceedings cases were judged in this configuration. Travel difficulties were the main reasons why the courts of first instance held summary proceedings by videoconference. The texts applicable during the state of health emergency allowed the use of any means of electronic communication, other than videoconferencing, in case of impossibility to use it. Only a few TAs used this procedure and for less than 10% of the cases in the courts that used it.
Generally speaking, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions of the orders allowing hearings to be held by videoconference and this use was justified by the constraints and difficulties linked to the health crisis. 2°) The provisions allowing to limit the number of persons attending the hearing were applied by a large number of courts and in a frequent manner. On the other hand, the provisions allowing the president of the court to decide that the hearing will be held without the presence of the public have been used very little. 3°) The dispensation of the public rapporteur's conclusions has been used very little by the courts. This dispensation was applied because of the vulnerable state of the public rapporteur or to limit the length of the hearings (in these cases the dispensation was granted for cases that did not present any difficulty).

(2017): As regards administrative law cases, the Council of State report indicates that it is a coincidence to have the same number for incoming and resolved cases.

(2013): 2012, 2013: The 'non-litigious matters relating to the implementation' (which answer is NA) exist but are included in the category 'non-litigious civil cases'.

(2012): 2012, 2013: The 'non-litigious matters relating to the implementation' (which answer is NA) exist but are included in the category 'non-litigious civil cases'.

Germany

(General Comment): General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys generally only count the number of received cases, claims, etc..
In the monthly surveys of a court, a statistical record with regard to the stage of appeal exists for the proceedings covered by the procedural surveys, while the case count for "other caseload" generally only exists for the whole court.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistencies with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occur in the statistics published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this is, that courts submit count corrections for the monthly surveys at the end of the year.

(2021): "Other": family cases at Higher Regional Courts, appeal and complaint proceedings at Regional Labour Courts
Pending civil and commercial litigious cases on 31 Dec: The discrepancy stems from a rise in pending cases at the Higher Regional Courts (approx. 33% compared to 2020). While the number of pending cases at the Higher Regional Courts has risen in all Länder, the discrepancy is especially high in Baden-Württemberg (rise of approx. 88%). The reason for this is most likely the flood of lawsuits brought against car manufracturers in connection with the "diesel emission scandal". The Higher Regional Court of Stuttgart, where a large manufracturer has its main offices, has seen a rise in pending cases of more than 100% compared to 2020.

(2020): family cases at Higher Regional Courts, appeal and complaint proceedings at Regional Labour Courts

(2019): The horizontal consistency in the table is not ensured because the data are continuously checked.

(2015): A substancial number of the Länder was unable to provide information, meaning that any amount cited would not be meaningful in substantive terms.

(2014): The 2014 data are the same as those that have been provided in 2013. No update was available.

(2013): For 2013, two Landers did not provide any information.
The category “other “ includes proceedings on complaints on appeal in family cases at the Higher Regional Courts and appellate proceedings on fact and law and proceedings on complaints on appeal at the Regional Labour Courts. In addition, given a lack of complete data, a total of 164 272 new legal cases or proceedings on complaints on appeal (in custodianship, accommodation, insolvency, estate, and costs cases, along with other complaints on appeal) were not considered in the category “other”.
Regarding the slight horizontal inconsistency for the category “administrative law cases”, it can partly be explained by the federal State structure of Germany. Moreover, data regarding incoming administrative law cases also reflected the number of appeals against decisions to grant provisional legal protection in the higher administrative regional courts and in the higher social courts; and appeals in matters of legal aid and other proceedings. In comparison with the previous years, the 2013 data are more accurate. The same applies regarding resolved cases even though no data was available for the appeals in matters of legal aid and other proceedings.
With regard to the sub-category “civil and commercial litigious cases” and the meaningful increase of the number of resolved cases, it should be noticed that in the frame of the 2013 exercise, the indicated figure encompassed the number of resolved civil and commercial litigious and not-litigious cases. For this cycle, it was impossible to distinguish between these two sub-categories.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 evaluation it was stressed that the values regarding questions 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108 corresponded to data of the year 2011.

Greece

(2021): The data are from the Statistical Service of the Ministry of Justice.
The data has been collected from the 19 out of 19 Courts of Appeal in Greece.
Business registry cases do not belong anymore to the case of the courts, there is new department of a different Ministry.

(2020): Due to the pandemic, pending cases have accumulated in the courts of first instance, with the result that the courts of second instance have fewer cases to handle.
The data given for questions 97 and 98 are collected from all second instance courts. However, many fields are answered NA as only few data were collected from the second instance Courts.

(2019): The Council of State did not provide the Ministry of Justice with data regarding the Administrative law cases

(2017): Concerning Civil and Commercial litigious cases but also administrative law cases, the numbers are different from those provided in the 2016 questionnaire due to the recent operation of the OSDDY-PP and OSDDY-DD Integrated Management Systems (please see the comments provided for Q91).
Variations in the number of resolved cases are explained by the fact that in 2017 the function of the courts was not affected by the strike of the lawyers, which took place in 2016.

(2016): Any deviations from the 2015 figures are due to a new way of collecting statistics. In fact, in 2016, a working group was set up to update and simplify the content of the statistical data requested by the judicial services of the country. The working group created tables followed by detailed instructions and training in relation to the requested information. According to the instructions given to the courts, some procedures they handle, in those which there is no participation of a judge, are not included in the data collected. In addition, in 2016 a long-term abstention by the lawyers of the country took place, resulting in reduction of numbers regarding the cases.

(2012): In the ambit of the 2012 exercise, it has been stressed that, as far as the statistical information provided by the courts is concerned (e.g. replies to questions 91 and 97), the system of collecting data could not comply with the CEPEJ methodology because it was planned having altogether different national needs in mind. Thus, schematically, a case brought into the Greek judicial system gets an initial reference number. However, in the process of being tried, it gets more than one reference number according to the laws. As a result the numbers of incoming and resolved cases do not match.
Moreover, the Ministry of Justice, Transparency and Human Rights was not able to verify the accuracy of the replies, due to the lack of IT system.
Besides, recent law changes have altered the jurisdiction of courts, so the figures communicated for 2012 could not be compared with these provided for the previous evaluation cycles.

Hungary

(2021): As of 1 April 2020, a significant change was introduced concerning the competence of the Administrative Chamber. As a result of this change, all legal remedies sought for in administrative disputes were decided by the Curia after 1 April 2020. Other cases: second instance labour cases and those second instance insolvency cases that are not included in category 2.1.

(2020): The pandemic situation had a huge effect on the case flow of the courts on every level of the court system. Special regulations were adopted by the legislator to promote videoconferencing and the courts were "closed between the 16th of March and the 31th of March (during this period no procedural events could be performed at the courts). Although the courts carried out their main activities, many cases were prolonged e.g. because the parties were not able to attend the hearings. Regarding administrative cases the re-organization of administrative jurisdiction also could have an effect on the case-flow.

(2019): No specific reason was pointed out in respect of decreases observed for the period 2018 - 2019 with regard to "4. other cases".

(2017): With regard to variations observed in the numbers of “registry cases” and “other registry cases”, it is noteworthy that the content of these categories is the same for the last four cycles. As the legislation on civil societies was amended in 2014 this resulted in an increased number of registry cases, but since then the number of incoming cases is decreasing.

(2016): With regard to the pending cases, it is noteworthy specifying that the decrease of the “backlog” of the courts is an overall trend in the Hungarian judiciary.
As for the other variations observed within the frame of question 97, the “raw” figures in most of the categories can be considered as relatively low figures (e.g. some hundreds in the whole country), so even a not so huge increase or decrease result in a large percentage change.

(2014): In 2014, in contrast with the 2013 evaluation, some registration cases were also included within the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”. The item “other registry cases” includes registration of civil societies. The item “other non-litigious cases” includes court mediation and non-litigious labour cases.
The category “other” encompasses insolvency cases and labour cases.

Ireland

(General Comment): Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

(2020): Reduced cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. This included domestic violence and criminal proceedings. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie.
Attendance at Court offices was by appointment only to ensure that footfall could be safely managed.
The Court of Appeal quickly adopted the use of video technology and made greater use of electronic documentation to facilitate its work. Procedures were introduced to ensure that justice was administered in public. Judgments were delivered electronically. Waiting times for a hearing were improved, to a certain extent, by a net reduction in the numbers of new cases coming into the list from other jurisdictions. By year end, there was a net improvement in the numbers of cases waiting to be dealt with compared to 2019.

(2017): The number of resolved civil and commercial litigious cases reflects a significant reduction in disposal of second instance appeals by comparison with that returned in the previous reporting cycle.

(2016): As concerns the number of resolved "Civil and commercial litigious cases", 2016 data reflects a significant increase in disposal of second instance appeals over that in the previous reporting cycle. Accordingly, the total of resolved cases is affected.

Italy

(General Comment): · Non-litigious enforcement cases are not in the competence of the Courts of Appeal.
· With regard to the administrative cases (which number is provided only since 2014), the appeals are dealt with by the Council of State (Consiglio di Stato) which is a legal-administrative consultative body ensuring the legality of public administration in Italy. The Council has jurisdiction on acts of all administrative authorities, except when these authorities lack discretionary power, in which case the dispute is considered to be one of civil law. Figures referring to the activity of the Council of State are inserted in the frame of question 99 and not question 97.

(2021): There are no "other cases"
Figures in 2020 were hugely affected by the pandemic

(2020): In 2020 the case flow was highly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent temporary shutdown of courts. This had an impact on both incoming and resolved cases, which fell quite considerably compared to 2019. However, the fall in the number of resolved cases was less drastic than that of incoming cases, resulting in a clearance rate (CR) higher than 100% and, hence, in a reduction in the number of the unresolved cases (i.e. the pending cases at the end of the period). The COVID-19 pandemic also had a strong impact on the disposition time (DT).

(2018): -

(2017): The number of pending “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, older than 2 years, decreased between 2016 and 2017. Generally speaking, pending cases older than 2 year have priority. However, in this specific case, the important reduction (in %) is mainly due to the fact that the numbers are small.

(2016): As regards the variations concerning the category "general civil (and commercial) non litigious cases", it should be noted that the Ministry of Justice has recently implemented a data warehouse system that can collect a huge number of data and events pertaining to millions of civil cases. The new DWGC (Data Warehouse for Civil Justice) is now fully operational and it represents a major improvement in terms of statistics and quality. Since 2015, data pertaining to Q.97 is extracted from the above Datawarehouse and it is to be considered more accurate than the figures provided in the past.
It should be noted that in 2014 for many cases it was not possible to distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases because they were coming together in a bundle. With the data warehouse it is possible to tell whether any given procedure has either litigious or non-litigious nature. Besides, when comparing pending cases on 31 Dec 2014 with pending cases on 1 Jan 2016, the variations are less important.

(2015): The appeal of administrative case is dealt by the Council of State (Consiglio di Stato) which is a legal-administrative consultative body that ensures the legality of public administration in Italy. The council has jurisdiction on acts of all administrative authorities, except when these authorities lack discretionary power, in which case the dispute is considered to be one of civil law.

Figures referring to the activity of the Council of State (second instance of administrative justice) have been submited to Q.99 rather than Q.97.

Figures on Q.97 (points 1 and 2) have been extracted from a new IT system called “Civil Data warehouse”. This new system allows us to get in-depth information on single proceedings. Before the implementation of such data warehouse, statistics were based on aggregated variables that only partially could distinguish between litigious and non-litigious cases.
All cases dealt by the Supreme Court of Cassation has always a litigious nature.

Latvia

(General Comment): Data from the first and appeal instance courts are compiled by the Court Administration, and the Court Information System is a living database that allows data to be corrected, so changes between previous periods are possible. In accordance with the provisions related to data gathering, all information must be recorded in the Court Information System within 3 days. However, the Court Information System functionality for the statistical reports provides in the System recorded figures at the end of the year. Consequently, submissions received in the previous year but registered the next year are considered as incoming cases for the new year.
Justice statistics do not distinguish between “non-litigious enforcement cases” and “non-litigious business registry cases” because such types of cases are not defined in the Civil Code. Accordingly, the reply in their respect is NAP. At any rate, both of these sub-categories of cases are not within the competence of courts neither in first instance (similar to the “non-litigious land registry cases”), nor in second instance. By contrast, the “non-litigious land registry cases” are dealt with by the regional courts in second instance and they are within the competence of the Land Registry Office only in first instance.

(2021): Comparing to the previous period, the number of pending civil cases on 1 Jan is lower due the restriction measures of the Covid-19 spreading in 2019 and 2020. However indicator of pending administrative law cases on the beginning of year is lower than previous period due the high CR in 2020.
The reduction of pending cases is related to the increased interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending cases.

(2020): Data on civil (commercial) litigious cases (number of resolved and incoming cases) is lower due to the Covid19 pandemic. On March 14 2020 there was the state of emergency that affected the work of courts. In order to mitigate potential risks of virus, oral proceedings that did not involve serious violations of rights were cancelled. This restriction directly affected the number of resolved cases. Also, there were restrictions on appearance of persons in the court, that affected the number of new claims or request - incoming cases. The first state of emergency lasted till June 2020. The second state of emergency started in November 2020.
Number on civil (commercial) non - litigious cases include the data like in the first instance. Mainly there are cases on undisputed enforcement. Usually, non-litigious cases are resolved in written (not oral) process, and during State of emergency oral processes were not allowed, but there were no restriction on written process. According to this the number of non-litigious cases are higher.
Number on incoming administrative cases are lower. It is connected with restrictions of state emergency situation when representatives from institutions could not check, revise, visit companies (individuals) in the face-to-face meetings.

(2019): Decrease of pending administrative cases us due to many result cases in previous period
The number of Non-litigious civil cases is very low, that's why percentage isn't good qualifier

(2018): Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – pending. Data on court statistics are being calculated by automated systems and records on changes that affect data in database are not available. Any changes to the Court Information System can affect the data.

(2017): As regards the decrease from 2016 in administrative law cases pending on 1 Jan, it can be explained as there were much more resolved cases than incoming in previous cycle. As regards the decrease in the total of other than criminal pending cases, it can be explained as there was a change of pending civil law cases in second instance. This might be an issue due to reclassifying the starting moment of a court case. Also, much more resolved cases than incoming cases has decreased the amount of unresolved cases on 31 Dec.

(2016): The increase in pending civil cases is due to fewer resolved cases in 2015. Decrease in pending Administrative cases is due to more resolved cases in 2015.

(2014): In the frame of the 2013 and 2014 exercises it has been indicated that the category “other” includes the following types of cases from the Supreme Court : cases related to moral and physical damages; copyright related cases; family relationship; deprivation of citizenship; labour law cases; cases in respect of inheritance rights.

(2013): In the frame of the 2013 and 2014 exercises it has been indicated that the category “other” includes the following types of cases from the Supreme Court : cases related to moral and physical damages; copyright related cases; family relationship; deprivation of citizenship; labour law cases; cases in respect of inheritance rights.

(2012): The decreases observed in 2012 with regard to the totals in respect of the different items (pending, incoming and resolved cases) are the consequence of the evolutions noticed for each of the sub-categories in respect of the number of incoming cases. The decrease of the latter and the improvement of the judicial efficiency resulted in a decrease of the number of pending cases. The end of the economic crisis and the strengthening of the courts’ capacity are general factors which have to be taken into account when analysing this positive trend.
As to the sub-category “civil and commercial litigious cases“, the increase of the number of pending cases on 1 January 2012 is due to the increase of the number of incoming cases in different categories of cases such as different types of bankruptcy cases which know a long processing time. The duration of these special types of bankruptcy cases cannot be shortened by improving the efficiency of the judiciary. The increase of the number of resolved cases can be explained by the improvement of the work capacity of courts.
As to the sub-category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, the decrease of the number of resolved cases and pending cases on 1 January 2012 and 31 December 2012 can be explained by the transfer of a part of the cases from the first instance courts to the Land Registry Department, following the legislative reform of 1 January 2012. The number of incoming cases has decreased essentially due to external (socio-economic) factors, namely the gradual exit from the economic crisis during 2010-2013.
As to the sub-category “non-litigious land registry cases”, the increase of the number of resolved cases between 2010 and 2012 can be explained by the courts work reviewing a large number of cases in the law limited time because of external factors causing an increase of the number of incoming cases before the entry into force of the new provisions of the Civil Procedure Law on 1 January 2012.
As to the sub-category “administrative law cases”, the decrease of the number of pending cases on 1 January 2012 can be explained by the courts work, namely the improvement of the judicial capacity and the decrease of the number of incoming cases due to external factors as public activity resubmission to the Administrative Court and internal factors. The decrease of the number of resolved cases can be explained by the limited capacity of courts work, the complexity of the cases, the parties’ failure to appear for court hearings, etc. The decrease of the number of pending cases on 31 December can be explained by the improvement of the judicial capacity of courts and decrease of incoming cases due to external factors.
There are no cases in the sub-category “other”. All cases are distributed among the mentioned categories No.1, No.2 and No.6.
The decreases observed with regard to the totals in respect of the different items (pending, incoming, resolved cases) are the consequence of the evolutions noticed for each of the sub-categories in respect of the number of incoming cases. The decrease of the latter and the improvement of the judicial efficiency resulted in a decrease of the number of pending cases on 1 January and 31 December. The end of the economic crisis and the strengthening of the courts’ capacity are general factors which have to be taken into account when analysing this positive trend.
As to the sub-category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, the increase of the number of resolved cases between 2012 and 2013 can be explained by the long pending backlog of complex cases before the courts of the second instance.

Lithuania

(General Comment): In Lithuania, statistical data on case flow and their classification are made according to the specific regulations and are mainly based on the institutes of Civil, Criminal Codes and the codes of Civil and Criminal procedures, as well as the Code of Administrative Offences and the law on Administrative procedure. Therefore figures for some of the types of cases are unavailable because there is no such classification while making statistical reports. In respect of the variations that can be observed between figures provided for the different evaluation cycles and in the light of the above described peculiarity of the statistic system of Lithuania, it is noteworthy that cases the number of which is not available are included in other categories, i.e. “civil litigious”, “civil non-litigious”. Accordingly, the indicated totals are relevant. Second instance courts deal with some non-litigious cases, but their number is insignificant.

(2021): Other cases include appeal cases regarding decisions announced by the district courts in cases of administrative offenses.
The number of incoming administrative cases were increased in 2021 due to 1214 cases received in Vilnius Regional Administrative Court and the Regional Administrative Court regarding asylum (due to decisions taken by the Migration Department under the Ministry of Internal Affairs not to consider the request for granting asylum or decisions not to grant asylum). Only 335 such cases were examined.

(2020): Second instance courts deal with some non-litigious cases, but their number is insignificant.

(2019): "Other": administrative offence cases (including cases in process of enforcement (execution)).
"Administrative cases" - the data provided encompasses cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania; it is to notice that these figures include apellation cases (on decisions of the court of first Instance) well as cases that are heard in the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania as sole instance.
"Pending cases older than two years": the decrease is due to the fact that cases pending for more than 2 years have been resolved.

(2018): The decrease in "other cases" (4), i.e. administrative offence cases (including cases in process of enforcement (execution), at second instance courts (appeal) in 2017-2018 period was related to the decreased number of resolved administrative offence cases in the first instance courts (see Q091).

(2017): As regards the category "other cases" which refers to cases of administrative offences and cases of administrative offences in process of enforcement (execution), the observed decreases in their numbers (pending at the beginning of 2017, incoming, resolved, pending at the end of 2017) are the consequence of the entry into force of the new Code of Administrative Offences.

(2016): The changes in number of cases are mainly related to the increased number of resolved administrative cases in the first instance administrative courts in 2015 and 2016 (the courts were fighting backlogs from previous years) and the renewed processes that were suspended in the second instance court due to the application to the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania (related to salaries of civil servants, decreased pensions, etc.).

(2014): The increase between 2013 and 2014 in number of cases can be explained by the increase in the number of incoming administrative cases and cases of administrative offence. They were mostly cases on remuneration of public servants in 2013 due to the decision of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania, which recognized the laws on the reduction of the remuneration of state servants and judges unconstitutional. This also had an effect on the significant increase of the category “other cases” since this situation resulted in the increase of the number of cases of administrative offence (in execution process).

Luxembourg

(2021): The increased number of pending administrative law cases at the beginning of 2021 is a consequence of the increase in the number of pending administrative law cases at the end of 2020. In this respect, it should be recalled that the decrease of the Clearance rate for 2020 was mainly due to the increase in the number of appeals, in particular those relating to the general development plan of the City of Luxembourg. These cases had entered the first instance from January to March 2018, while the related judgments, consolidated by the administrative court, were delivered between May and September 2020. The related appeals, 51 in number, were filed between July and November 2020 and were still under investigation on 31 December 2020 due to the fixed time limit regime of investigation, but also due to the pandemic and the introduction of crisis legislation involving a suspension of appeal timeframes.

(2020):

Administrative cases - the decrease in the RC for 2020 is primarily due to the increase in the number of appeal motions, particularly those related to the City of Luxembourg's general development plan. These cases were entered in the first instance from January to March 2018, while the related judgments, consolidated by the Administrative Court, were issued between May and September 2020. The related appeals, numbering 51, were filed between July and November 2020 and were still being processed on December 31, 2020, due to the fixed timeframe regime (suspension from July 16 to September 15 - one month for the answer - one month for the reply - one month for the rejoinder), but also due to the pandemic and the implementation of crisis legislation involving a suspension of the appeal deadlines (until June 24, 2020). Thus, in addition to the increase in the number of requests for appeal, their investigation has been postponed, leading to an increase in the number of cases pending as of December 31, 2020. Throughout 2020, the Administrative Court was essentially up to date and disposed of cases as soon as they had been heard. The same is true in 2021.

(2019): Civil and commercial litigious cases pending at the beginning of the year have been restated in relation to those available at the time of the 2018-2020 evaluation cycle. The introduction of a new case management application at the Court of Appeal (JUCIV) has made it possible to identify a number of cases, still listed as pending, which were in fact completed.

(2016): It is a fact that the number of appeals before the Court decreased between 2014 and 2016. A key reason is that the number of appellate judgments rendered by the court has decreased significantly. The first reason is that the court had to evacuate a large number of cases as a matter of priority under the so-called accelerated procedure provided for by the law of 18 December 2015 on international protection. For the judicial year 2015/2016, 355 judgments out of a total of 938 judgments (excluding striking off) were rendered in accelerated proceedings and therefore not subject to appeal.

(2013): 2013: because of the international events that have increased the number of asylum seekers, the administrative courts that have jurisdiction in case of appeal against a refusal of refugee status, have, in particular in 2013 but already during the 3-4 previous years, known a significant increase in this very specific litigation both at first instance level and appeal level.

Malta

(2020): The decrease in the Incoming caseload results from the disruption of the pandemic on the court operations.
In the second instance courts, we are still unable to distinguish precisely between the cases that are appealed. Thus, Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

(2019): Total other than criminal cases - resolved cases: The data shows an increase in the resolved cseload of the 2nd instance courts and in fact, the pending caseload at the end of the year is less than that registered in 2018. These courts were more efficient in 2019.

(2017): In Malta, the civil second instance courts comprise the Civil Court of Appeal in its Inferior and Superior Jurisdiction. To date, whilst we can collect the data relating to the incoming, resolved and pending caseloads of these courts, we cannot easily distinguish between the sub-divisions of case typology outlined above. What we can tell for sure is that all cases filed before the Courts of Appeal are civil and commercial litigious cases (including a minority of administrative law cases) so the figures provided at Category 1 reflect the global total of cases heard at the second instance courts. Non-litigious cases are not filed before these courts (hence NAP answers).
Concerning the variation between 2016 and 2017 in the pending cases older than 2 years, the reason is due to a different methodology used in 2016 and in 2017.

(2016): Regarding Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: 2015 was the best year in terms of number of resolved cases, mainly because the judiciary were trying hard to conclude cases that were ready for sentencing. In fact, our efficiency indicators reflected this effort. As regards to the other data, we do not, as yet, have those statistics at hand and hence, the last 3 evaluations were marked as NAP.

(2014): The discrepancy in the data provided for 2014 as “pending cases on 31st December 2014” results from an internal exercise being carried out by the Court Administration in which cases that have been prescribed, are being cleaned from the system. This exercise is going to be carried out more frequently so that it does not reflect in discrepancies in the data that is published.

(2013): The significant increase of the number of civil and commercial litigious cases between 2010 and 2013 was due to the fact that the number of appeals has increased substantially in the past few years and the jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal has been extended to include also appeals from large public contract awards. Accordingly, the Court of Appeal was not in a position to manage the considerable influx of cases.

(2012): In 2012, a number of judges in the Appeal Court retired and their replacement took some time to materialise, as a result of which, the number of decided cases decreased.

Netherlands

(General Comment): It is not possible to differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases at second instance. The financial registrations at first instance make a clear distinction between types of cases (that the answer for first instance can be based upon), but for second instances this differentiation does not exist (and thus, the registration is all the same).
As to the lack of horizontal consistency that can be observed, the reason is that the official number of cases pending on January 1st is determined at different time then the other 3 categories (official incoming, official resolved, official pending on December 31st). Due to time lags in registration and dynamics in the data systems, if the cases pending on January 1st are measured at the same time as the others, the result would be different.

(2021): The number of incoming administrative law cases increased between 2020 and 2021, most probably due to the pandemic. Especially, the number of appeals for tax cases is higher in 2021.

(2020): It is not possible for us to differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases at second instance. In short, we can provide this for first instance because the financial registrations makes clear distinction between types of cases (finances differ) that we can base that answer on, but for second instances, this differentiation in finances does not exist and thus, the registration is all the same.

(2019): .

(2018): If there is an appeal, cases are litigious in my view. I would tend to enter the value "0", but since the question is being asked, you probably see things differently. So I chose the answer "NA"

(2017): Administrative law cases, litigeous plus non-litigeous.

(2016): Administrative law cases, litigeous plus non-litigeous.

Poland

(General Comment): The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97, while Q99 is replied by NA.
The category „Other cases” includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.

(2021): The category „Other cases” includes appeals and complaints concerning social insurance, minors and others.
* administrative law cases - The figures given to you on the receipt of cases at the Supreme Administrative Court and their settlement were affected primarily by two circumstances, i.e. changes in the organizational structure of the Supreme Administrative Court (NSA) and the related transfer of cases between departments, and, as indicated above, restrictions on court operations due to the declared epidemic state in Poland.
As of January 1, 2021, new additional adjudicatory divisions were established in the Finance Chamber and the General Administrative Chamber. Some cases from Divisions I and II of both chambers were transferred to the newly created Division III. These actions had a significant impact on the way the statistics were read.
According to the data provided to you, in 2020 the NSA completed 15786 cases registered in the "SK" repertory (cassation complaints, complaints for the resumption of proceedings). However, this number includes not only cases completed by issuing a substantive decision, but also cases closed due to their transfer to a new department. There were 3115 such cases in 2020. Given the above, the real efficiency in 2020 was 88%, not 110% as reported. Cases closed in the Finance Chamber of the Supreme Administrative Court in 2020 were, in turn, in large part added to the impact in 2021, for they were re-registered in another judicial department.
The re-registration of the aforementioned cases in the Financial Chamber, as well as the re-registration of cases in the General Administration Chamber for similar reasons (4079 cases) were recorded in the total number of cases received by the NSA in 2021. Hence, 7194 cases (re-registered) would have to be deducted from the total number of 26873, which was given to you in earlier correspondence. Thus, the real flow of new cases to the NSA was 19679.
The data on the completion of cases for 2021 shows that 17111 cases were completed at the NSA. It should be noted that this figure also includes cases closed in the General Administration Chamber due to their transfer to Division III. Such cases, as mentioned, were 4079. Thus, it can be assumed that in 2021 the NSA completed 13032 cases through their substantive settlement. These data, in turn, allow us to assume that the NSA's adjudication efficiency in 2021 was 67%.
Despite the decrease in efficiency in 2021 compared to the previous year, it should be noted that in 2021 the NSA settled more cases than in 2020. On the other hand, undoubtedly, the higher inflow of cases to the NSA was due to the increased number of complaints filed with provincial administrative courts, as discussed in more detail in point 1. The increased inflow of cases to the NSA was also due to a partial blockage in the circulation of documentation between administrative courts of both instances, which occurred especially during the first phase of the pandemic (March-May 2020). During this period, far fewer cases were submitted to the NSA, which consequently translated into an increase in impact in the following months of 2020 and 2021. In turn, referring to issues related to the number of cases handled at the NSA in 2021, one can additionally point to staff shortages resulting from the retirement of some judges and the fact that more than a quarter of full-time positions were unfilled (more than 20% of judicial positions remained unfilled). In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic necessitated the reorganization of the Court's work by providing parties with the opportunity to attend hearings remotely. For technical reasons, fewer cases may be handled at remote hearings than at land-based hearings.

(2020): “Other than criminal law” cases: compared to the previous period (2018), decreases in the numbers of "incoming cases" before courts and "resolved cases" result from the COVID19 pandemic. As regards increases in the number of pending cases, they are due to increased amount of unresolved specific categories of cases in civil litigious procedures (e.g.claims under the loan agreement) and civil non-litigious procedures (e.g. division of the property). Administrative law cases : In 2020, the court disposed of 57.70% of all cases within 12 months, and within up to 24 months 78.66%. With regard to cassation complaints, 44.06% of cases were dealt with within 12 months. As far as complaints are concerned, 75.99% are settled within 2 months, while within 12 months the rate is 99.57%. 4. "4.Other cases": From the analysis of annual information for 2020 at the level of district courts and appellate courts in the labour and social security division, the following factors had an impact on the decrease in the degree of control of the impact (and thus the number of cases handled) and the increase in the average duration of proceedings in Ua, Uz and AUa and AUz cases in relation to 2019: - restrictions on court activity in 2020 related to the Covid-19 pandemic, due to the declaration of an epidemic state in the territory of the Republic of Poland from 20 March 2020 and the associated need for quarantine, sick leave, isolation, the need to provide care for children under 8 years of age, remote working, resulting in a reduction in the work of adjudicators, clerks and experts; - Insufficient number of experts on the list of expert witnesses compared to the number of cases requiring an opinion and the need to carry out joint or multiple expert opinions from different specialities, refusal of experts to carry out examinations necessary for their opinion (as a result of the epidemic situation in relation to SARS-CoV-2 infections), - a large number of suspended cases resulting from the regulation of the Act of 19 June 2020 on amending the Act on pensions from the Social Insurance Fund (Journal of Laws of 2020, item 1222), concerning a group of women born in 1953 (in these cases the proceedings were suspended by law as of 10 July 2020 until the pension authority issues a new decision recalculating the benefit of entitled persons, but not earlier than after 6 months from the suspension).

(2019): The decrease of Clearance Rate for 1. Civil and commercial litigious cases and 4. Other cases in 2019 compared with 2018 is caused by increased value of incoming cases. For 1. Civil and commercial litigious cases: from 141 045 cases in 2018 to 155 341 cases in 2019 (increase of 10%) and for 4. Other cases: from 41 242 cases in 2018 to 44 233 cases in 2019 (increase of 7%). The number of judges hearing in these type of cases in 2019 was at comparable level like in 2018 so the number of cases per one judge had increased automatically. In 2019, 16,844 cassation appeals (3,385 appeals less than in 2018) and 80 appeals for reopening the proceedings were submitted to the Supreme Administrative Court. From the previous period, 27,649 complaints and 28 applications for reopening of proceedings remain to be considered. In total, the Supreme Administrative Court had to consider 44,493 cassation appeals. In 2019, a total of 16,375 cassation complaints were examined. In 3,465 cases, the Supreme Administrative Court allowed the cassation appeal (21.16%), dismissed 11,721 cassation appeals (71.58%), and settled 1,189 in a different way (7.26%). Apart from cassation appeals, in 2019 the Supreme Administrative Court handled 4,665 complaints against decisions (orders) of courts of first instance, of which 715 allowed the appeal (15.36% of all appeals), and in 3,773 cases, the Supreme Administrative Court dismissed the appeal (80.88%), and it handled 177 matters in a different way (3.79%).
Moreover, the Supreme Administrative Court examined 162 complaints about violation of a party's right to hear a case in court proceedings without undue delay, of which 4 were admitted (2.47% of all settlements of this type), 60 were dismissed (37.04%), and 98 were settled in other way (60.49%).
In 2019, the Supreme Administrative Court handled 42.33% of all cases within 12 months, and 80.43% within 24 months. With regard to cassation complaints, 23.54% of the cases were settled within 12 months. In the case of complaints, 91.13% are examined by 2 months, and within 12 months, this ratio is 99.72%.

(2017): 2.2.2. There is not any specific explanation for observed increase. We can indicate only that mentioned increase is related especially to Register of Pledges.
As regards General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases, we have validated previous data and we have made some corrections. We also indicate that a number of pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year have been increased due to higher number of incoming cases in 2016.

(2016): Within the changes in business registry cases we can observe significant increase in all types of Application for registration (first registration) cases, but there is also considerable increase in general business cases (changes in the registry, including cases of removing from registry).
In 2016 there were serious problems with the information system which is in use in electronic proceedings therefore the number of pending cases had increased.

Portugal

(General Comment): Since 2007, statistical data concerning pending cases in 2nd instance judicial courts are collected through the courts information systems. Being a dynamic system, allowing regular corrections and up-dating, this data collection may lead to oscillation data from previous years resulting in variations in pending cases.
In Portugal, there are not non-litigious cases in superior courts.
The category "other" does not exist in the higher instances.
It is noteworthy that before 2015, data concerning the total of “other than criminal law cases” did not include administrative law cases. Since 2015, administrative law cases are included in the total which explains the significant increase of cases.

(2021): The decrease in the number of pending cases is related to the fact that in 2020 the number of cases that were completed in the second instance courts was higher than the number of new cases. This downward trend in pending cases has been constant since 2016.

(2020): The decrease in the number of cases under the category "Civil (and commercial) litigious cases" between 2018 and 2020 is justified by the decrease in court activity in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation. The number of cases pending on December 31, 2020 has reduced compared to the number of cases pending on December 31, 2018, since the number of cases completed from 2018 to 2020 was relatively higher than the number of cases entered in those years. The increase in the number of cases completed in Administrative Courts between 2018 and 2019 may be justified by the increase in the number of judicial magistrates working in these courts. Even so, despite this increase in cases completed, there was an increase in the number of cases pending on January 1, 2020 compared to the number of cases pending on January 1, 2018, considering that the number of cases completed from 2018 to 2019 was still relatively lower than the number of cases entered in those years.

(2019): This increase of resolved cases can be explained by the increase on the number of judges in Administrative Courts.

(2018): Regarding the increase in the number of pending administrative law cases comparing to 2016, there were no legislative changes or others that could explain this variation".

(2016): There is no specific explanation as regards the increase in the number of civil and commercial litigious cases pending on 1 January 2016 between 2015 and 2016. The question 97_3 "Administrative law cases", includes administrative and tax cases.
The number of Pending cases on 1Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 3.909
The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 1.809
The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 1.663
The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 4.055

(2015): The question 97_3 "Administrative law cases", includes administrative and tax cases.

Romania

(General Comment): It is worth specifying that, since 2010, the first table (question no. 91) centralizes all the first instance cases (irrespective of the level of the courts), the second table (question no. 97) centralizes all the second instance cases – appeal (irrespective of the level of the court) and table no. 3 (question no. 99) shows the statistical data on all second appeal cases (last instance cases) from all courts (irrespective of their level).
In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.

(2021): As stated at Q91 the context of the Covid-19 pandemic affected the activity of the courts which led to the decrease in the number of resolved cases, therefore the the stock with old cases increased in some cases.

(2020): As stated at Q91 the context of the Covid-19 pandemic affected the activity of the courts which led to the decrease in the number of resolved cases in 2020 an increased Disposition time and an increased numer of pending cases older than 3 years.

(2019): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.

(2018): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
The increase in the number of cases in appeal reflects the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes; the jurisdiction of the courts in judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the New Civil Procedural Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the Old Code and shows continous increase since the entry into force of the provisions.

(2017): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
The increase in the number of cases in appeal reflects the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes; the jurisdiction of the courts in judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the New Civil Procedural Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the Old Code and shows continous increase since the entry into force of the provisions.

(2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.
The general increase in the number of cases in appeal reflects the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes; the jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the new Civil Procedure Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the old Code and shows continuous increase after 2014.

(2014): By the decision n° 46/2012, the Superior Council of Magistracy has decided that all the courts will implement by 1 January 2014 the IT system of collecting data. The new method is based on new definitions of the indicators. Accordingly, a case is transferred from the field “stocks” to the field “closed” only when the final decision, including its reasoning is drafted signed and communicated to the parties. For that reason, the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 cannot be identical with the number of pending cases on 1st January 2014.
The meaningful increases in figures observed between 2012 and 2014 are due to the fact that, in relation to the appeal, beyond the differences recorded in Statis, there was a change of jurisdiction in civil matters. Accordingly, the appeal (apel) became the main instrument to challenge a decision.

(2013): With regard to the category “civil and commercial litigious cases”, the observed evolutions between 2010 and 2013 are due to the fact that following the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes, the jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the new Civil Procedure Code includes the number of appeals and second appeals from the old Code. Thus, even if the number of solved files in second instance is higher in 2013 than in the previous year, the number of new appeals (incoming cases in second instance) is higher. This explains the growth of the workload in the last period of time on these courts, although previously the trend was descending.
With regard to the category “civil and commercial non-litigious cases”, the analysis of data and the noticed evolutions and variations between 2010 and 2013 should be qualified. In fact, the figures are not so high and the growth and regress of a few cases during one year lead to relatively important variations. For example, a growth of only 8 cases at the end of the year will reflect a growth of 35%. The same reasoning should be applied with regard to the category “non-litigious land registry cases” where a growth of only 122 cases at the beginning of the year will reflect a growth of over 40%.
In respect of the category “non-litigious enforcement cases”, the considerable increases between 2010 and 2013 with regard to all the items (pending cases, incoming and resolved) were the consequence of the new distribution of competences between courts. Since 2013, all the enforcement cases are in the jurisdiction of the courts of appeal. The number of cases in third instance decreased correlatively.
Following the changes in the procedural provisions made in 2013, the second appeal, as means of review in the field of non-litigious business registry, became appeal, in accordance with the new principles of the Civil Procedure Code as regards the means of review.

Slovak Republic

(2021): Explained in the table.

(2020): More significant decline of incoming cases and resolved cases as well in the Second instance courts as a result of a pandemic situation. In the category 3. Administrative law cases was only one pending case on 1 January 2020, which was resolved during the year and no case came into the Second instance courts in the year 2020.
The number of non-litigious business registry cases is included in "general civil and commercial non-litigious cases".

(2019): The decrease in the number of cases (especially incoming and pending on 31 December) was not analysed yet but we can confirm that there were no significant changes in the system or legislation.

(2018): The discrepancies in the number of pending cases as of 1 January 2018 in comparison with the final numbers as of 31 December 2017 were caused due to the introduction of electronic data collection through the Data Collection Application (hereinafter referred to as AZU). When introducing the electronic data collection in 2018, the courts were allowed to record the actual state of pending cases as of 1 January 2018 with the aim of not transmitting any inaccuracies from paper data collection of previous periods. These differences should not occur in the next year, given the introduction of automatic transfer of the number of undecided cases from the end of the previous period in the electronic data collection

(2017): As regards the trends of the decrease in all monitored indicators, the decrease in caseload at first instance courts has a secondary impact on the drop in caseload at the courts of appeal. We did not analyse in details the cause of decrease and the detail structure of caseload. The decrease of caseload has the positive effect of raising the CR to 121% and decreasing of total number of pending (unresolved) cases.
The data in the table are not horizontally consistent. This is caused by the fact, that the data on pending cases on 1. January 2017 (the same as data on 31. December 2016 given for the previous cycle) were collected in a one-shot collection for the Justice Scoreboard 2017 and were not bound by control patterns of horizontal consistency as it is in the new electronic data collection active since January 2018. The improper initial number of unresolved cases taken from a “paper” collection of data in 2016 caused such differences. Likewise, the transition from 2015 final numbers to 2016 initial numbers were counted up manually from paper collections. We cannot therefore consider the initial numbers as of 1 January as reliable. The transition between the old system of collecting the statistical data to new one is more complicated than was expected, with the setting up of Analytical centre of the MoJ, application of CEPEJ methodology and its tools is one of the targets in the on-going project between CEPEJ and Ministry of justice of the Slovak republic.
There are still two different IT tools used to collect the statistical data from the courts to Analytical centre. Some inconsistencies in data between the old and new system persist.
The Analytical centre makes every effort to complete the transition between two systems as soon as possible to get reliable data as soon as possible.
As to administrative cases, since 1 July 2016 the appeals against the decisions of the District courts are processed at the Regional courts and the appeals against the decisions of Regional court are processed at the Supreme court as the court of appeal.
In our data for administrative cases in the year 2017 there were some appeal procedures pending at Regional courts as the courts of appeal as the result of application of the previous procedural rules described in point 1. Those appeal proceedings appear in this table. All appeals against the decisions of Regional court (as the courts of first instance) were always tried by the Supreme court and we are presenting this data for all evaluation cycles in the table to Q 99

(2016): The new structure of data presented by the Ministry of Justice influenced also the second instance. Registry cases are all included in 2.1 and can not be separated by categories.

(2014): In respect of the variations observed in 2014 with regard to the category “administrative law cases”, it is worth mentioning that the low number of cases makes small absolute variation large in relative terms.

(2013): For 2013, a general remark was provided in respect of questions 91, 97 and 101, explaining that there were no specific reasons justifying the variations in the numbers of cases of the particular categories. It was stressed that the Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called “non-bank loan companies” where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. The capacity of the court staff to resolve all of the filed cases in the appropriate time period was limited despite the measures which have been taken. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The distribution of cases for Q97 is the same as for Q91.
Inconsistences noticed are due the Data Warehouse system explained in Q91.

(2021): All categories - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: decrease by approx. 50%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions (and the number of resolved cases at first instance courts decreased). As second instance courts deal with the majority of cases without hearing of parties, their functioning was not affected that much. The number of appeals coming from first instance decreased, which resulted in the decrease of pending cases at second instance courts at the beginning of 2021.
Resolved cases: The decrease in the number of resolved cases is due to two factors: 1. impact of Covid-19 pandemics, namely the higher number of judges and court staff on sick leave or quarantined (compared to 2020), and 2. more general human resources issues (retirement of judges, prolonged sick leaves etc.).
Categories 1, 2 and 2.1 - Pending cases on 21 Dec.: increase by approx. 10-30%
Higher courts resolved approx. 10% less cases in 2021, which resulted in a greater increase of pending cases on 31. Dec (Disposition time in higher courts is low – 1-2 months; ratio of Resolved vs. Pending cases is approx. 10:1)
Categories 2.2/2.2.1 - Pending cases on 21 Dec.: increase by approx. 60/90%
Please note the increase in resolved land registry cases in 2021 (Q91) which may result in an increase of appeals, and small (absolute) number of cases at second instance (20-30 pending cases).
Category 2.2.2 - Pending cases on 21 Dec.: decrease by approx. 25%
Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at second instance (less than 5 pending cases).

(2020): The decrease in pending cases at the beginning and the end of the year is due to the fact that higher courts are sucesfully reducing the number of pending cases. The decrease in incoming and resolved cases is partially due to the national trend observed in general, and paritally due to the limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics.
The discrepancies in categories 2.2.1. Non litigious land registry cases and 2.2.2 Non-litigious business registry cases (and subsequently in 2.2. Registry cases), as well as at Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court are due to a small absolute number of cases.

(2019): No particular explanation can be given for the general decrease of incoming cases (national trend) which resulted in the decrease in the number of incoming and pending cases.
The increase in incoming Non-litigious business registry cases in 2018 resulted in an increased number of pending cases in the beginning of 2019. Please note small (absolute) number of cases.

(2018): No particular explanation can be given for the general decrease of incoming cases (national trend), as well as for the increase in number of incoming registry cases.

(2017): In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 20%-30% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases might have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases.

(2016): In recent years, the number of incoming cases is generally decreasing due to several reasons, partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary (informatisation, change of perception when litigants and debtors do not see any profit in prolonging court procedures, gradual settlement of case-law). Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 20%-30% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases might have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases.

(2015): In recent years, the number of incoming non-litigious cases is generally decreasing partly due to a better economic situation in Slovenia and mainly to a successful introduction of new business models in the Slovenian judiciary. Considering the higher number of incoming cases (number of pending cases is approx. 15%-20% of all incoming cases), a slight variation in incoming cases have a considerable effect on the number of pending cases.

(2013): 2013 The area of land registry cases has been in constant improvement since a successful computerisation project in 2003 – the average disposition times have fallen from 18 months to 2 weeks. The lowering of the number of pending cases is the consequence of a better organisation of work and of the totally electronic procedure.

(2012): 2012 The figures of pending cases on 1 January 2012 for civil litigious cases (as well as for incoming, resolved and pending cases on 31 December 2012) are higher than in the previous exercise, because we included in this category the cases of bankruptcy proceedings (including: compulsory composition, bankruptcy of legal person, bankruptcy of physical person, bankruptcy of inheritance and compulsory dissolution), which were counted as 'other cases' in the previous evaluation cycle. The example in the questionnaire for this 7th category was ‘insolvency registry cases’, so we mistakenly included here all the cases pursuant to the Financial Operations, Insolvency Proceedings and Compulsory Dissolution Act handled by district courts. These are not insolvency registry proceedings, but are to be understood as litigious proceedings according to the CEPEJ Explanatory note.
With regard to the category "administrative law cases, in the previous round we included appeals in administrative disputes, which are lodged with and dealt with by the highest instance court, namely the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia in this category (Q 97.6). To ensure internally consistent answers we decided to provide the data in this chapter regarding the instance of the court that decides on the case not the instance of the procedure in which the cases is decided. This means that all the cases that are addressed by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia are taken into account at question 97.

Spain

(General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Lawyer of the Administration of Justice detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies. It is noteworthy that the small (probably insignificant) number of Registry cases that arrive to the Second Instance is not distinguished of the Litigious cases. This is why, the total number of cases can be provided.
Regarding "other non-litigious cases", the most correct answer is NA (because we can appeal against certain decisions of 'voluntary jurisdiction' not included in the CEPEJ categories).

(2021): For civil and commercial litigious cases the number of incoming cases increased in comparison with 2020, because that was the year in which the pandemic forced mobility restrictions. This also affected the increases of the number of pending cases at the end of the year.

(2020): There is an increase in the number of incoming administrative appeal cases in the Autonomous Regions High Courts. It is possible that certain modifications in the Contentious Administrative Jurisdiction, as well as the Judgement of the Constitutional Court in 2015 that eliminated the fees to appeal, have had an impact on the number of incoming cases.

(2019): "Civil and commercial litigious cases": the increased number of pending cases at the beginning of the year is partly due to the low clearance rate in 2018. In general there is an increase in incoming issues. In civil law many appeals are related to cases of general conditions included in financing contracts with real estate guarantees in which the borrower is a natural person (object of massive cases in Spain since the doctrine of the CJEU).
"Administrative cases": The increase of administrative appeals may probably be due to Aliens (inmigration) cases, which had a strong increase in resolution in 2018.

(2018): The Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) of December 21, 2016 and other previous Judgments have meant a massive interposition of lawsuits based on that doctrine, for the civil challenge of general conditions included in financing contracts with real estate guarantees whose Borrower is a natural person. Measures, referred to in previous assessments, of spatialization of certain judicial bodies have been adopted. In 2018, the appeales to the judgments in matters of individual suitcases against general conditions included in financing contracts with real estate guarantees whose borrower is a natural person have reached the Provincial Courts (second Instance). The small (probably insignificant) number of Registry cases that arrive to the Second Instance is not distinguished of the Litigious cases. This is why the total number of cases can be provided

(2016): In respect of the increase in the number of incoming civil and commercial litigious cases as well as the increase of the total of incoming cases between 2014 and 2016, it should be mentioned that since March 2015 the fees to bring a case to the court were abolished in case of natural persons. Besides, in July 2016, the Constitutional Court declared the nullity of the fees to appeal.

(2015): Law 10/2012 governing certain fees in the area of the Administration of Justice could explain (especially in Administrative Law cases) the decrease in the number of incoming administrative cases, and logically the decrease in the number of resolved and pending cases.

(2014): For the 2014 exercise, the decrease of the number of pending administrative law cases in the beginning and in the end of the year is the result of the decreases observed and explained in fist instance.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, the lack of horizontal consistency with regard to the total number of pending cases on 31 December has been explained by the fact that inspection services are entitled to correct the number each time they find it inaccurate. Moreover, the horizontal inconsistency is also a result of the inclusion within the table of data related to restarted procedures, while there is not a specific item dedicated to this category of cases.

Question 098

Austria

(2020): "Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases": compared to the previous 10 years the pending, incoming and resolved cases in this category in the year 2020 showed a slight decrease. There is no specific explanation for this circumstance.

(2016): There is significant discrepancy in the number of incomming and resolved misdemeanour cases because the administrative criminal cases of second instance are included in third instance.

Belgium

(General Comment): Severe criminal cases: cases appealed to the Appellate court (criminal matters).
Minor criminal cases: appeals before the first instance criminal courts (“jurisdictions correctionnelles”) against decisions of the Police courts (thus cases dealt with by the first instance criminal courts at second instance).
Criminal law cases encompass also cases dealt with by the Investigation chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation). The latter has competence for controlling judicial investigations, namely it controls pre-trial detention, and decides on referral to the trial judge.

(2021): Protectional cases - youth: these cases have been included in point 2 "Minor criminal cases". Here are the figures: pending cases on 1/01/2021 = 337; pending cases on 31/12/2021 = 306; Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court = 124. Bron: data warehouse (data extraction date: 01/07/2022).
The category “3. Other criminal cases” corresponds to the cases dealt with by the Investigation Chamber (Chambre des mises en accusation).

(2020): "Second instance Courts (Criminal Matters): * Totals: Cases pending as of 1/01/2020 = 9434; Cases pending as of 12/31/2020 = 9317; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 2616.
* Serious offenses (involves correctional and indictment division cases): Cases pending as of 1/01/2020 = 9095; Cases pending as of 12/31/2020 = 8981; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 2499.
* Minor offences: youth cases are included in the figures shown in the table (1,374 new cases and 1,377 completed cases respectively). Also noteworthy are the youth cases: Cases pending on 1/01/2020 = 339; Cases pending on 31/12/2020 = 336; Cases pending for more than 2 years from the date the case is brought to the 2nd instance courts = 117.
Source: datawarehouse (data extraction date: 16/06/2021)
*For 2020, there is a decrease in the number of new cases and in the number of completed cases due to the pandemic that affected court operations."

(2016): The category "Severe criminal cases" concerns appeals to the courts of appeal against the judgements of the courts of first instance ruling in criminal matters. The category "Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases" refers to appeals to the courts of first instance against decisions of police courts in criminal matters.

Bulgaria

(2020): The specified sum does not include proceedings for which no penalties are imposed (pre-trial proceedings, enforcement proceedings). These proceedings are within the competence of other bodies in the Republic of Bulgaria.

(2018): NA

Croatia

(2021): In category "Other cases" are included cases of execution of imprisonment sanctions on county courts in second instance.

(2018): Starting from 1 June 2013, when the Act on Amendments to the Misdemeanors Act (OG 39/2013) entered into force, the inflow of first-instance misdemeanor cases had been reduced up to the point where there was no more justification for keeping specialized courts for these types of cases. This led also to continuous decrease of second instance misdemeanor cases, which is also the case in this reporting cycle.
Category "Other cases" - category introduced in this cycle: in case of Croatia, cases calculated here are cases of execution of imprisonment sanctions on county courts in second instance.

(2016): Starting from 1 June 2013, when the Act on Amendments to the Misdemeanours Act (OG 39/2013) entered into force, the inflow of first-instance misdemeanour cases displayed in this table continuously and significantly had been reduced. The number of resolved cases reduced as well, but due to a significant decrease in inflows, the number of unresolved cases reduced by the end of the period.

(2014): According to 2014 data and pursuant to the Act on the Amendments of Misdemeanour Act which entered into force in 2013 (OG 39/13), possession of drugs for personal usage is no longer a criminal act but a misdemeanour act. That provision enabled disburdening of the county courts. Furthermore, municipal courts became competent for criminal act of unauthorized production and trafficking of drugs (which was previously in the jurisdiction of county courts and made a share of 40-50% of all cases dealt with by the county courts).

(2013): Generally speaking, the decrease of the total number of misdemeanour cases at all levels was the main goal and purpose of adopting the Act on the Amendments of the Misdemeanour Act in 2013 (OG 39/13) in which the definition of misdemeanour act was changed, the principle of opportunity as well as the simplification of the procedure were introduced, the more active role was given to the plaintiff. Moreover, specific measures were introduced: if the fine is paid when caught in committing a misdemeanour offence, it is considered as paid if the half of the amount was paid immediately, and if the deadline was prescribed, it is considered as paid if the 2/3 of the amount was paid. Moreover, the enforcement procedure conducted on monetary assets is more efficient. The Register of Unpaid Fines was established.
According to the new misdemeanour provisions, there is no suspension of the proceedings because of the statute of limitations. Every court decision is being enforced, fines are being paid, therefore strengthening the general prevention and withdraw of committing misdemeanour offences. All of the above said leads to the reduction of the number of misdemeanour cases at both courts' instances: misdemeanour courts and High Misdemeanour Court of the Republic of Croatia

Cyprus

(General Comment): The case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in this question as second instance cases, although Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court."

(2020): with regard to criminal appeals less were filed.

(2016): There was an increase in the cases pending between 2014 and 2016. With regard to the increase of number of cases resolved this was due to the creation of the administrative court and therefore the Supreme court did no longer had to deal with first instance administrative cases.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases".
The data provided involves appeals and complaints (corrective measure against a resolution). Instead of "Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court" "Pending cases older than 1 year from the date the case came to the second instance court" are provided.

(2021): The number of pending cases older than 2 years is very low in second instance and thus it follows that there is a big variance in the data between years.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 evaluation cycle, it has been specified that the total number of criminal cases includes severe criminal cases decided by second instance courts acting in first instance and appeals against decisions of the first instance courts in criminal matters. On the contrary, in 2010, the total encompassed only the number of appeals, while the number of severe criminal cases was not subsumed. Accordingly, due to the different methodology of presentation of data, the comparison between the 2010 and 2012 figures should be qualified.

Denmark

(General Comment): All criminal cases at 2nd instance are considered severe as they would otherwise not become 2nd instance criminal cases. We can not differentiate pending cases depending on their age. There might be cases though that would not fulfil the criteria of a severe case. About one third of the cases may be smaller or bigger issues from the cases in the district courts that are appealed to one of the two High Courts before proceeding at the district courts and then finally settled in the district court. It is not possible to see if it an issue is from a severe case in the district or a case that is not severe. Then the whole case may afterwards be appealed to one of the two High Courts when the district courts have come to a final judgment.

(2020): 2020 was an unusual year because of the Covid-19 related close down of society, including close down of courts. It created more pending cases as the prosecution continued to forward new cases to the courts that could not deal with it.

(2016): All criminal cases at 2nd instance are considered severe as they would otherwise not become 2nd instance criminal cases. We can not differentiate pending cases after how old they are.

Estonia

(General Comment): Some horizontal inconsistencies and inconsistencies with previous year are due to the fact that data are always taken from the live database. Other criminal cases: The enforcement and pretrial cases do not exist in the second instance.

(2020): The pandemic has affected the courts activity in criminal matters in general. The criminal procedure law was not as flexible when judges had to work online. The complete revision of the criminal procedure law is ongoing and will come into force next year.

(2016): Discrepancies are due to the numbers being quite small. Number of incoming cases depends on the crimes being committed and the number of resolved cases depends on.
Because the distinction between severe and minor criminal cases is not the same with the CEPEJ, data for subcategories can be found below :
Severe criminal cases : Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 71
Incoming cases : 745
Resolved cases : 762
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 54
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : 0
Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases :
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 9
Incoming cases : 208
Resolved cases : 214
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 3
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : 0

(2014): The variations observed over the years 2010, 2012 and 2014 are most likely due to the fact that the Ministry of Justice and the biggest court in Estonia (Harju County court) had an agreement setting the target for eliminating backlogs.

Finland

(General Comment): The cases are not statistically catecorised in severe criminal cases and misdemeanour and / or minor cases in Finland.

(2021): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ.

(2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available
data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases
managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

France

(2021): Source SDSE

(2020): "The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (by reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to trial). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and transportation strike had mostly affected TAs.
"

Germany

(General Comment): General information on the statistics used as sources for answering the questions in this section:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys generally only count the number of received cases, claims, etc..
In the monthly surveys of a court, a statistical record with regard to the stage of appeal exists for the proceedings covered by the procedural surveys, while the case count for "other caseload" generally only exists for the whole court.
The answer to Q98 includes the cases that appear in the monthly surveys of the Higher Regional Courts as "other caseload" and that can definitely be identified as second instance cases due to their subject (complaints and objections in regulatory fining proceedings). However, some second instance cases are also included under "other cases" in Q94.
The category "other cases" in Q94 includes the cases that appear in the monthly surveys of the Regional Courts as "other caseload", which means that these cases are actually first and second instance cases. Due to the above mentioned structure of data collection, a distinction between 1st and 2nd instance cases ist unfortunately not possible for these cases.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.
Horizontal inconsistencies in the table:
The inconsistencies with regard to the pending cases at the end of the year also occur in the statistics published by the Federal Statistical Office. The reason for this is, that courts submit count corrections for the monthly surveys at the end of the year.

(2021): "Other": complaints in regulatory fining proceedings at the Higher Regional Courts (according to Section 80 of the Act on Regulatory Offences), objections in regulatory fining proceedings according to the Competition Act
With regard to these cases, only the number of incoming cases is recorded. Pending minor criminal cases on 1 Jan: The number of incoming cases was lower in 2020 than in 2019 and the number of resolved cases higher, resulting in a lower number of pending cases at the end of 2020. A reason for this development could not be identified.

(2020): complaints in regulatory fining proceedings at the Higher Regional Courts (according to Section 80 of the Act on Regulatory Offences), objections in regulatory fining proceedings according to the Competition Act

(2016): The category “severe criminal cases" (line 2) includes criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code (Strafgesetzbuch, StGB) and ancillary criminal laws. The category “minor criminal cases” (line 3) includes regulatory fine proceedings before the criminal courts.

(2014): According to 2014 data, the category “severe criminal cases” included criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” subsumed regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.
The information provided in the frame of the 2014 evaluation refers to 2013 data (the 2014 data is not available).

(2012): According to 2012 data, the category “severe criminal cases” included criminal proceedings in accordance with the Criminal Code and ancillary criminal laws. The category “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” subsumed regulatory fine proceedings before criminal courts.

Greece

(2021): The data are from the Statistical Service of the Ministry of Justice. The courts function in cooperation with the prosecutions offices. For example, postponed cases get to the prosecutor offices and then to the courts, in repeat 2-3 times, during the period (year). The definition of the pending cases included postponed cases or the cases for which the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn't been determined during the year. The data has been collected from 19 out of 19 Courts of Appeal in Greece.

(2020): Due to the pandemic, pending cases have accumulated in the courts of first instance, with the result that the courts of second instance have fewer cases to handle.
The data given for questions 97 and 98 are collected from all second instance courts. However, many fields are answered NA as only few data were collected from the second instance Courts.

(2018): To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor's Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A', which was completed in March 2019 for 41 courts of the State, an integrated information system is implemented, which includes individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data.

(2016): Filling in the requested information regarding the criminal procedure is not possible at the moment. To give a brief overview of the national criminal procedure, criminal cases are filed for admission in the Public Prosecutor's Office, where they are further investigated. If a prosecution is initiated, the cases are discussed in court. The Court of First Instance or the Court of Appeal discusses and issues a judgment on each case brought before the court. The decision can then either postpone the case (whereby the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office for further processing), or convict/ acquit the defendants. When the case is forwarded to the competent Prosecutor's Office (after a postponement), it is uncertain if and when it will go back to the court for discussion. Criminal cases cannot be tracked down throughout the different stages of the criminal procedure at present. With the Integrated Civil and Criminal Court Case Management System (OSDDY-PP)- Phase A', which is expected to be completed by November 2018, an integrated information system will be implemented, which will include individual applications (subsystems) to support the operational functioning of the units of all levels of the courts involved in the flow of every case (criminal and civil), allowing the extraction of the relevant data. For 2016 the available data regarding the criminal procedure are as follows: Courts of First Instance: Criminal Cases Discussed: 473.457, Convictions/Acquittals: 206.311, Postponements: 262.433, Courts of Appeal: Criminal Cases Discussed: 59.643, Convictions/Acquittals: 24.995, Postponements: 33.601

Hungary

(2021): As it was mentioned at the first instance, the introduction of new types of misdemeanours resulted in a higher number of incoming cases. As a result of the increase of incoming cases the number of resolved cases was also higher.

(2014): The increases over the period 2010-2014 regarding misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases, is due to the constant increase of incoming and resolved first instance cases starting from 2010, which led to the increase in the number of second instance incoming cases.

Ireland

(General Comment): Except for the Supreme Court, criminal cases are generally counted by offence rather than case due to the various ICT systems used. This is due to data collection/ ICT systems that are in use by the Court Service.

(2020): Reduced misdemeanour/minor cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. This included domestic violence and criminal proceedings. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie. Attendance at Court offices was by appointment only to ensure that footfall could be safely managed.
The Court of Appeal quickly adopted the use of video technology and made greater use of electronic documentation to facilitate its work. Procedures were introduced to ensure that justice was administered in public. Judgments were delivered electronically. Waiting times for a hearing were improved, to a certain extent, by a net reduction in the numbers of new cases coming into the list from other jurisdictions. By year end, there was a net improvement in the numbers of cases waiting to be dealt with compared to 2019.
Offences are counted here rather than number of cases. There were 260 appeals in respect of 1,405 offences lodged in the Court of Appeal (Criminal) in 2020. The Court disposed of 367 appeals in respect of 1,719 offences.

(2018): With regard to the category "resolved cases", the figures reflect a continuing increase in disposal of second instance appeals disposed of over that in the previous reporting cycle (2016 data) due to the establishment of the Court of Appeal.

(2016): Data on resolved cases reflect a significant increase in disposal of second instance appeals due to the establishment of the Court of Appeal. Concerning the number of incoming severe criminal cases, 2016 data reflects the receipt by the Court of Appeal of a substantial number of pending appeals following its establishment.

(2014): The increase of 161% between 2012 and 2014 in the number of incoming cases and the increase of 101% in the number of resolved cases are due to a change in the unit of measurement for criminal cases from a defendant related unit to an offence related unit.

Italy

(General Comment): In Italy there is no formal definition of “minor criminal cases”. For the purposes of this exercise are considered as minor criminal cases those proceedings dealt with by the Justice of Peace Offices which have been appealed (to Tribunal).

(2021): Figures in 2020 were hugely affected by the pandemic

(2018): -

(2016): With regard to second instance criminal cases, in 2014-2015 a new case management system was introduced. This has negatively affected the statistics for those two years. Statistics for 2016 are definitely more robust and consistent. Besides, when comparing pending cases on 31 Dec 2014 with pending cases on 1 Jan 2016, the variations are less important.

Latvia

(General Comment): Data from the first and appeal instance courts are compiled by the Court Administration, and the Court Information System is a living database that allows data to be corrected, so changes between previous periods are possible. The figures reflect data of second instance courts and the Supreme Court Criminal chamber. The latter is the appellate body in respect of cases decided by regional courts acting as courts of first instance. Statistics related to the Supreme Court are mentioned only within the total, because till 2009 the statistics were compiled by a specially hired expert.

(2021): In the middle of 2020, Saeima adopted Law on Administrative Liability that affected amount of incoming cases significantly in the first instance courts. According to the law, if the person intends to use his right to appeal a decision, he/she needs to address the complain to the higher official from institution which has made this decision, but if there is no higher official, a decision may be appealed to a district (city) court. This is the main reason for decrease of incoming cases in the first instance courts and in appeal courts as well.
The reduction of pending cases is related to the increased interest and pressure of the public, the Council of Justice and the Ministry of Justice to reduce the number of long pending criminal cases.

(2020): In 2020 there was changes in Administrative Procedure Law, that might affect the amount of resolved cases. Furthermore, number of misdemeanour and / or minor cases are higher in the appeal courts because in last years the Constitutional court has declared several norms on administrative infringements are not incompatible with the Constitution of Latvia. This led to an increase of incoming administrative cases.

(2018): Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – pending. Data on court statistics are being calculated by automated systems and records on changes that affect data in database are not available. Any changes to the Court Information System can affect the data.

(2014): In 2014, the statistics of the Supreme Court Criminal Chamber were the following: pending cases on 01.01.2014: 139; incoming cases: 19; resolved cases: 73; pending cases on 31.12.2014: 0.
Due to a court reform, the Chamber of Criminal Cases of the Supreme Court has been liquidated as from 1 January 2015. All cases, which were not resolved on 31 December 2014, were transferred to regional courts.

Lithuania

(General Comment): There is no separate statistical data allowing to distinguish between severe/minor/and other criminal cases. Neither the court information system is applied to this, nor the courts have obligation to provide the information on the seriousness of the crime. In the court information system offenses are described through the indication of an article (it does not show the severeness of a crime by itself).

Luxembourg

(General Comment): 0

(2018): Concernant le nombre d'affaire résolues en matière d'affaire pénales grave, une baisse des recours introduits à la Cour d'appel est observée depuis ces dernières années, en conséquence les affaires terminées ont diminué en 2018. Concernant le nombre d'affaire résolues en matière d'affaire pénales mineures, le chiffre plus élevé des affaires d'infractions mineures s'explique par le fait qu'en 2017, 59 recours avaient été introduits sur des jugements du tribunal de police et que ces recours ont été traités pour partie en 2018 seulement.

Malta

(2021): During 2021, the criminal courts were still largely effected by Covid restrictions. Given that these particular courts did not introduce video-conferencing, it was not possible to counteract the increasing incoming caseload with an equally increasing resolved caseload. As a result of this imbalance, the efficiency parameters of the criminal courts suffered. Having said this, following the removal of the pandemic restrictions, sincere efforts have been made in order to restore the efficiency of the criminal courts to the former levels.

(2020): The above data reflects the aggregate scores of the Criminal Court of Appeal in its Superior and Inferior Jurisdiction. The pandemic restrictions effected the caseload of the Court.

(2018): Given that in the Maltese legal system, the definition of severe/ minor-dismeneanor cases is not fully consistent with the definition built by CEPEJ, the data for these types of cases for Malta, is going to be presented within this section: For severe cases: Pending caseload at 1st January 2018 = 32; Incoming cases = 6; Resolved cases = 14; Pending cases on the 31st December = 21. Minor/ misdemeanour criminal cases: 1st January 2018 = 1266; Incoming cases = 445; Resolved cases = 644; Pending cases on the 31st December = 1018.

(2016): There was an increase in the pending caseload of the Court of Criminal Appeal, Inferior Jurisdiction.
In the Maltese legal system, the definition of severe/minor-misdemeanor cases is not fully consistent with the definition built by CEPEJ and therefore a comparison is not possible with the previous cycles. According to the Maltese categorization of cases, the number for severe criminal cases in 2016 is as follows: pending on the 1st Jan of Ref Year = 26; Incoming cases = 15; Resolved cases = 10; Pending cases on the 31st Dec of Ref Year = 32. The number for minor/misdemeanor criminal cases is as follows: pending on the 1st Jan of Ref Year = 1214; Incoming cases = 629; Resolved cases = 485; Pending cases on the 31st Dec of Ref Year = 1358.

(2012): In 2012, the increase of the number of criminal cases resulted from the fact that for some time the number of judges hearing the appeals, particularly in the Criminal Court of Appeal (Inferior Jurisdiction), was reduced due to retirement and re-allocation of duties. Accordingly, the number of appeals in the inferior jurisdiction increase considerably.

Netherlands

(2014): The reason for the horizontal inconsistency in 2014 is that the figures from the 4 columns of the table are not retrieved at the same time. The number of pending cases on Jan 1st is determined one year before the other 3 columns can be filled. One year later it is possible to determine the number of incoming cases, the number of resolved cases and the number of pending cases on Dec 31st. The definition of 'pending' together with dynamic changes in the registration system mean that the number of pending cases on Jan 1st will have changed. To ensure horizontal consistency, all the 4 columns should be determined after the years' end which would imply to overrule a previously determined and official (i.e. published) number of pending cases on Jan 1st.

Poland

(General Comment): Severe criminal cases includes all offences under the Penal Code, Penal Fiscal Code and offences specified in other Acts. Misdemeanours are cases conducted under the Petty Offence Code. The category "Other cases" covers the rest of cases conducted in criminal courts which are not connected directly with the severe criminal cases or misdemeanours. Mainly these are cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code, e.g: complaints against the discontinuation of the proceedings, complaints against the application or extension of pre-trial detention, complaints against the ordering the execution of a substitute prison sentence, complaints against a failure to grant parole.

(2021): Severe criminal cases includes all offences under the Penal Code, Penal Fiscal Code and offences specified in other Acts. Misdemeanours are cases conducted under the Petty Offence Code.
The category "Other cases" covers the rest of cases conducted in criminal courts which are not connected directly with the cevere criminal cases or misdemeanours (mainly cases conducted under the Code of Criminal Procedure and Petty Offences Procedure Code).

(2020): Variations in the number of criminal law cases in 2020 compared to the previous period (2018) are mainly due to two reasons. First – the COVID19 pandemic which reduced the inflow of severe criminal cases (p. 1) and misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases (p. 2). Second – in 2020 release, the number of Other cases (p. 3) was added to the table. It significantly increased the number of total cases shown in the line Total of criminal cases (1+2+3).

(2012): The increase of the total of criminal cases and the number of severe criminal cases in respect of the item "pending cases on 1st January 2012" is due to the fact that since 2010, there was a significant increase of the inflow of cases".
As to the number of minor cases, there was a change in the statistical system which resulted in aggregating some categories of cases considered as minor with other criminal second instance cases. Accordingly, it was impossible to include them in the provided figures.

Portugal

(General Comment): When courts handle appeal cases it is not possible to separate appeals that had in their origin a criminal case or a misdemeanor case.

(2016): There is no specific reason explaining the increase in the number of pending criminal cases on 31 December 2016 in comparison with the values of the previous cycle. There were no legislative changes or other that could explain this change.

Romania

(General Comment): There is no classification of severe and less severe offences in the Romanian statistics.

(2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on categories of pending cases as follows: - 0-1/2 years;
- 1/2-1 year;
- 1 - 1 and 1/2 years;
- 1 and 1/2 - 3 years;
- 3 - 5 years;
In the table above, last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years.

(2014): The significant increase of the total of criminal cases in respect of all the enumerated categories (pending, incoming and resolved cases) in 2014 is due to the entry into force of the new Codes and the changes of jurisdiction.

(2012): The decrease of the total of criminal cases in 2012 in respect of all the enumerated categories (pending, incoming, resolved cases) is due to the entry into force of Law n° 202/2010, the so called “small reform law”. Consequently, the legal remedy of appeal (appeal on the merit) has been abolished in several criminal matters, remaining only the “recurs” (“appeal on law”).

Slovak Republic

(2020): Sources: Analytical center, Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic

(2016): The 2016 data are based on the new methodology which may cause inconsistency comparing to previous cycles. The 2014 data are based on the methodology that covered only two main criminal court registers, while the 2016 data are based on the methodology that covers more than two criminal court registers. This makes the basic and key difference.

Slovenia

(General Comment): For explanation on severe criminal cases and minor offences please see comment to Q94.
The figures for severe criminal law cases at second instance include criminal cases (Kp).
The figures for minor offences cases at second instance include:
- PRp-zsv – minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection,
- PRp-obp – minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals,
- EPVDp – cancellation of validity of the drivers license according to the legal limit of punitive points,
The figures for other cases include:
- Kr – various criminal cases,
- PRnkp – setting a task for the good of the community or the local community,
- PRr – various cases in minor offences,
- PRuzp – compliance detention.

(2021): All categories - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: decrease by approx. 10-70%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions (and the number of resolved cases at first instance courts decreased). As second instance courts deal with the majority of cases without hearing of parties, their functioning was not as affected that much. The number of appeals coming from first instance decreased, which resulted in the decrease of pending cases at second instance courts at the beginning of 2021.
2. Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases – Incoming/Resolved cases: increase by approx. 150/90%, Pending cases on 21 Dec.: increase by approx. 1400% (this also reflected in Total)
The increase in incoming cases at second instance in 2021 is mostly due to two factors: 1) according to the Minor Offences Act, the appeal in minor offences in regular court procedures – request for judicial protection was limited (depending on the criteria - sanction). At the end of 2020 the Constitutional court established that the aforementioned limitation for appeal was unconstitutional, which lead to the increase in the number of appeals in 2021; 2) In 2021, the higher court, competent for the coastal region received multiple cases of fishermen regarding border-crossing issues (in relation to the Arbitration under the arbitration agreement between the government of the Republic of Croatia and the Government of the Republic of Slovenia; PCA CASE NO. 2012-04). Despite the efforts (see the number of resolved cases), the number of pending cases at the end of the year increased (Disposition time in higher courts is low – less than 1 month; ratio of Resolved vs. Pending cases is approx. 33:1).

(2020): The decrease in pending cases at the beginning and the end of the year is due to the fact that higher courts are sucesfully reducing the number of pending cases. the decrease in incoming and resolved cases is due to the limitation of operation of courts due to Covid-19 pandemics
The discrepancies at Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the second instance court are due to a small absolute number of cases.

(2018): Discrepancies: This year, some of the cases, previously reported at Severe or Misdemeanor cases, are reported under new category - Other cases (for details, please see general comment). The metodology for the total number of cases reported did not change, and the changes for total are below 20%.

(2016): The observed decreases can be attributed to the decrease in the number of cases, processed by the police and the state prosecution (see Q107).

(2014): According to 2014 data, the figures for “severe criminal law cases” at second instance includes: criminal cases (Kp) and various criminal cases (Kr). In this respect, it should be highlighted that the 2014 data is not comparable to pre-2014 results, because until 2014, only first category was reported. In 2015, the reporting method was further improved, and other types of cases were also included in the reporting.
The figures for “minor offences cases” at second instance included: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PRp-zsv); minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PRp-obp); cancellation of validity of the drivers license according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVDp); compliance detention (PRuzp); setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnkp); various cases in minor offences (PRr).

(2012): According to 2012 data, the figures for “severe criminal law cases” at second instance included criminal cases (Kp) and excluded various criminal cases (Kr).
The figures for “minor offences cases” at second instance included: minor offences in regular court procedure – request for judicial protection (PRp-zsv); minor offences in regular court procedure – accusation proposals (PRp-obp); minor offences at the transition from 2004 to 2005 (PRps); minor offences, introduced in the judicial jurisdiction after the 31.12.2004 (PRpv); cancellation of validity of the driver’s licence according to the legal limit of punitive points (EPVDp); and compliance detention (PRuzp). The category did not include: setting a task for the good of the community or the local community (PRnkp) and various cases in minor offences (PRr).
The decrease of the number of “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” before courts in 2012 is the result of the reform in law on minor offenses which transferred some of the jurisdiction in cases previously tried by courts to other authorities.

Spain

(General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Lawyer of the Administration of Justice detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

(2021): The number of incoming and pending cases for both severe and minor criminal case categories increased in comparison with 2020, because that was the year in which the pandemic forced mobility restrictions. The recovery of activity, after the most severe restrictions of the pandemic, may have contributed to the improvement in efficiency and increased number of resolved minor criminal cases.

(2020): The reduction in criminal appeals during 2020 may be an effect of the pandemic.

(2016): The number of pending severe criminal cases decreased due to the decrease in the number of incoming cases. The decreases observed in respect of the numbers of Misdemeanour cases can be due to the elimination of "Faltas" (Misdemeanour cases) by the Organic Law 1/2015. Some of theme were transformed in minor offences, but other disappeared or were transformed in administrative infractions.

(2012): The lack of horizontal consistency in 2012 was due to the number of restarted procedures that were not counted in the boxes of the questions because they are not really incoming cases. Besides, there was a readjustment of the statistical data in the period between 2010 and 2012. The final data provided in the questionnaire, and shown in the box of pending cases is the real data at December 2012.

Question 099

Austria

(2021): Discrepancy between number of pending administrative law cases on 31 December 2020 and number for pending administrative cases on 1 January 2021: 3043 procedures adopted from previous years and 139 procedures completed in previous years and reopend in the reference year. "Administrative law cases": The COVID-19 pandemic posed significant and new challenges to international and government institutions worldwide, including the Supreme Administrative Court. Social distancing necessary to combat the pandemic required profound changes in the service of the Supreme Administrative Court to guarantee its functioning. In addition to internal organisational measures such as the possibility of remote work and new electronic communication tools, changes to the legal framework were necessary to enable the passing of resolutions via circular letter without physical contact between the members of the judicial body. These legal changes became effective in the course of 2020 and 2021. The continuing high level of new cases in asylum and aliens law is due to the numerous applications for international protection filed in Austria from 2015 onwards. The increase in staff at both the Federal Office for Immigration and Asylum and the Federal Administrative Court has led to an increase in the number of cases dealt with by these authorities and thus also in the number of cases brought before the Supreme Administrative Court, which has now been at a relatively high level for several years.

(2020): Discrepancy between number of pending administrative cases on 31 December 2019 and number fo pending administrative cases on 1 January 2020: the number of 3 064 pending administrative cases on 1 January 2020 corresponds to 2762 procedures adopted from previous years and 302 procedures completed in previous years and reopend in the reference year.
Pending administrative law cases older than 2 years: the observed increase is a consequence of the high number of cases in the field of asylum and aliens.

(2019): The reason for the increased number of incoming administrative cases and accordingly the increase in the number of pending administrative cases is related to the high number of cases in the field of asylum and aliens law characterizing the period 2016 - 2019.

(2018): The reasons for this increase of the incoming administrative cases is related to the high number of cases in the field of asylum and aliens law.

(2017): To 3.:
Because of the model of business cases installed at the Supreme Administrative Court pending cases at the begin of a reporting year have to be analysed by calculation. Incoming cases are substracted from the sum of resolved cases and of pending cases at the end of the reporting year. New applications within the same case cause a reopening of the concerned cases. Thus the number of pending cases changes. Therefore a completly consistent image of figures of pending cases from the end of previous year and those from the begin of the current year is not feasible.

(2016): The big variation is due to the fact that this cycle the administrative cases were included.
The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. After their establishment the data of the administrative courts is introduced this cycle for the first time.

Belgium

(General Comment):
Civil, social and tax cases at the Court of Cassation
Administrative cases - cases “in cassation” at the Council of State (Conseil d’Etat).
The lack of horizontal consistency for administrative cases is due to the fact that the number of judgments does not necessarily correspond to the number of cases closed. For example, a judgment closing two cases is recorded as one judgment.

(2021): “Civil (and commercial) litigious cases”: in 2021, the Court of cassation managed to adopt a higher number of final decisions compared to 2020 (973 final decisions in 2021 compared to 853 in 2020). This is largely due to a series of 72 similar cases in which final decisions were delivered in 2021, as well as to the endeavours to increase the number of final decisions in tax matters (+30 final decisions compared to 2020). The number of incoming civil (and commercial) litigious cases in 2021 is more or less comparable to the one in 2020. In the long term, an upward general trend is to be noticed. However, more specific evolutions have been observed within this case category: in 2021, compared to 2020, the number of incoming civil cases (including commercial and administrative cases), as well as the number of incoming social cases has slightly decreased, while the number of incoming tax cases has increased. The latter is increasing from year to year.
The category “2.3 Other non-litigious cases” encompasses cases related to requests for judicial assistance introduced before and dealt with by the Court of cassation in 2021.
The category “4. Other cases”, concerns disciplinary cases brought before and resolved by the Court of cassation in 2021. Incoming disciplinary cases, as well as resolved disciplinary cases are higher in 2021 compared to 2020 (+ 15 incoming cases; + 11 final judgments). Given that the Court processes a small number of disciplinary cases each year, it is not possible to draw relevant conclusions based on the observed variations.
“3. Administrative law cases”: data communicated by the State Council; in respect of the number of resolved cases, there were 170 final decisions and 255 non-admission orders.

(2020): In the category '1. contentious civil (and commercial) cases' are included the C, F and S cases (civil; fiscal and social cases) that were filed/processed before the Court of Cassation in 2020.
The category '4. other cases' contains the D cases (disciplinary cases) filed before/processed by the Court of Cassation.
It should be noted that the Court of Cassation is also competent to decide on applications for legal aid. The category 3 ""administrative cases"" was provided by the highest adminsitartive Court.
(source Cour de Cassation)
With regard to the category ""administrative cases"" (Council of State), for completed cases: it should be noted that the figure of 479 covers 177 final judgments and 302 orders of non-admission. (source Council of State). It should be noted that the lack of horizontal coherence is due to the fact that the number of judgments does not necessarily correspond to the number of closed cases. For example, a judgment that closes two cases is recorded as a single judgment.
In 2020, the number of new administrative cases increased compared to 2019. However, due to the exceptional situation caused by COVID, the State Council could not keep up with the flow of cases and even though the number of completed cases increased compared to 2019, the number of pending cases at the end of 2020 increased. "

(2019): Civil, social and fiscal affairs at the supreme Court. A dministrative cases are the cases 'in cassation' at the Council of State.

(2018): Civil, social and tax cases at the Court of Cassation
Administrative affairs = cases "in cassation" at the Council of State

(2017): civil and commercial cases: cases in roles C, S and F at the Court of Cassation
administrative cases: cases before the Council of State "in cassation": Out= 221 judgments and 214 non-admission orders

(2016): Civil, social and fiscal cases at the Court of Cassation
Administrative cases ="cassation" cases in the State Council
The decrease in administrative cases is due to a reduction in referrals to the Council of State for this type of case.

(2014): 2014: The civil and commercial cases include cases of roles C (private and public law), F (tax law) and S (employment law) of the Court of cassation.
Administrative cases fall within the decisions of the Council of State in cassation.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The data on the supreme courts are provided by the Supreme Court of Cassation and the Supreme Administrative Court on the basis of the information extracted from the case management systems implemented in these courts. The software of the Supreme Court of Cassation for extraction of statistical data is made according to a methodology developed in the Supreme Court of Cassation, as the codes for the respective type of cases are formed by a working group of judges in the Supreme Court of Cassation. This software, which allows the SCC to extract the statistics needed to answer Question 99, is different from the product used for other courts.
Since 2020, the Unified Court Information System (UIS) has been gradually introduced in all courts, developed within the project “Creating a Model for Optimizing the Court Card of Bulgarian Courts and Prosecutor's Offices and Developing a Unified Court Information System” with the financial support of Operational Program "Good Governance" 2014-2020.
Administrative law cases- When preparing the statistical data for the judicial proceedings in the Supreme Administrative Court, existing specifics in connection with the formation and administration of the cases should be taken into account, which can be used to explain the discrepancies in the data. Part of the cases that have already been recorded as closed/completed in the statistics can be reopened, for example, when a party to the proceedings submits a request to cancel an effective court act. In the court's statistics, these cases, already declared closed, are again placed in the "pending" column, although at the time of their reporting, they have not yet been scheduled for consideration in an open court session. The final /total/ number of pending cases in the statistics of the Supreme Administrative Court also changes with the addition of cases on cancellation requests.

(2021): There are also some other non-litigious cases that are not included in the data. However, their number is insignificant. Concerning the category "Civil and commercial litigious cases": the reasons for the difference between 2020 and 2021 are twofold: the large increase in caseloads in 2021 and the critical staffing of the Supreme court of cassation. 1. There are 836 pending cases as of December 31, 2021 more compared to those at the end of 2020, as the cases received in 2021 were 1105 more than those who entered in 2020. As a result of the amendments to the Civil Procedure Law, access to cassation appeals was expanded from the beginning of 2020 in cases related to consumer disputes, which in turn caused an increase in the number of cassation cases in the Civil College/Chamber and the Commercial College/Chamber. 2. The court in 2021 is not sufficiently staffed due to delays in the competitions for the appointment of judges in the Supreme Court, as well as due to the retirement of judges in 2021 - in the Civil College/Chamber - 3 judges, and in the Commercial College/Chamber - 1 judge.

(2020): The number of pending administrative cases decreased meaningfully because of reorganization of work in the Supreme Administrative Court (SAC). By issuing an internal order The Chairman/President of the SAC increased the workload of each judge to achieve these results.
The difference of two cases in the horizontal calculation/consistensy (indicated by the SCC 3863 cases instead of 3865-Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year) is due to two cases found in 2020, which were completed in the SCC in a previous period (before 2020), but were not correctly filled in then with all the details needed by the software to report the cases as completed. The adjustment was made in 2020, which actually reduces the number of cases for consideration by two, and the number of completed cases does not increase because the cases were completed in a previous period - before 2020.

(2019): There are some non-litigious cases that are not included in the data but their number is insignificant.

(2018): There are also some other non-litigious cases that are not included in the data. However their number is insignificant. The number of pending administrative cases older than 2 years decreased meaningfully because of reorganization of work in the Supreme Administrative Court (SAC). By issuing an internal order The Chairman/President of the SAC increased the workload of each judge to achieve these results.

(2017): The answer for 2. Non litigious cases (2.1+2.2+2.3) is NAP for previous cycles as well.

(2016): The increase in the number of pending administrative law cases (in the beginning and at the end of the year) is explained by the fact that data has been provided by different sources for 2014 and 2016.

Croatia

(2017): Regarding the answers in this question, cases dealt with by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, as the highest instance court in the RoC, have been presented. We are unable to show separately the required categories. The Supreme Court of the RoC is in the process of preparing the implementation of the ICMS, which will in future enable the expression of cases by types. Source for this data is published data by the Supreme Court of the RoC for year 2017 on their website.

(2016): Due to a large influx of revision proceedings and a slower solving of cases in 2014 and 2015, at the beginning of 2016 the number of pending cases continues to increase. However in 2016 the Supreme Court of the Republic od Croatia significantly resolved more cases than in previous cycle and the number of pending cases had decreased compared with 2015 althought not when compared with 2014.

(2015): In the table 99. cases dealt by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, as the highest most instance court, have been presented. We are unable to show separately the required categories. The Supreme Court is in the process of preparing the implementation of the ICMS, which will in future enable the expression of cases by types.

(2014): After the new standardization of the audit, the Supreme Court has started to be less up-to-date since the number of received cases is far beyond the number of cases which the existing judges and advisors at the Supreme Court may solve. In resolving the cases at the Supreme Court, advantage is given to urgent cases (determined by laws) and to old cases.

Cyprus

(General Comment): Q99 is NAP because Cyprus has a two tier system therefore the supreme court is the second, highest and final instance court.

(2018): Cyprus only has a two tier system. The Court of Appeal is also the Supreme Court, therefore the relevant data could be found in the section on second instance cases.

(2016): The supreme court is the appeal court

Czech Republic

(General Comment): Other cases: This category includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes.

(2021): Other cases: This category includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes.

(2020): Civil (and commercial) litigious cases: After several years of steady growth in the incoming cases, the incoming cases started to decrease in 2018. This is mainly due to legislative changes and drop in first and second-instance agenda in previous years. Thanks to this decrease the Supreme court was able to resolve part of its backlog and thus pending cases significantly decreased.
Civil (and commercial) non litigious cases: The variations should be put into perspective due to small absolute values.
Administrative cases: The Supreme court is overburdened and encounter difficulties to resolve its cases thus the number of pending cases grow quite quickly. It is connected to grow in number of administrative first-instance cases and growing tendency to fill an appeal to Supreme Administrative Court.
Other cases: This category includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes. The changes are the result of changes in second-instance agenda. Also, it must be noted that the number of pending cases is relatively small, thus the variance is bigger.

(2019): Court was overburdened last year (there was much higher number of incoming cases than it managed to resolve), so there is a big increase in the number of pending Administrative cases.

(2018): The category “other” includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes.

(2017): The category “other” includes appeals in last (third) instance of insolvency cases and incidence disputes. This whole agenda is relatively new (since 2008) and it takes quite a long time to resolve a case (several years). Since the agenda is new, it took several years before the number of first-instance incoming cases stopped growing and reach somehow stable level. Of course, the number of appeals (second instance) and incoming case second instance cases started to grow as well, but later. For simplicity, it can be said that Supreme Court deals with appeals in final (third instance). It follows that the number of final instance cases in this agenda also started to grow and again, later than the number of incoming cases in second instance. Thus the number of incoming cases in this agenda (insolvency cases and incidence disputes) is currently growing. The court seems to be struggling to deal with this growth in number of incoming cases, yet it is difficult to understand the reasons behind it, as the growth does not seem to be very high in absolute numbers.

(2016): In 2016 the administrative cases were added and for that reason all numbers show variation. Previously the number of administrative cases on this instance was NA.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 evaluation cycle, it was specified that the civil and other cases are within the competence of the Supreme Court, while the administrative cases are within the competence of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Denmark

(General Comment): All cases at the Supreme Court are considered litigious.

(2021): There is no special reason explaining the increase in the number of incoming cases. It should be recalled that 2020 was a special year because of the lockdown. The Supreme court depends on the two High Courts to receive cases and they send a few more cases to the Supreme court in a year without lockdown compared with 2020.

(2019): resolved and incoming cases have not markedly changed. So it is pending cases that varies. But pending cases are residual numbers and will typically vary from year to year.

(2018): In the Danish context, non-litigious cases do not make sense. Pending cases may vary as it is residual in nature and is depending on the number of incoming and resolved cases and the ratio between those two.
it is also important, when we talk discrepancy, that there is a year between previous and present year (2016 - 2018). 2017 is missing, so data - in particular pending cases - may vary.

(2017): Pending cases primo and ultimo 2017 for the Supreme Court is found based on pending cases ultimo 2016, received cases in 2017 and resolved cases in 2017. Put differently, pending cases are now generated based on pending ultimo 2016 and cases in 2017.

(2016): In the Danish context, non-litigious cases do not make sense. Pending cases may vary as it is residual in nature and is depending on the number of incoming and resolved cases and the ratio between those two.

(2015): The number of incoming cases ("other than criminal cases") dropped between 2010 and 2015. Since the instance reform in 2007, the Supreme Court is now almost only a third instance court (instead of being partly a second instance court and partly a third instance court). Indeed, first instance pending cases at the two High Courts in 2007 have gradually already been appealed or finalised.

(2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, the attention was drawn on the fact that the number of incoming and resolved cases before the Supreme Court was still falling, since the reform of 1st January 2007. Before 2007, many cases started in one of the two High Courts and could be appealed directly to the Supreme Court as second instance. Since 2007, almost all cases start at the lowest level and consequently, much fewer cases are appealed to the Supreme Court. This effect of still fewer cases appealed to the Supreme Court following the reform could still be seen from 2012 to 2014.

Estonia

(General Comment): It is noteworthy that the discrepancies that can be observed between the number of pending cases indicated for December of one year and the number of pending cases communicated for January of the next year, are due to the fact that the statistic system is alive and courts are entitled to modify and up-date data at any time.
Moreover, differences in the horizontal consistency may be explained by the fact that during the proceedings some cases are joined and some are disjoined.

(2016): The number of pending cases has increased because the number of cases where the Supreme Court has decided to open proceedings in the Supreme Court has increased.

Finland

(General Comment): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. The "other" referes to insurance cases, land law cases, petitions (for example, reversals of final judgements) and pardons in the Supreme Court.

(2021): The number of incoming administrative cases has been on the decline for the last years.
Variations observed in respect of "civil and commercial litigious cases" are due to yearly fluctuations.

(2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ.

(2019): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 22.1.2020 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is:
1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

(2018): The total of incoming other than criminal cases decreased slightly in 2018 compared to 2017. The number of administrative law cases decreased slighty in 2018 but is still high. The general increase is mostly a consequence of the asylum crisis and the fact that cases from the administrative courts have reached the highest instance in 2017 and 2018.

(2017): The total of incoming other than criminal cases increased for the period 2016-2017. This increase is mostly due to the increase in the number of administrative law cases as a consequence of the asylum crisis and the fact that cases from the administrative courts have reached the highest instance in 2017 (which was not the case in 2016).

(2016): Courts were able to resolve more cases because the number of incoming cases decreased. The Supreme Administrative court got more resourses and personnel due to the asylum crisis, but cases from the administrative courts have still not reached the highest instance.

(2014): In respect of the variations observed between 2012 and 2014 data, it is noteworthy that the statistics system has changed. Data is not received any more from the Central Statistical Office of Finland. Instead, the Ministry of Justice receives information directly from processing systems. This method of compilation of statistics does not quite support answering the question, as the information is run periodically and not daily. As a result, some discrepancies occur. As the system does not provide the numbers for 1 January 2014, it is necessary to calculate them separately from the correct data obtained on a later date.

France

(2021): source SDSE and Council of State

(2020): "The health crisis and containment may have played on TAs (completed cases) (by reducing the ability of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to trial). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly affected the TAs.
Commentary provided by the Conseil d'Etat: As a reminder, the measures derogating from the ordinary law of contentious administrative procedure adopted to respond to the situation arising from the health crisis caused by the Covid-19 epidemic were provided for by Ordinance no. 2020-305 of March 25, 2020, and then by Ordinance no. 2020-1402 of November 18, 2020, and Decree no. 2020-1406 of the same day. I - Concerning the rules relating to the organization or holding of hearings 1°) Use of audiovisual or any other means of electronic communication
The two orders of March 25 and November 18, 2020 provided for the possibility of using an audiovisual means of telecommunication for the holding of hearings or any other means of electronic communication.
When this device was used, it was used, in almost all the jurisdictions that had recourse to it, for less than 10% of the cases judged in collegiality during the same period.
The most common configuration used was that in which one or more members of the panel were at a distance and the president, the other members of the panel, and the parties and their counsel were in the courtroom (approximately 75% of the courts that used videoconferencing chose this configuration, and 53% of them used it for less than 10% of the cases heard by the panel). Very few courts have used video-conferencing with remote parties. The reasons for which the courts have used video-conferencing are linked to the constraints linked to the health crisis, in particular the difficulties encountered by lawyers to travel, especially in overseas territories, and the isolation imposed on certain people (judges or lawyers) declared to be in contact or recognized as fragile.
In the case of single-judge hearings, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions allowing the use of an audiovisual means of telecommunication, since only 6 administrative courts out of 35 have indicated that they have used it. The administrative courts indicated that they had used videoconferencing, as a single judge, for the processing of emergency proceedings in matters concerning foreigners, particularly in cases where the foreigner was in administrative detention. Finally, 15 administrative courts indicated that they held summary proceedings by videoconference. For almost all of these courts, the summary proceedings judge was in the courtroom and the parties were at a distance, and less than 10% of summary proceedings cases were judged in this configuration. Travel difficulties were the main reasons why the courts of first instance held summary proceedings by videoconference. The texts applicable during the state of health emergency allowed the use of any means of electronic communication, other than videoconferencing, in case of impossibility to use it. Only a few TAs used this procedure and for less than 10% of the cases in the courts that used it.
Generally speaking, the courts have made a very measured application of the provisions of the orders allowing hearings to be held by videoconference and this use was justified by the constraints and difficulties linked to the health crisis. 2°) The provisions allowing to limit the number of persons attending the hearing were applied by a large number of courts and in a frequent manner. On the other hand, the provisions allowing the president of the court to decide that the hearing will be held without the presence of the public have been used very little. 3°) The dispensation of the public rapporteur's conclusions has been used very little by the courts. This dispensation was applied because of the vulnerable state of the public rapporteur or to limit the length of the hearings (in these cases the dispensation was granted for cases that did not present any difficulty).

(2014): 2014: The statistics of the Court of Cassation are not based on the same information system as the ones of courts of first instance and appeal courts. If discontinued cases of the category non-litigious cases may be subject to an appeal, it is not possible to identify them, they are included in the figure given for civil litigious cases. Thus, the total figure is the one retained.

Germany

(2021): The statistics of the Federal Court of Justice do not differentiate between litigious and non-litigious cases. The data given under Nr. 1 represents all appeal cases in civil matters at the Federal Court of Justice (including family matters).
"Other Cases": Data represents labour law cases at the Federal Labour Court.
The annual report of the Federal Labour Court doesn't provide an explanation for the decrease in incoming cases and resolved cases. According to press reports, the decrease in incoming cases might be due to the good economic situation prior to the pandemic (less dismissal cases). The decrease in resolved cases might be due to a rising number of cases, in which an involvement of the European Court of Justice is necessary.

(2015): The data provided date from 2014. At present, no data are available for 2015.
It is not possible to distinguish between litigious civil cases, respectively commercial cases, and those that are non-litigious. Accordingly, number 1 of the answer to question 99 includes all appeals on points of law brought in the civil matters before the Federal Court of Justice (Senates for civil matters including family law matters). However, the number of proceedings dealt with and concluded by litigious rulings in 2014 amounts to 600.

(2014): The 2014 data are the same as those that have been provided in 2013. No update was available.

(2013): For 2013, two Landers did not provide any information. Data provided for the civil (and commercial) litigious cases include all appeals lodged encompassing litigious and non-litigious cases as well as family law cases.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 evaluation it was stressed that the values regarding questions 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 107, 108 corresponded to data of the year 2011.

Greece

(2021): The fact is that Supreme Court couldn't split the number of civil cases on each category provided in the table. The correct numbers for Categories 1+2 are the following: 2300 pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year, 2 644 incoming cases, 2 262 resolved cases and 2 682 Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year.

(2020): No data were collected from Supreme Courts regarding incoming and resolved cases. Therefore, we were unable to provide the relevant evaluable data.

(2018): "the discrepancy between the number of the resolved cases of 2017 and of 2018 for administrative law cases is due to the combination of the following factors:
-in 2018 a number of difficult cases, that had to do with the system of social insurance, was about to be completed
-lawyers become familiar with the filters regarding the cassation and its strict prerequisites, which lead to less rejections of cases as inadmissible and subsequently to a higher number of cases being discussed as far as their real facts are concerned.
-for the abovementioned reason the fast procedure provided for by the relevant code of procedure is not so often implemented
-there are still vacant places of councellors of state, i.e. of the highest rank."

(2017): "Administrative law cases": the number of incoming cases decreased in mainly two sections of the Council of State (i.e. section b for tax issues (-239 cases) and section d for general issues (-692)).

(2016): Previous data concerning the total did not include administrative law cases.

Hungary

(2021): Other cases: insolvency cases, review procedures in labour cases, uniformity complaints
Administrative Chamber
As of 1 April 2020, a significant change was introduced concerning the competence of the Administrative Chamber. As a result of this change, all legal remedies sought for in administrative disputes were decided by the Curia after 1 April 2020. This caused a significant increase in the caseload which was substantially higher than any number of incoming cases in the previous years, regarding the year 2021 as a whole. The change in the competences had an impact for the whole year 2021, due to which administrative legal remedy cases accounted for almost half of the total number of incoming cases at the Curia. Because of the change, the number of administrative judges was increased, and the increased judicial staff managed to resolve the surplus in a timely manner.
Civil Chamber
In comparison to 2020 data, the increase in the number of incoming civil and commercial litigious (line 1) can be explained by the fact that the incoming appeal (second instance) cases were higher by almost 40%. Regarding the appeal cases, the Curia experienced a temporary fallback in 2020; however, as the pandemic situation got better, lower courts could resolve more cases. So, the increase experienced in 2021 is explained by the low base value in 2020, as well as by the improvement in the COVID-19 pandemic situation.
The increase in the number of incoming general civil non-litigious cases (line 2.2.1) can be explained by the increase of cases initiated for the designation of the competent court to two and a half times. Despite the fact that the Civil Division of the Civil Chamber had resolved two times more cases than in the previous year, still there was a significant number of 'designation cases' remained pending.
2.1. Civil and commercial non-litigious cases referred to the Curia through an appeal or a petition for review, cases concerning recusal of judges, cases concerning the designation of the competent court, cases concerning an objection filed because of allegedly excessive duration of the proceedings.
2.2. This is an aggregate of the numbers reported under lines 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3.
2.2.2. Business registry cases referred to the Curia through an appeal or a petition for review.
2.2.3. Review proceedings concerning the registry of civil organizations and other non-profit organizations.
2.3. Review proceedings initiated in non-litigious labour cases, as well as non-litigious proceedings related to labour litigation, initiated for the designation of the competent court.

(2020): The pandemic situation had a huge effect on the case flow of the courts on every level of the court system. Special regulations were adopted by the legislator to promote videoconferencing and the courts were "closed between the 16th of March and the 31th of March (during this period no procedural events could be performed at the courts). Although the courts carried out their main activities, many cases were prolonged e.g. because the parties were not able to attend the hearings. Regarding administrative cases the re-organization of administrative jurisdiction also could have an effect on the case-flow.

(2017): The number of incoming cases decreased in most of the observed categories at the Supreme Court. This also resulted in a decrease in the number of resolved cases thus the number of pending cases increased.

(2016): Generally, the increase in the number of incoming cases at the Kúria (Hungarian Supreme Court) for 2016 is the result of the increasing use of extraordinary remedies by the parties. As the number of incoming cases increased, it resulted in an increase in the other categories as well.

(2014): In 2014, in contrast with the 2013 evaluation, some registration cases were also included within the category "civil and commercial non-litigious cases". The item "other registry cases" includes registration of civil societies. The item "other non-litigious cases" includes court mediation and non-litigious labour cases.
The category "other" encompasses insolvency cases and labour cases.
On the occasion of the 2014 exercise, it has been stressed that one of the main aims of the judicial reform of January 1, 2012 was that the President of the Supreme Court (Kúria) and the Supreme Court itself should focus more on the quality of judicial work. As the President of the Supreme Court was released from the burden of the central administration of the court system, the Kúria was able to reduce its backlog as well as to focus more on the consistency of the national jurisdiction.

Ireland

(General Comment): Administrative law cases are included in the number of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases.

(2020): Reduced cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie.
Both the Supreme Court and Court of Appeal quickly adopted the use of video technology and made greater use of electronic documentation to facilitate their continued work. Procedures were introduced to ensure that justice was administered in public. Both jurisdictions delivered their judgments electronically. Waiting times for a hearing in both Courts were improved, to a certain extent, by a net reduction in the numbers of new cases coming into their lists from other jurisdictions. By year end in both Courts, there was a net improvement in the numbers of cases waiting to be dealt with compared to 2019.

(2019): There has been an overall increase in the appeals in civil matters to the Supreme Court from 2016 and it is expected at this stage that this trend will continue into next year.

(2018): There has been an overall increase in the appeals in civil matters to the Supreme Court from 2016 and it is expected at this stage that this trend will continue into 2019.

(2017): Since the establishment of the Court of Appeal in 2014, the number of pending cases at third instance has fallen. However, the number of incoming cases at third instance has slightly increased between 2016 (164) and 2017 (190).

(2016): The reduced number of incoming and resolved cases reflects the consequences of the establishment of the new Court of Appeal which came into operation in October 2014.

(2015): The reduction in the number of incoming cases to the Supreme Court substantially reflects the change in the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court from that of a second instance appeal court to an appeal court which is primarily third instance in nature

(2014): 2014: Variation: The significant increase in the number of resolved civil (and commercial) litigious cases between 2012 and 2014 reflects a significant exercise undertaken by the Supreme Court in reviewing its caseload in preparation for the establishment in 2014 of the new Court of Appeal (which has assumed the previous second instance jurisdiction of the Supreme Court), which resulted in the striking out or withdrawal of a significant number of appeals then pending before the Supreme Court.

Italy

(General Comment): · With regard to the administrative cases (which number is provided only since 2014), the appeals are dealt with by the Council of State (Consiglio di Stato) which is a legal-administrative consultative body ensuring the legality of public administration in Italy. The Council has jurisdiction on acts of all administrative authorities, except when these authorities lack discretionary power, in which case the dispute is considered to be one of civil law. Figures referring to the activity of the Council of State are inserted in the frame of question 99 and not question 97. · In Italy, non-litigious enforcement cases are not heard by the highest instance court. The latter only hears litigious enforcement cases.

(2021): "Other cases" represent residual cases, such as those concerning the competence or jurisdiction of the courts, or those concerning the correction of the so-called material errors committed by the Supreme Court.

(2019): Other cases represent residual cases, such as cases regarding the competence or jurisdiction of the courts, correction of material errors.

(2018): The increase of the incoming civil litigious cases is ascribed to proceedings related to immigration matters. There is no specific explanation for the increase of resolved administrative cases. Other cases represent residual cases, such as cases regarding the competence or jurisdiction of the courts, correction of material errors.

(2017): The category "other cases" at Q.99 (Supreme Court) represents residual cases such as cases regarding the competence/jurisdiction of the court, corrections of material errors, etc. The 25% variation (in terms of number of resolved cases) has no particular explanation. Please also note that this category do not exist at first and second instance.

(2016): "Other cases" represent residual cases such as cases regarding the competence/jurisdiction of the court, corrections of material errors, etc. In respect of this category, the numbers are small and the observed variations should be put into perspective.

(2014): · In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been indicated that figures subsumed within the category "other" represent really residual cases (such as cases regarding the competence/jurisdiction of the court, corrections of material errors, etc.).

· As to the increases observed in respect of the "total of other than criminal law cases" with regard to all the items (pending, incoming, resolved cases), it is noteworthy that in 2014 for the first time "administrative law cases" dealt with by the Council of State were considered. If looking only to "civil (and commercial) litigious cases", the differences are not that big. In general terms the Supreme Court of Cassation resolves fewer cases than incoming cases.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been specified that non-litigious enforcement cases are not heard by the highest instance court which hears only litigious enforcement cases. Before 2012, only litigious enforcement cases have been provided. For 2012, data related to litigious enforcement cases are the following: initially pending: 1090; incoming: 221; resolved: 413; finally pending: 898.

Latvia

(2021): Total number of incoming administrative cases and civil cases has decreased significantly; taken measures to handle backlog of administrative cases has resulted in increased turnover, this has resulted in falling numbers of pending cases. To handle backlog of administrative cases, two additional posts of judges were created for the years 2021 and 2022.
For some type of listed cases the total numbers are so small, that even 2-3 cases give discrepancy ratio of 100 % or even more.

(2020): There has been gradual decrease of incoming cases: civil cases 1336 (2018), 1164 (2019), 1127 (2020) and administrative cases 850 (2018), 844 (2019), 826 (2020). There has been increase of examined cases per judge of the Administrative chamber (+4) and there was additional judge from the Civil chamber allocated to deal with administrative cases (February-September 2019) and substitute judge working at the Supreme Court (September-December 2020). As result the clearance rate for administrative cases in 2019 was 113% and in 2020 was 114%.
The clearance rate for civil cases (Civil chamber) was 120% which is explained by decrease of incoming cases and high number of examined cases per judge (97 cases). Decrease of non-litigious land registry cases is explained, first, by decrease of total numbers of transaction, for example according to the statistics published by the State Cadastre, total number of transaction of land with buildings was 21619 in 2019 and 18616 in 2020. And, second, because majority of land registry cases of previous years concerned aspects of transformation of property rights (privatization and restitution) and economic activity before economic crises of 2008/2009 which are solved by now. Starting from 2019 the Supreme Court uses the same categories of cases as it is used in the first and second instance courts. Therefore previously used category „other cases" disappears.

(2019): Starting from 2019 the Supreme Court has changed system of classification of cases under different categories for civil cases. During this change we encountered problem of reclassification of cases registered during previous years. This reclassification had as objective to introduce the detailed classification used for first and second instance courts. Statistics for the reference year 2019 encompasses results from both categories. Since 2015 number of unresolved administrative cases increased. During year 2018 additional recourses were allocated to the Administrative department (chamber) of the Supreme Court, including additional judges. As the result, number of resolved cases in 2019 increased. For next coming two years there are two additional judges envisaged for the Administrative department.
Other non-litigious cases (2.3) are specific enforcement procedures which are regarded as uncontested for our civil procedure. These have been received via the specific procedure of a protest submitted by the Prosecutors General Office. The number became available as the result of introduction of the detailed classification regime.

(2018): Supreme Court does not rely only on data in the Court Information System, they keep separate sheet for statistics

(2017): Supreme court has provided data for questions 1 & 2. As regards the decrease of Civil (and commercial) litigious cases, there was a major performance raise in 2016. Also, the Supreme court has only recently begun to collect statistics on their work performance and thus there was and still are some NA answers for CEPEJ questionnaire

(2016): Supreme court had accumulated too many unresolved cases and 1/3 of those ar older than 2 years so they have have made some changes and acheaved progess.

(2015): An explanation for the rather large difference in case count for general civil and commercial non-litigious cases are changes in civil proceedings - while in 2014 undisputed compulsory execution cases were also heared by Supreme Court, in 2015 it was tasked with hearing decisions from Land registry, sworn baillifs and notaries only.

(2012): In 2012, the decrease of the total of cases before the higher instance courts correlates with the general decrease of the number of civil cases.

Lithuania

(General Comment): Other cases - jurisdictional cases and cases based on requests to resume proceedings in cases of administrative offenses.

(2020): In 2019, the Supreme Court of Lithuania examined fewer cases than were received, therefore the number of pending cases increased at the end of the year. However, it should be noted that in 2019 the Supreme Court of Lithuania has provided a number of important and particularly socially sensitive interpretations in both civil, criminal and administrative offences cases. The decrease in the number of resolved civil and commercial litigious cases and accordingly the increase in the number for pending cases at the end of 2020 are due to the reduction in the number of judicial posts and the lengthy appointment by Parliament procedures for vacancies.

(2019): Other cases - jurisdictional cases and administrative offences cases.
Over the last five years, there has been an almost consistent decline in cases, including cassation appeals. In 2019, as compared to 2015, 20 percent less civil cassation appeals were filed and 17 percent fewer civil cassation cases were accepted, 43 percent fewer civil cassation cases were examined. In 2019, the Supreme Court of Lithuania examined fewer cases than were received, therefore the number of pending cases increased at the end of the year.
However, it should be noted that in 2019 the Supreme Court of Lithuania has provided a number of important and particularly socially sensitive interpretations in both civil, criminal and administrative offences cases.

(2018): The number of civil (and commercial) litigious cases (1.) of the cassation instance court (Supreme Court) pending at the end of the year decreased due to the general decrease of resolved cases at first instance. In 2018 the number of civil cases resolved at first instance courts decreased by 10.89% compared to 2017 and was 15.03 % lower than in 2016. This led to the slightly lower inflow and larger number of resolved cases, therefore, to the decreased number of pending cases at the end of the year.

(2016): NA was changed to NAP only for calculation purpose -situation hasn't changed.

(2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been indicated that the Supreme Court of Lithuania received 1369 appeals (cassation) in criminal cases and 2794 appeals (cassation) in civil cases. 677 appeals in criminal cases and 2038 in civil cases were returned to the complainants.
2014: Different category of cases as in Q91, 97 and 99 exist in Lithuania, but they are all under the category 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases and it is not possible at this point to distinguish them from other cases.
The increase between 2013 and 2014 in number of cases can be explained by the increase in the number of incoming administrative cases and cases of administrative offence. They were mostly cases on remuneration of public servants in 2013 due to the decision of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania, which recognized the laws on the reduction of the remuneration of state servants and judges unconstitutional. This also had an effect on the significant increase of the category "other cases" since this situation resulted in the increase of the number of cases of administrative offence (in execution process).

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The pending files are now detailed between criminal and civil/commercial cases, thus this additional information is now available. There is no cassation possibility against the decisions of the administrative court of appeal.

(2021): The number of incoming cases depends on the appeals lodged which the Court has no influence on and which is, among other things, a function of the number of decisions taken at the level of the other instances. In 2020, the number of decisions taken by the different instances has decreased compared to the previous years, which can explain the decreased number of incoming cases before the Court of Cassation. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.

(2019): Pending cases at the beginning of the year have been restated in relation to those available at the time of the 2018-2020 evaluation cycle. The introduction of a new case management application at the Court of cassation (JUCIV) has made it possible to identify a number of cases, still listed as pending, which were in fact completed.

(2018): Comparing 2016 to 2018, the increase in pending cases at the end of the period is 40.73%. However, there was already a clear increase in cases pending at the end of the period between 2016 and 2017, which is largely explained by a larger number of new cases in 2017. Between 2017 and 2018, the variation in cases pending at the end of the period is + 5%, which does not seem excessive, especially taking into account the low numbers.

(2017): Q99: total and civil and commercial litigation cases: the slight increase in the number of incoming cases in 2017 and the relatively stable number of resolved cases explain the increase in the number of pending cases at the end of 2017 to 109 .

(2014): 2014: several categories are in NAP because the Court of Cassation has no jurisdiction over these categories.

Malta

(2017): In Malta the 2nd instance courts are the highest instance. Hence the NAP answer to this section.

(2016): In Malta the 2nd instance courts are the highest instance. Hence the NAP answer to this section.

Netherlands

(General Comment): Information in this section is taken from the annual report of the High Court. The formula for pending cases on 31 December might not work satisfactory – there will be a gap between pending cases at the ent of the year and the number of pending cases at the beginning of the year + incoming cases -/- resolved cases. The gap is caused by cases that are labelled 'outflow other'. These are cases that do not get resolved because of administrative reasons (for instance, the appeals is filed to late, or mandatory court fees have not been paid and there is no dispensation).

(2021): The formula for pending cases on 31 December might not work satisfactory – there will be a gap between pending cases at the ent of the year and the number of pending cases at the beginning of the year + incoming cases -/- resolved cases. The gap is caused by cases that are labelled 'outflow other'. These are cases that do not get resolved because of administrative reasons (for instance, the appeals is filed to late, or mandatory court fees have not been paid and there is no dispensation).
2 – Non-litigious cases: in theory, it might possible these cases get to the Supreme Court, but the numbers are not specified for the courts.
3 – Administrative law cases: please note that the Dutch Supreme Court only handles tax cases and some social security cases. There is not third instance court for other administrative cases in the Netherlands, so these are not included in the numbers given. 4 – Other cases: There might be other cases in separate courts, but these numbers are not nationally available. Regarding discrepancy: There are always factors that might influence the number of cases the SC handles in a year. There are no published numbers identifying the various types of cases the tax chamber handles. As mentioned before, we can provide a more general explanation for an increase in SC cases and/or disposition time. For example, delays or catch up in lower courts (increasing/lowering the number of incoming cases), new laws or changes in law that the SC must answer, cases may become more complex due to increasing complexity of laws and differences (and thus, cases may take longer), or cases that are connected are grouped to deal with in clusters (meaning more cases for a longer time). While a specific cause cannot be clearly pinpointed, all these factors might influence the numbers.

(2020): With regard to 2. Non litigious cases: In theory, it is possible these cases get to the Supreme Court, but these cases are not specified in available numbers for the courts.
With regard to 3. Administrative law cases: Please note that the Dutch Supreme Court only handles tax cases and some social security cases. There is no third instance court for other administrative cases in the Netherlands, so these are not represented in this number.
With regard to 4. Other cases: There might be other cases in separate courts (Kamers), but these numbers are not available nationally.
With regard to the discrepancies: there are always some factors that might be of influence on the number of cases the Supreme Court handles in a year. It might be due to delays or catch ups in lower courts (so incoming cases are lower/higher), new laws or changes in law that the SC must answer (like covid-regulations), cases may become more complex because laws and differences are more complex (as a result cases may take longer), or cases that are connected that are grouped to deal with in clusters (meaning more cases for a longer time). While we cannot clearly pinpoint a 'cause' of the discrepancies, all these factors mentioned might influence the numbers.

(2019): Reason for discrepancies: discrepancies seem higher, as absolute values are lower. When asked, the High Court explains that there is always an eb and flow of cases due to several factors.

(2018): Cases handled by the High Court are 'litigious' by nature (= cases are settled at first instance if one party remains inactive)

(2017): the answer to this question is still not available.

(2016): A the moment the Supreme Court has not the data available to answer this question. The National Correspondent is consulting the Supreme Court to improve this situation.

Poland

(General Comment): The Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance and it is impossible for the Statistics Division to divide its cases statistics and identify the number of second instance cases on the one hand, and the number of third instance cases, on the other hand. The total number of administrative law cases dealt with by the Supreme Administrative Court is provided within the frame of Q97, while Q99 is replied by NA.
While the Supreme Court considers non-contentious cases, there is no inclusion of this category of cases in the internal statistics. Accordingly, the reply is NA.

**(2021): ***1. They include cases conducted in the Civil Chamber, the Labor and Social Insurance Chamber Chamber and the Chamber for Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs, including those with the reference NSNc
*4)The data includes cases conducted in the Chamber for Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs with the references NSK, NSKP, NZP, NZ, NSW, NSP NKRS, NWW, and NO signatures. These are cases that fall under the jurisdiction of the Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs Chamber mainly in the field of public law public, i.e., other than extraordinary complaints in both civil and criminal cases (which have been assigned to civil and criminal cases shown in boxes 99 and 100, respectively),
For example, cases in the field of telecommunications regulation, energy, competition protection, but also appeals against resolutions of the National Judicial Council.
*4)Other cases are also disciplinary cases resolved in the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court.
In the case statistics of the Chamber Civil, Labor and Social Security Chamber, as well as in the statistics of civil cases (extraordinary complaints) of the Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs Chamber, there was an increased receipt in 2021 compared to 2020.This was an increase so significant that the statistics of cases handled declined compared to 2020.It should be assumed that - similar to previous years previous years, the general reason for the less favorable statistics are further organizational changes within the Supreme Court and the impact of the dispute over judicial reform on the efficiency of the work of Supreme Court judges. In addition, following the assumption of the post of President of the Civil Chamber of the Supreme Court by prof. Joanna Misztal-Konecka, there has been a review of the observance of the order in which cases are received in their allocation to individual judges. The Office Instruction was then modified in the part concerning the system of case numbers. Some cases were then assigned new case numbers, which could lead to an artificial overestimation of the number of cases with an unchanged rate of their handling.

**(2020): ***Civil cases :- litigious cases heard by the civil chamber and the labour and social insurance chamber: Civil Chamber - pending cases on 1 Jan - 2596, incoming cases - 4360, resolved cases - 5518, pending cases on 31th Dec - 1438; Labour and social insurance chamber - pending cases on 1 Jan - 2161, incoming cases - 1535, resolved cases - 1938, pending cases on 31th Dec - 1758; *Other cases: - cases pertaining to public law, decided by the Chamber for Extraordinary Control and Public Issues and disciplinary cases resolved in the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court: the Chamber for Extraordinary Control and Public Issues - pending cases on 1 Jan - 149, incoming cases - 6696, resolved cases - 6710, pending cases on 31th Dec - 135; the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court: pending cases on 1 Jan - 105, incoming cases - 312, resolved cases - 395, pending cases on 31th Dec - 22; Other cases: *These increases must be explained by the election year, in which the Chamber of Extraordinary Control and Public Affairs dealt with numerous protests. This has resulted in a substantial increase in the dynamics of cases in this Chamber.
Discrepancies - Administrative law cases - see data in Q97 and general comment to that question.

(2019): 1. Civil cases = civil cases + labour and social security cases;
4. Other cases = public law cases + disciplinary cases;
3. Data from Supreme Administrative Court; “1. Civil and commercial litigious cases”: Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 2586 (civil cases) + 2010 (labour and social security cases); Incoming cases :5105 (civil cases) + 2480 (labour and social security cases); Resolved cases: 5095 (civil cases) + 2329 (labour law and social security cases); Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 2596 (civil cases) + 2161 (labour and social security cases);
“4.Other cases”: Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref year: 117 (disciplinary cases) + 215 (public law cases); Incoming cases: 269 (disciplinary cases) + 894 (public law cases); Resolved cases: 281 (disciplinary cases) + 955 (public law cases); Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 105 (disciplinary cases) + 154 (public law cases).
Public law cases and disciplinary cases were not entered in the table in 2018. Public law cases in 2018: Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. Year – no data; Incoming cases – 293; Resolved cases – 81; Pending cases 31th December – 212; Disciplinary cases in 2018 : In 2018 the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court received a total of 161 cases, of which 52 to the First Department and 109 to the Second Department. In the First Department, in 2018, 11 cases were resolved. In the Department of the Second Disciplinary Chamber, 17 cases were considered and completed in terms of content, and 16 cases formally (data from the Supreme Court activity report for 2018).

(2016): In 2014 the Administrative Supreme court cases were not included and they are reintroduced in this cycle. In regard to administrative law cases we kindly indicate that administrative cases are excluded from the jurisdiction of the common courts. Administrative cases are proceeded by the Voivodship Administrative Courts and Supreme Administrative Court, which are only competent to proceeded such cases.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been indicated that the Supreme Court provided the Ministry of Justice with data set that allowed summing up non-criminal cases with administrative cases of the Supreme Administrative Court. Therefore it was possible to include both data-sets.

Portugal

(General Comment): In Portugal, there are not non-litigious cases in superior courts.
The category "other" does not exist in the higher instances.
It is noteworthy that before 2015, data concerning the total of “other than criminal law cases” did not include administrative law cases. Since 2015, administrative law cases are included in the total which explains the significant increase of cases.

(2021): The increase in the number of cases pending on 1 January 2021 is related to the fact that in 2020 the number of cases brought was slightly higher than the number of cases completed. There is no specific explanation for these values.

(2020): There was an increase in the number of cases pending from 2018 to 2020 at the Supreme Court of Justice, considering that the number of cases that ended from 2018 to 2020 was relatively lower than the number of cases brought in those years. The rise in the number of pending cases in the year 2020 is also partly explained by the decrease in court activity in the year 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.

(2019): 99 (total) - the increase on the number of pending cases vis a vis 2018 is explained by the fact that the closed cases from 2018 to 2019 were relatively inferior to the number of incoming cases in those years. There were no legislative changes that could explain these numbers.
99.1 - the increase on the number of pending cases vis a vis 2018 is explained by the fact that the closed cases from 2018 to 2019 were relatively inferior to the number of incoming cases in those years. There were no legislative changes that could explain these numbers.

(2018): Regarding the slight decrease in the number of pending civil and commercial litigious cases at the beginning of the year 2018, comparing to 2016, there were no legislative changes or others that could explain this decrease

(2017): Q99.1 - The decrease in the number of pending civil and commercial litigious cases on 31 december 2017 is explained by the fact that the number of resolved cases in 2017 was superior to the number of incoming cases in the same year. There were no legislative changes or other that can explain this decrease.

(2016): In Portugal, there are not non-litigious cases in superior courts.
The category "other" does not exist in the higher instances.
It is noteworthy that before 2015, data concerning the total of “other than criminal law cases” did not include administrative law cases. Since 2015, administrative law cases are included in the total which explains the significant increase of cases.
The question 99.3 “Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.
The number of Pending cases on 1Jan. that correspond only to tax cases is 783
The number Incoming cases that correspond only to tax cases is 1.039
The number of Resolved cases that correspond only to tax cases is 946
The number of Pending cases on 31 Dec. that correspond only to tax cases is 876

(2015): The question 99.3 “Administrative law cases”, includes administrative and tax cases.

Romania

(2021): The increase in Pending cases older than 2 years for administrative cases could be explained both by the significant increase in 2017 of the number of incoming cases of this type and by the limited capacity for resolving cases during the pandemic crises (from 30038 in 2019 to 26800 in 2020); therefore, the effect shall be seen in terms of statistics after 3 years in the number of pending cases (according to our statistical application the pending cases are registered in the category cases pending for more than 3 years).

(2019): In 2017 there was a significant increase in the number of incoming administrative cases explained by the modifications in terms of procedure, namely amendments regarding the jurisdiction for administrative cases brought in 2013 that might have generated later effects in terms of number of "second appeals" (peculiarity of our system). Since 2017 and the described peak, the number of incoming administrative cases is decreasing.

(2018): The differences compared to the previous cycle are due to changes brought by the Constitutional Court's decisions to the interpretation given by the High Court of Cassastion and Justice to the legislation regarding the increasing number of incoming civil litigious cases and the decreasing number of civil litigious cases pending for more than 2 years.

(2017): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, for the last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years. The increase in the number of incoming administrative cases may be explained by the modifications in terms of procedure, namely modifications regarding the jurisdiction for administrative cases brought in 2013 that might have generated later effects in terms of number of "second appeals" (peculiarity of our system); moreover, there should be mentioned that the number of second appeals in this question, refers to both the second appeals judged by the supreme court (High Court of Cassation and Justice) and by the courts of appeals, aspect that is valid even for the previous cycles.

(2016): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, for the last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years. As result of the changes in the procedural provisions in the new codes; the jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed and some of the cases that were under the jurisdiction of the High Court are now under the jurisdiction of the courts of appeal Consequently the number of cases in Supreme court shows significant decrease in all categories.

(2014): By the decision n° 46/2012, the Superior Council of Magistracy has decided that all the courts will implement by 1 January 2014 the IT system of collecting data. The new method is based on new definitions of the indicators and offers data with greater value for 2014. This partly explains the considerable increase of the number of pending administrative cases on 1st January between 2012 and 2014. Besides, the number of incoming cases in 2013 was higher than in 2014.

(2013): In respect of the administrative law cases, until 2013, there was only a second appeal that is encompassed in the answers to question 99.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The collected statistical data for the Supreme Court do not distinguish the litigious and non-litigious cases. In the civil and commercial matters the Supreme court decides primarily on the applications for appellate review on legal questions. In the commercial cases it decides also in the appellate procedure against the decisions of the Regional courts as the courts of first instance. The administrative cases at the Supreme Court level includes the remedy procedures against the decisions of the Regional courts as the courts of first instance. Depending on the type of the administrative procedure it might be appeal procedure or the cassation review procedure.

(2021): As to the number of administrative law cases, in August 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic was established as a separate institution and it took over all the administrative law cases of the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic. Therefore, the above-mentioned figures of the administrative law cases cover only the period from January to July 2021.

(2020): Decline of incoming cases and resolved cases as well in the Supreme court as a result of a pandemic situation.

(2019): No cases in the category other cases
Line 1: A significant drop in the number of cases for 2019 compared to 2018 has been caused by a massive decrease of incoming cases of a certain plaintiff - Pohotovosť s. r. o., a legal person which back then overwhelmed the Supreme Court´s Civil and Commercial law divisions with thousands of appeals and caused an abnormal caseload. Therefore, the indicators for 2019 should be considered as regular average numbers. Compared to e.g. 2018 and previous years which were rather exceptional.

(2018): The decrease in numbers of both incoming and resolved other than criminal cases may be explained by two important issues. First of all this is the complex change of the Civil and Administrative court procedure by introducing the new procedural rules which came into force since 1 July 2016. The other reason is the decrease of the caseload at the lower courts which naturally influence the number of cases at the Supreme court level.

(2017): The decrease in numbers of both incoming and resolved cases must be understood in connection with the data for previous years. As we explained in previous cycles (data 2014, 2015, 2016), at the level of the Supreme Court of the Slovak Republic there was the enormous increase of incoming (and resolved) cases related to consumer protection in civil and enforcement procedure. We recorded in previous years thousands of recurring submissions of several private loans' companies. These submissions started to be processed quicker and subsequently, its number dropped. The similar explanation is relevant also for the administrative cases.
As regards the variations, some inconsistencies in data between the old and new system persist, and they can be explained as the transition between the old system of collecting the statistical data to new one is more complicated than was expected, with the setting up of Analytical centre of the MoJ, application of CEPEJ methodology and its tools is one of the targets in the on-going project between CEPEJ and Ministry of justice of the Slovak republic.
There are still two different IT tools used to collect the statistical data from the courts to Analytical centre. The Analytical centre makes every effort to complete the transition between two systems as soon as possible to get reliable data as soon as possible.
As to administrative cases, in the year 2017 there were some appeal procedures pending at Regional courts as the courts of appeal as the result of application of the previous procedural rules described in point 1. All appeals against the decisions of Regional court (as the courts of first instance) were always tried by the Supreme court and we are presenting this data for all evaluation cycles in this table.

(2016): The enormous increase of the incoming cases is related to consumer protection in civil and enforcement procedure.

(2013): For 2013, a general remark was provided in respect of questions 91, 97 and 101, explaining that there were no specific reasons justifying the variations in the numbers of cases of the particular categories. It was stressed that the Slovak judicial system was facing different types of claims which massively loaded courts of all instances. For example, there was a huge number of legal actions arisen from the loans provided by the so called "non-bank loan companies" where courts had to consider constant violations of the consumer protection law. Besides, there was a huge number of class actions against the State, carried out by one of the non-bank companies for alleged damages etc. The capacity of the court staff to resolve all of the filed cases in the appropriate time period was limited despite the measures which have been taken. In spite of the positive trend concerning the increase of the number of total resolved cases, the number of incoming cases was increasing even more, causing backlogs.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The Supreme court has Criminal, Civil, Commercial, Labour and Social and Administrative department, The categories 1., 2.1 and 2.2.1 include corresponding cases from Civil, Commercial and Labour and Social departments registers. Category 3. includes registers of the Administrative department. The distribution of cases for Q99 is the same as for Q91.
Inconsistences noticed are due the Data Warehouse system explained in Q91.

(2021): 1. Civil (and commercial) litigious cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: decrease by approx. 40%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions (and the number of resolved cases at first instance courts decreased). As the Supreme Court deals with the majority of cases without hearing of parties, its functioning was not affected as much and it managed to resolve more cases than it had received.
2. Non litigious cases (2.1+2.2+2.3); 2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases; 2.2 Registry cases; 2.2.1 Non litigious land registry casesPlease note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.

(2020): Please note, the procedure of manifested inadmissibility cases are included in figures above.
The decrease in the number of (all) pending cases is due to the efficient work of the court in 2019 and 2020. Discrepancies in sub categories (form 1. through 3) are due to a small absolute number of cases).

(2019): The differences are due to a small (absolute) number of cases in some legal areas. The decrease in pending cases at the end of 2019 is due to more efficient work of the Supreme court (changes in criteria for manifested inadmissibility in 2017).

(2018): Administrative cases - in 2017, the procedure of manifested inadmissibility was introduced in aministrative cases, reducing the number of incoming (as well as resolved and pending) cases. As for other categories and Total, the difference is due to more efficient work of the Supreme court and due to aforementioned reason.
Please note, the procedure of manifested inadmissibility cases are included in figures above.

(2017): Administrative cases: the higher number of pending administrative law cases older than two years is partially a result of higher workload of the court. Partially this is the consequence of the fact that some older cases are waiting on the decision of the Constitutional court regarding laws in question (mainly taxes and public access to information issues).

(2015): Differences in pending, incoming and resolved cases Non litigious and administrative cases are mainly due to the small absolute number of cases and the nature of the cases (most complicated cases).

(2014): 2014: Variations: The numbers in that almost all categories for 2014 deviates more than +/- 20% from the 2012 data. This is due to a small (absolute) number of cases but also because the number of judges is smaller when compared to first and second instance and a single absence due to prolonged illness has a significant impact on the solving of some types of cases. We also believe that changes in economy (financial crisis), as well as in legislation, had impact on the overall statistics, but since cases at the Supreme Court level are "filtered" through courts of first and second instance, a direct connection cannot be established.

(2012): 2012: The decrease of the number of pending cases at the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia can be attributed to different factors. On one hand procedural legislation has changed. Following the changes to the Administrative Dispute Act (2007) and the Civil Procedure Act (2008) the Supreme Court has now the right to decide in these types of cases whether to review a case or not. With the reform the admissibility criteria have changed and revision is now a remedy that depends mainly on the discretion of the Supreme Court. Now revision is admissible only, if the case raises a question of law of fundamental significance or if the development of law or the preservation of uniformity of case law requires a decision by the Supreme Court. The number of all incoming cases for the whole Supreme Court has dropped considerably from more than 5 000 in 2008 to less than 4000 in 2012). On the other hand this is the consequence of changes in human resources management. Firstly, the number of judicial advisers has risen and secondly, several judicial advisers were transferred from less burdened departments to those with more pending cases and consequently the productivity has risen and the number of pending cases decreased.

Spain

(General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Lawyer of the Administration of Justice detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error. These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

(2021): The recovery of activity, after the most severe restrictions of the pandemic, may have contributed to the entry of more cases, as well as to greater efficiency and increased number of resolved cases. The comparison is with 2020, the year in which the pandemic forced mobility restrictions.

(2020): In administrative law cases, judgements based on the unified doctrine related Tax on the Retail Sales of Certain Hydrocarbons facilitated the resolution of cases in previous years and partly caused the good clearance rate of the Supreme Court Administrative Room in 2019. However, there were fewer of these cases in 2020, so the number of resolved cases decreased.

(2019): In respect of administrative law cases, the very positive clearance rate in 2018, added to the trend that continues being positive in 2019, explains the decrease in pending cases.

(2018): The Administrative Procedural Law allows the inadmissibility of the cassation appeal by resolution of a lower level than Civil Procedural Law. This explains partially the different clearance rate between this two rooms.
In relation to the good resolution rate in Administrative is due in part to this cause: In previous years, a Judgement of the Court of Justice of the European Union declared Spanish law contrary to Community law authorizing the tax on retail sales of certain hydrocarbons. This fact meant the massive presentation of claims for the patrimonial responsibility of the State for the undue payment of the so-called "sanitary cent". Once the Supreme Court established jurisprudence, many of these cases were resolved more quickly.

(2017): The cause of the raise of administrative cases (pending at the beginning of 2017 and resolved) in the Supreme Court is the reform of the cassation appeal by the Final Disposition Third of the Organic Law 7/2015, and, on the other hand, a new organisation of the Third Courtroom.

(2016): As concerns the variations observed between 2014 and 2016 regarding the categories "total of other than criminal law cases"; "civil and commercial litigious cases"; "administrative law cases", it should be noted that:
- the increase in the number of cases in civil matters is due to the increase in conflicts of competence entered and resolved as well as the increase in the number of resolutions of appeals for unification of doctrine.
- the high increase in administrative matters is due to the massive presentation of claims for the State's patrimonial responsibility for the undue payment of the called "sanitary cent", because of the Judgement of the Court of Justice of the European Union that declared contrary to the Community law the Spanish law that authorized the Tax on Retail Sales of Certain Hydrocarbons.

(2015): Regarding administrative cases in 2015, there was a significant flow of incoming cases related with tax on retail sales of certain hydrocarbons. But before that, since 2011, the incoming administrative cases dropped due to the Law of courts' fees.

(2014): For the 2014 exercise, the decreases observed in respect of the number of pending administrative law cases in the beginning of the year and the number of resolved administrative law cases, are the result of the decreases observed and explained in fist instance.
The increase in the number of pending civil and commercial litigious cases on 31 December between 2012 and 2014 is due to the economic crisis which resulted in the increase of the number of cases in the civil jurisdiction.

(2012): For the 2012 evaluation cycle, the category of civil and commercial litigious cases includes data on labour matters, special matters and military matters.

Question 100

Austria

(2021): The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.

(2020): The total figure includes data on administrative criminal cases before the Supreme Administrative Court.

(2016): The big variation is due to the fact that this cycle the administrative cases were included.
The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. After their establishment the data of the administrative courts is introduced this cycle for the first time.

Belgium

(General Comment): "The total corresponds to the criminal law cases (roll P) of the Court of Cassation.
Source: Hof van Cassatie van België - Cour de cassation de Belgique - Kassationshof von Belgien
Justitiepaleis - Poelaertplein 1 - 1000 Brussel
Palace of Justice - Place Poelaert 1 - 1000 Brussels
Council of State
Rue de la Science 33 Wetenschapsstraat
1040 Brussels - Brussel
http://www.raadvst-consetat.be"

(2021): Remarks on the evolution of criminal cases:
While the number of incoming criminal cases brought before the Court of Cassation each year remained relatively stable between 2016 and 2020, this number increased sharply in 2021, with 345 additional units compared to 2020. This is an increase of 25.50% in one year. At present, it is not clear whether this increase is a one-off and attributable to rather occasional circumstances or whether it is the harbinger of a period of significant growth in the number of criminal cases. It goes without saying that this sudden development will have to be monitored closely in the years to come.
Of necessity, the Court of Cassation has succeeded in significantly increasing the number of final judgments handed down in criminal cases in 2021 compared to 2020 (+237 units). This is an increase of 17.27%. However, these efforts could not prevent the criminal caseload at the end of 2021 from increasing for the first time in years, especially with 89 units compared to the criminal caseload at the end of 2020.

(2016): Cases on the 'p' list of the Court of Cassation
the downward trend in the input of criminal cases is due to the tightening of access conditions: stricter time limits, obligation to serve notice of appeal, compulsory intervention by a lawyer trained in the cassation technique, abolition of immediate appeal against interlocutory judgments, abolition of the Court of Cassation's review of pre-trial detention, except for the first confirmation of the arrest warrant. To all this it must be added the introduction of a rapid and non-adversarial procedure allowing appeals that are not substantiated or manifestly inadmissible or unfounded to be refused.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The software of the Supreme Court of Cassation for extracting statistics is different from the product used for other courts. The division of criminal cases according to the criteria set out in Question 100 was made on the basis of the definitions of the CEPEJ.
In the category “other criminal cases” are included: cases with charges on corpus delicti which doesn’t have independently application; cases on Chapter XXXIII Criminal Procedure Code (re-opening of criminal cases); private cassation proceedings (change of local jurisdiction, jurisdiction disputes, proceedings on returning of cassation claim/protest etc.); procedures regarding execution of judicial acts that are entered into force; proceedings regarding administration and/or movement of cases etc.

(2021): Explanation related to all differences reported under item 2 "Misdemeanors and/or minor criminal cases" (31.8%, 22.73%, -20.69%) and item 3 "Other criminal cases" (-45 % and 54.55%.):the reasons for the differences in percentages for the above types of cases compared to 2020 are mathematical. The figures for all the listed indicators for the reference years 2020 and 2021 are small, respectively, and the differences are small as an absolute value and do not reflect a significant change in the work on criminal cases in the Supreme Court of Cassation, but are recalculated in a large percentage difference. A more detailed mathematical explanation is obtained if each of these indicators is calculated, what percentage it represents in relation to the total number of cases for examination for the corresponding year, received by the Criminal Board of the Supreme Court. In 2020, there were 1 328 cases for consideration, while in 2021 - 1 407 cases. Taking into account the total number of cases for consideration in 2020 and 2021, the difference for which an explanation is due varies in absolute value from 0.76% to -1.79%. It is too small to be an indication of a significant change in the work of the Supreme Court of Cassation in criminal cases.

(2018): The “Other cases” group are: cases where the punishment for a committed crime depends on the punishment for other crime, that is established in the main text of the Criminal Code – it could be an offence of more severe or lightly punishment; cases on procedures related to the main case; cases on claims for re-establishment of criminal case; cases on jurisdiction disputes; cases on interpretation of a judicial act; cases on rehabilitation; cases that were instituted on a private appeal, etc. Some cases which were previously counted in misdemeanour/minor are now indicated under “other” which explains the decrease in the number of misdemeanour/minor criminal cases in respect of all categories – pending, incoming and resolved cases.

(2016): Comment on question 100
Till 2015 only the Supreme Court of Cassation was hearing the requests for resumption of criminal cases. In 2015 the Criminal Procedure Code was amended with the Law For Amendment and Supplementation of Criminal Procedure Code /SG, 42/2015/. According to the amendment the request for resumption of the criminal case grounded on art. 422, par. 1, p. 5 of the Criminal Procedure Code shall be heard by the respective court of appeal, when the judgments under art. 419 of the Criminal Procedure Code were decreed by a regional or district court, except of the new verdicts.
As a result of the legislative amendment, a significant part of the requests under Chapter Thirty-three of Criminal Procedure Code are heard by the courts of appeal in the state.
The above led to reduction in the number of cases related to the resumption of criminal cases heard by the Supreme Court of Cassation. This is also the reason for the presence of more than 20% deviation from the total number of criminal cases heard by the Supreme Court of Cassation during 2016 than those from previous years.

(2014): In the annual report of the Supreme Court of Cassation in 2012 (criminal division) the cases pending at the end of the reporting period were 260. In the report for 2013 the pending cases at the beginning of the period were 602 and the pending cases at the end of the reporting period were 671. Under Table 1 of the report for 2012, there is a note that the pending cases which are not included in the number of adjourned and private proceedings were filed in December 2012 at the registry of the Supreme Court of Cassation and are scheduled for consideration in January and February 2013. As a result, the total number of pending cases in 2014 appears much higher than in 2012.

Croatia

(2021): There has been a decrease of incoming criminal law cases between 2020 and 2021 following the establishment of the High Criminal Court on 1st of January 2021, which took over part of the previous Supreme Court’s jurisdiction.

(2018): The table shows cases under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the epublic of Croatia, as the highest judicial authority in the Republic of Croatia.

(2016): The table shows cases under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia, as the highest judicial authority in the Republic of Croatia. We are not able to present the data separately for “Severe criminal cases” and “Misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” due to the fact that the implementation of the Integrated Case Management System at the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia is underway. It will enable the track record of the cases by type.
The significant decrease of the number of pending cases at the beggining of 2016 in the Supreme Court is due to the fact that since beginning of 2014 this court continuously solves more cases than it receives and also because in 2015 there was a further reduction in inflow of cases.

(2014): For 2014, the table shows cases under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, as the highest judicial authority in the Republic of Croatia. Data on “severe criminal cases” and “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” could not be presented separately due to the fact that the implementation of the Integrated Case Management System at the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia is underway. It will enable the track record of the cases by type.
When comparing 2012, 2013 and 2014 data, it can be noticed a trend of decrease of the total number of incoming criminal cases, which is a result of legislative amendments, suspension of extraordinary legal remedy (request for extraordinary mitigation of penalty), as well as the decrease of the number of cases in which the decision about an appeal to investigative imprisonment needs to be decided on.

Cyprus

(General Comment): The peculiarity of the judicial system of Cyprus is that the Supreme Court is the appeal and the final instance court.

(2020): The Supreme Court is also the appeal court

(2018): Cyprus only has a two tier system. The Court of Appeal is also the Supreme Court, therefore the relevant data could be found in the section on second instance cases.

(2016): The supreme court is the appeal court

Czech Republic

(General Comment): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases"

(2020): Total of criminal cases: The variations should be put into perspective due to small absolute values.

(2018): We are not able distinguish between serious offences and minor offences. Thus only total number of cases is reported. There are no cases that could be reported in "Other cases"

Denmark

(General Comment): All cases at the Supreme Court are considered severe.

(2018): Data are from the yearly report 2018 from the Supreme Court,
http://www.hoejesteret.dk/hoejesteret/embedsregnskab/Documents/Årsberetning2018.pdf

(2016): Based on the data the Danish Court Administration got, it is not possible to show pending criminal cases.

(2014): For 2014, the number of pending criminal cases was not available.
The number of received criminal cases has fallen all the years since 2010, except from 2014 where it went up with 7 cases and the same number of criminal cases were received as in 2012. It is worth mentioning that the Danish Court Administration differentiates between cases that are fully appealed and cases in respect of which a specific point is appealed (i.e. should the person being charged stay in custody while the case is on-going). The number of cases fully appealed has varied between 27 and 14 over the period 2010-2012-2013-2014 (in 2013 and 2014 there were 14 received cases). Completed “full cases” have varied between 32 and 12 cases (in 2014 there were 12 completed criminal cases). The rest of the cases were related to specific questions.
Therefore, and due to the instance reform as well, the Supreme Court has over the years dealt with fewer and fewer cases.

Estonia

(General Comment): The Supreme Court is the court of cassation, therefore only those cases are heard which have been given leave to appeal (i.e. that have been declared admissible for proceedings in the Supreme Court). The data presented shows the number of cases which have been actually heard by the Supreme Court and not the number of appeals. The Supreme Court is not required to give reasons in its ruling on the admissibility of the appeals.

(2021): The Supreme Court did not provide a specific explanation with regard to the decrease in the number of resolved criminal cases, but if we look the overall reasons, they are Covid-19 related.

(2020): The pandemic has affected the courts activity in criminal matters in general. The criminal procedure law was not as flexible when judges had to work online. the complete revision of the criminal procedure law is ongoing and will come into force next year.

(2016): Numbers are quite small. No special reason for discrepancies. Because the distinction between severe and minor criminal cases is not the same with the CEPEJ, data for subcategories can be found below :
Severe criminal cases : Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 18
Incoming cases : 82
Resolved cases : 73
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 27
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : NA
Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases :
Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year : 6
Incoming cases : 26
Resolved cases : 29
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year: 3
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court : NA

(2014): The variations observed in 2014 are not of importance, since the numbers are small.

(2012): In 2012, the higher number of criminal cases compared to 2010 was a result of the higher number of cases where the decision of the lower court was appealed. As regards the number of misdemeanour cases before the Supreme Court, the number of appeals was not much lower compared to 2010 but the number of cases accepted by the Supreme Court was lower (in 2010 the Supreme Court declared admissible 35% of the appeals, while in 2012 only 21% of the appeals were accepted).

Finland

(General Comment): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ.

(2021): Variations observed in respect of criminal cases are due to yearly fluctuations.

(2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ.

France

(General Comment): The total number of resolved cases corresponds to judgments of cassation, cassation without referral and dismissal of the appeal. The other judgments handed down by the criminal chamber of the Court of Cassation are not counted. It is not possible to distinguish the litigation of the Court of Cassation by type of offence. The item "serious criminal cases" includes all appeals before the Court of cassation. It should be noted that the appeals mainly concern crimes and offences. The share of minor criminal cases is residual. The data are taken from the annual activity report of the Court of Cassation. Priority questions of constitutionality are not taken into account.

(2021): Source SDSE

(2020): The health crisis and the lockdown may have had an impact on TAs (completed cases) (by reducing the capacity of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (new cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to court). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly influenced TAs.

Germany

(2021): It is not possible to differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" (NA). The total number of cases represents the number of appeals, including referrals and regulatory offences pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences (OWiG) as well as regulatory offences pursuant to the Act Against Restraints of Competition (GWB) and the Energy Act (EnBW) before the criminal panels (including antitrust panel).
There were more incoming cases in 2021 than 2020 and also more pending cases at the beginning of the year 2021 than 2020. As a result, the number of pending criminal cases on 31 December 2021 increased. No special reason could be identified for this development. The annual report of the Federal Court of Justice doesn't provide any information on this matter.

(2020): It is not possible to differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" (NA). The total number of cases means the number of appeals on points of law, including referrals and regulatory offences pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences (OWiG) as well as regulatory offences pursuant to the Act Against Restraints of Competition (GWB) and the Energy Act (EnBW) before the criminal panels (including antitrust panel).

(2018): It is not possible to differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" (NA). The total number of cases means the number of appeals on points of law, including referrals and regulatory offences pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences (OWiG) as well as regulatory offences pursuant to the Act Against Restraints of Competition (GWB) and the Energy Act (EnBW) before the criminal panels (including antitrust panel).

(2016): It is not possible to differentiate between "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases" (NA). The total number of cases means the number of appeals on points of law, including referrals and regulatory offences pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences (OWiG) as well as regulatory offences pursuant to the Act Against Restraints of Competition (GWB) and the Energy Act (EnBW) before the criminal panels (including antitrust panel).

(2014): The 2014 data reflects an overview of the case workflow processed by the Senates for Criminal Matters of the Federal Court of Justice (statistics for the year 2014). For 2014, it was not possible to distinguish between categories of “severe criminal cases” and “minor criminal cases”. The total number of criminal proceedings concerns appeals on points of law, including matters submitted to the Federal Court of Justice for its review of the principle of the matter and misdemeanour cases pursuant to the Act on Regulatory Offences. It also includes misdemeanours pursuant to the Act on Restraints of Competition that are pending before the Senates for Criminal Matters of the Federal Court of Justice (including the Senate for Anti-Trust Matters).
It is noteworthy that as there were only very few “minor criminal cases” in the previous cycles, the figures remain comparable for the last three evaluations.

Greece

(2021): There are no Other criminal cases at the level of the Supreme Court, these proceedings appear only at First instance and Appeals courts and prosecutors’ offices, therefore category 3. should be NAP.

(2020): There were no data collected for this question.

(2016): With regard to the category "pending cases on 1 January 2016", the abnormality of the figures is due to the fact that the postponed cases because of the abstention of the lawyers in 2015 were not considered as pending to the backlog of the court.
In 2016 a long-term abstention by the lawyers of the country took place, resulting in reduction of the number of resolved criminal law cases. Accordingly, the number of pending criminal law cases increased.

Hungary

(2021): In case of severe criminal cases, the fallback of the clearance rate can be explained on one hand by the pandemic situation; on the other hand, by the fact that in years 2020 and 2021, almost 50% of the judges of the Criminal Chamber retired. The vacant judicial positions were already filled. The increase in the number of motions for review can be explained by an increased activity of defendants and their defence counsels. Any objective reason for that increased activity cannot be established.

Ireland

(2020): Reduced cases due to COVID-19 pandemic. During the most restrictive lockdowns, only essential proceedings could be dealt with, but as guidance allowed, case volume increased. Urgent and essential cases continued to be heard throughout. All written judgments were delivered electronically and published on the Courts Service website, courts.ie.
Both the Supreme Court and Court of Appeal quickly adopted the use of video technology and made greater use of electronic documentation to facilitate their continued work. Procedures were introduced to ensure that justice was administered in public. Both jurisdictions delivered their judgments electronically. Waiting times for a hearing in both Courts were improved, to a certain extent, by a net reduction in the numbers of new cases coming into their lists from other jurisdictions. By year end in both Courts, there was a net improvement in the numbers of cases waiting to be dealt with compared to 2019.

(2018): The increase in incoming and resolved caseload reflects arrangements on foot of the establishment of the Court of Appeal and the new appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

(2016): The increase in incoming and resolved caseload reflects arrangements on foot of the establishment of the Court of Appeal and the new appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Italy

(General Comment): Under "minor criminal cases" fall cases against justice of peace's decisions and cases against first and second instance decisions regarding minor offences which are punished with fines.
“Other cases” represent proceedings regarding jurisdiction or competence conflicts, proceedings pending in other countries (rogatory) or procedures regarding the correction of the so-called material errors committed by the Supreme Court.

(2021): * Most discrepancies between 2021 and 2021 data are due to the fact that in 2020 the activity of the courts was hugely affected by the pandemic.
**Moreover, small number often lead to large percentage variations.

(2020): 2."minor criminal cases" represent cases against justice of peace's decisions and cases against first and second instance judges’ decisions, regarding minor offences that are punished with fines. 3. “Other cases” Can be related to procedures pending in first or second instances (jurisdiction or competence conflicts between other courts), or pending in other countries (rogatory or capture instances); “Other cases” can be also related to decisions regarding the execution of imposed punishments (for example regarding the end or a change (home detention) of the imprisonment), or can be related to the correction of material errors on Highest Court’s sentences.

(2018): Following the introduction of the new item “other” at Q100, the Supreme Court has revised and ameliorated their classification of cases. The misdemeanour category now includes not only the proceedings coming from the justice of peace offices but also all those minor offences which are punished with fines. “Other cases” (point 3) can be related to procedures pending in first or second instances (jurisdiction or competence conflicts between other courts), or pending in other countries (rogatory or capture instances); “Other cases” can be also related to decisions regarding the execution of imposed punishments (for example regarding the end or a change (home detection) of the imprisonment), or related to the correction of material errors on Highest Court’s sentences.

(2016): In respect of minor criminal cases, the numbers are small and the observed variations should be put into perspective.

Latvia

(2021): Total number of pending cases has significantly increased. Measures to handle this problem have been adopted and are under implementation. There are amendments to the Criminal Procedure Law adopted (https://likumi.lv/ta/id/336542-grozijumi-kriminalprocesa-likuma , in force since 3.11.2022.) to transfer competence to review specific agreement process cases to the regional courts. Some internal case management arrangements have been put into action.

(2020): During last two years 3 out of 8 judges (after increase of number of judges – 9 judges) have retired. Some additional time was needed to replace them (competition and appointment). There was significant decrease of examined cases in 2020 (clearance rate was 102% in 2019 and 95% in 2020) and increase of received cases in 2019: 734 (2018), 764 (2019) and 686 (2020).

(2018): Supreme Court does not rely only on data in the Court Information System, they keep separate sheet for statistics

Lithuania

(2020): general decrease of number of cases

(2016): The number of admitted cassation claims decreased in 2015 and in 2016 was almost the same as in 2015. Besides, the number of resolved cases increased in 2015 due to the aim to comply with the timeliness.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The Court of cassation makes a legality control, independant from the severity of the infraction. The pending files are now detailed between criminal and civil/commercial cases, thus this additional information is now available.

(2020): "The number of new cases depends on the appeals filed, on which the Court has no influence, and which is, among other things, a function of the number of decisions taken by the other courts. In 2020, the number of decisions taken by the different instances has decreased compared to the previous years, which can explain the decrease of new cases at the Court of Cassation. The legislation has not changed since the previous reference period.
The decrease in pending cases can be explained by the decrease in new cases in 2020, since the number of decisions taken remained stable between 2018 and 2020.
"

Malta

(2018): NA

Netherlands

(General Comment): No distinction is made between severe criminal cases, misdemeanors and/or minor criminal cases in the numbers and accounts kept by the Dutch SC.
The gap in horizontal consistency is caused by cases that are labeled as ‘outflow other’ (in Dutch: uitstroom overig). These are cases that do not get resolved because of administrative reasons (for instance: the appeal is filed too late, or mandatory court fees have not been paid and there is no dispensation).

(2021): No distinction is made between severe criminal cases, misdemeanors and/or minor criminal cases in the numbers and accounts kept by the Dutch SC.
Pending cases at the end of the year are not equal to the number of pending cases at the beginning of the year + incoming cases - solved cases

(2020): In the numbers and accounts that are kept by the Dutch Supreme Court, no distinction is made between severe criminal cases and misdemeanours and/or minor criminal cases.
With regard to the discrepancies: there are always some factors that might be of influence on the number of cases the Supreme Court handles in a year. It might be due to delays or catch ups in lower courts (so incoming cases are lower/higher), new laws or changes in law that the SC must answer (like covid-regulations), cases may become more complex because laws and differences are more complex (as a result cases may take longer), or cases that are connected that are grouped to deal with in clusters (meaning more cases for a longer time). While we cannot clearly pinpoint a 'cause' of the discrepancies, all these factors mentioned might influence the numbers. The gap of 213 is caused by cases that are labeled as ‘outflow other’ (in Dutch: uitstroom overig). These are cases that do not get resolved because of administrative reasons (for instance: the appeal is filed too late, or mandatory court fees have not been paid and there is no dispensation).

Poland

(General Comment): The Supreme Court does not divide its statistics into categories corresponding to those defined and used by the CEPEJ.

(2020): The dynamics of the movement of cases of 2020 in the work of the Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court was due to changes of a personnel nature. In addition, some of the disciplinary cases of advocates were submitted for consideration to the Criminal Chamber on the basis of decisions of the First President of the Supreme Court made in the period until May 2020 or decisions of the President of the Supreme Court directing the work of the Criminal Chamber at a later date, as the Disciplinary Court of the Polish Bar Association refers files of disciplinary cases with cassation appeals to the Criminal Chamber, recognizing that the Disciplinary Chamber should refrain from examining them. At the same time, the above-standard involvement in the work of judges, assistants and all other employees of the Criminal Chamber allowed for an increase in the number of cases dealt with.

(2018): Number of incoming cases has increased due to implemented law changes in Code of Criminal Procedure. On 15 April 2016 entered into force regulations about complaints against appellate court judgments. Parties may complain to the Supreme Court of the Republic of Poland against an appellate court judgment revoking a judgment of the court of the first instance and referring the case for reconsideration. In the first period of functioning of mentioned regulations there were not many incoming cases. The situation changed in 2018. We have observed that many cases incoming on the base of regulations implemented in 2016. Moreover, in 2018 were carried on some organisational changes e.g. Military Chamber of Supreme Court has been closed and all cases were moved to Criminal Chamber.

Portugal

(General Comment): The communicated data reflects the case-flow of criminal cases before the highest instance courts. “Misdemeanor cases” are never taken to high instance courts.

(2020): The increase in the number of criminal cases pending on January 1, 2020 compared to the number of cases pending on January 1, 2018, at the Supreme Court is justified by the fact that the number of cases completed from 2018 to 2019 was relatively lower than the number of cases entered in those years.

(2016): In Portugal, misdemeanour/minor criminal cases may not be dealt in the Supreme Court of Justice.

(2012): The number of pending cases has decreased between 1 January 2010 and 1 January 2012 due to the fact that the number of resolved cases in that period was superior to the number of incoming cases. Conversely, in the period between 31 December 2010 and 31 December 2012, the number of incoming cases was superior to the number of resolved cases, which resulted in the increase of the number of pending cases. In addition, the number of pending cases at 1 January 2010, as well as the number of incoming cases in 2010 benefited from the effect of the change of the Criminal Procedure Code (Law n.48/2007) that narrowed the access to the High Judicial Superior Council. In the years 2011 and 2012, this effect was diluted, leading to a slight increase of the pending cases on 31 December 2012.

Romania

(2021): according to the application for statistics

(2018): The increase in the total of criminal law cases incoming between 2016 and 2018 can be explained by the retrail / re-examination of a high important number of cases (to be noted that none of these cases were new) according to the Constitutional Court's decision that brought changes to the interpretation given by the High Court of Cassation and Justice in the matter of judicial organisation.

(2016): The jurisdiction of the courts on judging appeals and second appeals has changed and some of the cases that were under the jurisdiction of the High Court are now under the jurisdiction of the courts of appeal Consequently the number of cases in Supreme court shows significant decrease in all categories.
In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on categories of pending cases as follows: - 0-1/2 years;
- 1/2-1 year;
- 1 - 1 and 1/2 years;
- 1 and 1/2 - 3 years;
- 3 - 5 years;
In the table above, last column, there are mentioned the numbers for cases pending for more than 3 years.

(2014): The significant decrease between 2012 and 2014 of the total of criminal cases in respect of the following categories – incoming, resolved and pending on 31st December, is due to the entry into force of the new Codes and the changes of jurisdiction.

(2012): The important increase of the total of criminal cases pending on 1 January 2012 is the consequence of the entry into force of Law n° 202/2010. Consequently, the legal remedy of appeal (appeal on the merit) has been abolished in several criminal matters, remaining only the “recurs” (“appeal on law”). It resulted in an increase of the number of “recurs”.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The collected statistical data does not distinguish between the two types of criminal offences.

(2018): The decrease in incoming and resolved cases is influenced by the decrease of the caseload at the lower courts

(2016): During 2015 there were more pending cases created

Slovenia

(General Comment): For explanation on severe criminal cases and minor offences please see comment to Q94.
Figures for severe criminal law cases at the highest instance include:
- Kp – appeals in criminal cases,
- Ips – requests for protection of legality in criminal cases, against a decision ordering or prolonging a detention, extraordinary mitigation of punishment,
- I Kr – other criminal cases – delegations, jurisdiction disputes, prolongation of detention, other.
Figures for minor offences cases at the highest instance include:
- IV Ips – requests for protection of legality in minor offences cases.

(2021): Discrepancies: Please note the small (absolute) number of cases at the Supreme Court instance.

(2020): The discrepancies are due to a small absolute number of cases.

(2018): Discrepancies are due to small (absolute) of cases which fluctuate between years.
For distinction see general comment.

(2016): The observed decreases can be attributed to the decrease in the number of cases, processed by the police and the state prosecution (see Q107).

(2014): According to 2012 and 2014 data, figures for “severe criminal law cases” at the highest instance include: appeals in criminal cases (Kp); requests for protection of legality in criminal cases (I Ips); requests for protection of legality against a decision ordering or prolonging a detention (XI Ips); extraordinary mitigation of punishment (IX Ips); other criminal cases – delegations, jurisdiction disputes (I Kr); other criminal cases – prolongation of detention (II Kr); other criminal cases (III Kr). Figures for “minor offences cases” at the highest instance include requests for protection of legality in minor offences cases (IV Ips).

(2012): The decrease of the number of “misdemeanour and/or minor criminal cases” before courts in 2012 is the result of the reform in law on minor offenses which transferred some of the jurisdiction in cases previously tried by courts to other authorities.
According to 2012 and 2014 data, figures for “severe criminal law cases” at the highest instance include: appeals in criminal cases (Kp); requests for protection of legality in criminal cases (I Ips); requests for protection of legality against a decision ordering or prolonging a detention (XI Ips); extraordinary mitigation of punishment (IX Ips); other criminal cases – delegations, jurisdiction disputes (I Kr); other criminal cases – prolongation of detention (II Kr); other criminal cases (III Kr). Figures for “minor offences cases” at the highest instance include requests for protection of legality in minor offences cases (IV Ips).

Spain

(General Comment): The Criminal Procedure Law was amended by Law 41/2015, and thus the scope of the cassation appeal that reach the Supreme Court in Criminal Matters was broadened. The objective of the Law was to try to homogenize the doctrine in criminal matters, since previously, in cases that had not criteria of Supreme Court, the criteria of the Provincial Courts could be different.
When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Lawyer of the Administration of Justice detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

(2021): In 2021, the recovery of greater activity (after the restrictions of the pandemic) has been able to contribute to greater efficiency and increased number of resolved cases.

(2020): Considering the broadening the scope of the cassation appeal that reach the Supreme Court, the number of cases has been increasing. Already in 2018, the final pending cases were higher than the initial. In 2019, those incoming also increased. All this resulted in significant increase in the number of pending cases at the end of 2020.

(2014): The number of total criminal pending cases on 31 December has decreased of 30% between 2012 and 2014. It has to be noted that both in 2013 and 2014, the Supreme Court has resolved more cases than the number of incoming cases.

Question 101

Austria

(General Comment): "Employment dismissal cases": The Austrian court system knows labour law cases. These contain employment dismissal cases as well as all other disputes between employer and employee (e.g. concerning payment of wages, discrimination) and between employer and the works council. Dismissal cases are not being evaluated separately in the standard statistical tools of the Federal Ministry of Justice of Austria.

(2020): Insolvency cases: the observed decreases between 2019 and 2020 are due to the pandemic. Data on intentional homicide an robbery cases were delivered for the year 2018 due to a special evaluation that had taken place. Because of this special evaluation data for 2018 was available. The standard statistical tools do not enable enquiries to pending cases of a certain category (regarding certain criminal offences) to a specific date in the past.

(2019): The decreae in the number of incoming cases related to the right of entry and stay of aliens stems from the decline in migration flows. Accordingly, the number of pending cases at the end of 2019 decreased.

Belgium

(General Comment): Insolvency: the number of incoming and resolved cases includes cases of the company court concerning insolvency, as well as closed cases of the labour tribunal concerning collective debt settlement. Only figures for incoming and resolved cases are available. Incoming cases: refers to all registered cases concerning a bankruptcy "nature of case", cases to which a bankruptcy number has been assigned or cases registered on a specific bankruptcy roll.

(2021): Insolvency: the number of incoming (and resolved) cases includes cases of the company court concerning insolvency, as well as closed cases of the labour tribunal concerning collective debt settlement. In 2021, before the company court there were 37626 incoming insolvency cases, and 59074 resolved cases. Before the labour tribunal there were 8515 incoming cases related to collective debt settlement and 17659 resolved cases.

(2020):
For 2020, there is a decrease in the number of new cases and an even greater decrease in the number of completed cases due to the covid-19 pandemic.

(2019): In matters relating to asylum seekers, the line between an asylum case and a migration case is not always easy to draw. Thus, 'asylum' cases are very cyclical. The figures were communicated by the Foreigners Litigation Council.

(2018): As a result of the new rules for counting and recording cases, the number of contentious divorce cases is lower than the one in the previous years.
Bankruptcy cases do not include cases that have been managed by the Regsol system and procedure since mid-2017. The number of pending and resolved cases cannot be calculated due to the unreliability of the available data.
Cases concerning asylum seekers include asylum cases before the Aliens Litigation Council (e. g. applications for recognition of refugee status or granting of the subsidiary protection status). Cases relating to the right of entry and residence include migration cases before the Aliens Litigation Council (appeals for annulment of individual decisions taken pursuant to the Act on Access to the Territory, Residence, Establishment and Removal of Foreign Nationals).

(2017): Appeals lodged with the Aliens Litigation Council (Conseil du contentieux des Etrangers (CCE)) in the context of an asylum procedure
migration litigation.

(2016): "Justice of the peace: no data for pending cases (start + end)
civil courts of first instance and family courts: no data for pending cases (start + end)
Youth courts: no data for Eupen, Leuven, Brussels (Dutch-speaking), Tournai, Mons; no data for resolved cases, pending cases and lenght of criminal courts of first instance: no data for Turnhout, Tongeren, Hasselt, Leuven, Charleroi, Eupen; no data for durations and breakdown by type of offence; police courts : no data for civil cases: no data for new cases, pending cases and commercial court length: concerns (only) the following roles: general role (including contested claims), role of motions and role of summary proceedings. It should be noted that the number of resolved cases is only an estimation - this figure has been calculated on the basis of the last judgment and this judgment closes the case. Consequently, not all the following cases are taken into account in this calculation: cases that have been the subject of another judgement after the judgement ending the case, and cases in which no judgement has been pronounced; no data for pending cases. Insolvency (commercial courts) :
Due to unreliable data, figures for pending and resolved insolvency cases (commercial courts) cannot be provided. With regard to insolvency (commercial courts), it should be noted that: - incoming cases: cases registered with a insolvency nature, cases with a insolvency number or cases registered on a dedicated insolvency list. Cases relating to liquidations/dissolutions, business continuity law and commercial investigations (not leading to insolvency) are not recorded. Filter: nature group of the insolvency case or insolvency number or entry on the roll F, G, H, K, L, V.
Bankruptcies include business insolvency proceedings (Commercial Court) and personal insolvency proceedings (collective debt settlement with the labour court).
With regard to the "litigious divorce cases" category, the variations in the number of incoming cases and the number of resolved cases are due to the fact that, unlike the previous cycles (2014, 2015), the 2016 data do not include divorces with mutual consent. The category "insolvency cases" in 2016 encompasses insolvency proceedings of companies (Commercial Court) and personal insolvency proceedings (collective debt settlement before the Labour Court) that were not included in previous cycles."

(2015): The insolvency cases provided only include cases regarding individuals and not the ones concerning companies.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): Since there is no centralised Case Management System, the information on number of cases was summed up on the bases of the data collected from different courts and some mistakes are possible due to non-existence of control mechanism to check all the incoming courts data and spot eventual anomalies. Accordingly, some discrepancies can appear between data communicated for different cycles.

(2021): The Supreme Judicial Council does not collect separate statistics just for employment dismissal cases, but to them are also added the claims for annulment of the imposed disciplinary sanction "reprimand" and "warnings of dismissal".

(2020): The Supreme Judicial Council does not only collect separate statistics for "Employment dismissal cases", but also adds claims for revocation of the imposed penalty "remark" and "dismissal warnings". If this overall statistic will be useful for this row in the table of Q101, then the data for it are the following:
1. Pending cases on 1 January of the reference year - 749
2. Incoming cases - 1301
3. Resolved cases - 1121
4. Pending cases on 31 December of the reference year - 929
The increased number of pending “employment dismissal cases” and “insolvency cases” could be the result of the epidemiological situation in the country related to the spread of COVID - 19, as well as to the emergency measures introduced by the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria.

(2019): "Employment dismissal cases": the Supreme Judicial Council does not collect separate statistics only for the type of cases “employment dismissal cases”, but also adds in the statistics the claims for revocation of the imposed penalty "remark" and "dismissal warnings". "Cases relating to asylum seekers": in connection with the observed significant decrease in the number of cases received in 2018 and 2019 (217 in 2018 and 98 in 2019, respectively), we note that this is probably due to the significantly reduced number of foreign nationals, who sought asylum in the Republic of Bulgaria in 2019(2536 in 2018 and 309 in 2019, respectively).

(2018): The number of dismissal cases includes: "Claims for protection against unlawful dismissal and claims for annulment of the penalty imposed" note "and" warning of dismissal ".
There is no specific explanation as to why insolvency proceedings decreased during the reference 2018. There is also no specific explanation as to why the number of employment dismissal cases decreased.

(2017): Since there is no centralised Case Management System, the information on number of cases was summed up on the bases of the data collected from different courts and some mistakes are possible due to non-existence of control mechanism to check all the incoming courts data and spot eventual anomalies. Accordingly, some discrepancies can appear between data communicated for different cycles.

(2016): There is no particular explanation in respect of the observed variations. All the data provided is correct.

(2013): The increase in the number of pending insolvency cases on 1 January 2013 is due to the overall increase in the number of incoming cases justified by macroeconomic reasons, namely the global financial crisis.

Croatia

(2021): Between 2020 and 2021, there was an increase of incoming insolvency cases because from April 2020 until October 2020, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, a special law was in force (Law on intervention measures in foreclosure and bankruptcy proceedings for the duration of special circumstances) and there were no incoming bankruptcy and enforcement cases in courts.

(2019): Courts competent for "employement dismissal cases" solved more cases during 2018., which led to the decrease of pending cases at the end of 2018./beginning of 2019.
As regards insolvecies, in previous years, due to some legislative changes we had higher income of insolvency cases. The income of shortened bankruptcy procedures which was product of those changes stopped, so this is income is rather "normal" for Croatia (more or less similar to the income in years before aforementioned changes).

(2018): The reason for decreasing the number of pending insolvency cases lies in the new Bankruptcy Act, which entered into force in September 2015. Since then, and throughout the first half of 2016, many shortened bankruptcy proceedings have been initiated ex officio and finished in relatively short period (that was "unnaturally" large income of simple insolvency cases). Cycles defined in aforementioned Law of initiating these procedures by FINA finished, so 2018. actually reflects regular state of insolvency proceedings regarding income of insolvency cases.

(2017): "Litigious divorce cases" - regarding the decrease in the number of pending cases at the beginning of reference year in comparison to the beginning 2016., the reason lays in the fact that first instance municipal courts resolved significant number of cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (148%!!) during 2016., while the income of these cases, as stated in previous cycle decreased in comparison to the 2015. In 2017, courts resolved less cases than in 2016., but nevertheless more than they received which led to the decrease of pending cases at the end of 2017.
"Employment dismissal cases": Regarding the decrease in the number of pending cases at the beginning of reference year in comparison to the beginning 2016., the reason lays in the fact that first instance municipal courts resolved significant number of cases in relation to the number of incoming cases (133%!!) during 2016. Municipal courts received less cases of this type. The reason lays in the fact that in general, income of labour cases decreased in 2017. with no specific reason in sense of law changes etc. Lower number of recieved cases and Clearance rate of 137% lead to the decrease of the number of pending cases at the end of 2017.
Insolvency cases: in 2015. new Insolvency act was introduced. Significant number of companies were subject of shorened insolvency proceeding conducted by commercial court. Cycles defined in aforementioned Law of initiating these procedures by FINA finished by the mid of 2016., so 2017. reflects regular „movement“ of insolvency cases.

(2016): Regarding insolvency cases, 2015 was the year when, by introducing new Insolvency act, significant number of companies were subject of shortened insolvency proceeding conducted by commercial courts. Cycles defined in aforementioned Law of initiating these procedures by FINA finished, so 2016 actually reflects regular state of insolvency proceedings regarding income of insolvency cases. Relating the reduced number of incoming divorce cases, the number of divorces with minor children dropped in 2016. Namely, according to the new Family Law which came into force on 1 November 2015, couples with children, before initiating the court proceeding, have to undergo mandatory family mediation at social welfare centres. This fact postpones court proceedings and therefore there are fewer cases in court in 2016.

(2015): Regarding the Litigious divorce cases, the Republic of Croatia point out that in 2015 there have been amendments to the Family Act, due to which a certain number of family cases were no more resolved in a litigious, but in non-litigious proceedings. For this reason, the number of cases in this category for 2015 is presented decreased (e.g. if these cases remained within the same category, the result would be as follows: Pending at the beginning of 2015 – 4 595, Incoming – 9 253, Resolved – 8 756 and Pending at 31.12.2015 – 5 092 cases).

There is an increase of incoming insolvency cases due to the fact that on 1 September 2015 the new Insolvency Act came into force. The Act stipulates that the court will conduct an shortened insolvency proceedings regarding the legal person if the following conditions are met:
- If it has no employees
- If the FINA Register has unexecuted orders for forced payment for a continuous period of 120 days
- If preconditions for a second proceeding for deletion from the court registry are not fulfilled.

The Financial agency (FINA) is obliged, for legal persons who, on the day of the entry of the Insolvency Act into force, have had unexecuted orders for forced payment in the FINA Register for a continuous period of 120 days submit request to the court to initiate the shortened insolvency proceeding.

In view of the above provisions and the fact that at the time of the entry into force of the Insolvency Act there was more than 20.000 legal persons for which the preconditions were met to initiate the shortened insolvency proceedings, the number of incoming insolvency cases in 2015 increased significantly compared to previous years.

(2014): The increase in the number of pending bankruptcy cases on 1st January 2014 is due to the fact that many companies have gone bankrupt in 2013, thus there were a large inflow in 2013 in relation to other periods. The same reason accounts for the decrease in the number of incoming bankruptcy cases in 2014, when compared with the outlier in 2013.

(2013): The category “employment dismissal cases” includes dismissal of employment contract cases, determination of employment relationship cases and termination of employment cases.

Cyprus

(General Comment): Reducing delays in the disposition time is part of the reform process. Some data are missing because we did not have an electronic filing system.
The increase in the number of employment dismissal cases since 2010 is the result of the crisis.

(2021): In the previous cycle the number was higher because a bundle of cases were tried together.

(2019): The number of cases relating to asylum seekers reflects the period between June 2019 (date of establishment of the Administrative court for international protection) till December 2019.
The incoming and resolved employment dismissal cases include a bundle of 204 cases concerning overtime arrears against the Cyprus telecommunication authority.

(2017): in the litigious divorce cases 192 cases pending on 1.1.16 of the family court of Famagusta were not included
Concerning the employment dismissal cases, the variation (decrease) between 2016 and 2017 is due to the fact that in 2016 many cases were filed after companies were closed many of which were later withdrawn.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): It is not possible to provide the data on “employment dismissal cases”, “Robbery cases” and “Intentional homicide” since the source of data we mostly use for CEPEJ reporting does not distinguish case types to such a detail. We have these (more detailed) data from other sources, which however contains only cases, where the decision is legally effective. And thus, we can provide number of cases, where the decision is legally effective, average case length etc. However, this data does not allow us to determine number of incoming cases, pending cases or resolved cases.

(2020): In last years, there were many legislative changes in insolvency law. That results in relatively big changes in the number of cases.

(2019): There was a legislative change in insolvency law. We believe that this change resulted in significant grow in the number of incoming cases. The number of resolved cases also increased. The reason might be that number of incoming cases peaked in 2013 and the length of many insolvency cases is 5 years due to legislative reasons.

(2017): This is relatively new and very specific agenda, which usually takes 5 years to resolve. There was an increase in case fillings five years ago, which resulted in growth in the number of resolved cases nowadays. On the other hand, for various reasons (including legislative changes) the number of incoming cases is decreasing.
There was an amendment of insolvency law in 2017 which introduced e. g. obligatory processing of insolvency motion by specialised entities or broadening of reasons for discontinuance of proceedings due to the lack of, or little, estate.

(2013): The increasing trend concerning the category of insolvency cases is due to the economic situation. More particularly, the number of personal bankruptcies is increasing.

Denmark

(General Comment): To be sure to have consistent information, pending cases prior to the period in question is calculated based on received, finalized and pending cases ultimo the period in question. It should be noticed that all cases from the District Courts regarding marriage and paternity/maternity are considered litigious divorce cases.
We have not answered the question regarding how many pending cases exceed 2 years.

(2021): To be sure to have consistent information, pending cases prior to the period in question is calculated based on received, finalized and pending cases ultimo the period in question. It should be noticed that all cases from the District Courts regarding marriage and paternity/maternity are considered litigious divorce cases.
We have not answered the question regarding how many pending cases exceed 2 years. "Pending litigious divorce cases on 31 December 2021": The reason for the high figure in 2021 is that the courts resolved 800 fewer cases than they received. A new administrative set-up to deal with divorse cases was introduced and created backlogs.

(2020): Litigious divorce cases: The reason for the discrepancies is a new system to deal with Family cases from April 2019 that gave more cases in 2020.
Insolvency cases: There was a market increase in the number of bankruptcy cases at the Maritime and Commercial Court in 2020 compared to 2018 following a number of backlogged forced closures of companies in 2019 by the Danish Commerce and Companies Agency.
Employment dismissal cases, robbery cases and intentional homicide cases are not registered under these categories in the case registration system. Employment dismissal cases are just civil cases, and the two criminal cases are registered under criminal cases.

(2019): It should be noticed that all cases from the District Courts regarding marriage and paternity/maternity are considered litigious divorce cases. From April 1, 2019 a new law addressing divorces and togetherness with children and legal housing for children was implemented. It may have had an effect in the number of cases as administrative decisions to some degree become court decisions.
There is a change of numbers of pending insolvency cases as we succeeded to include the Maritime and Commercial Court's pending insolvency cases in the overall figure. We can see over numbers of years, that there is an increasing number of bankruptcy cases. This can be seen too from 2018 to 2019 where there is an increase in the number of bankruptcy cases.

(2018): It should be noticed that all cases from the District Courts regarding marriage and paternity/maternity are considered litigious divorce cases.
There is a change of numbers of pending insolvency cases as we succeeded to include the Maritime and Commercial Court's pending insolvency cases in the overall figure.

(2016): Please note concerning insolvency: The number of cases concerning compulsory dissolution of companies has increased markedly due to new regulation where it is possible to start a company without starting capital. Accordingly, more companies are started, but more companies are also then closed. As concerns the number of pending insolvency cases, the data refers only to district courts given that data related to the Maritime and Commercial court is not available.

(2015): A decrease in the number of litigious divorce cases can be observed from 2010, it is most likely due to a change in the administrative proceedings, i.e. fewer cases end up in the courts.

Estonia

(General Comment): It is noteworthy that the discrepancies that can be observed between the number of pending cases indicated for December of one year and the number of pending cases communicated for January of the next year, are due to the fact that the statistic system is alive and courts are entitled to modify and up-date data at any time.
It is possible to observe differences in the horizontal consistency since during the proceedings some cases are joined and some are disjoined.

(2019): For all the discrepancies - the numbers are so small so that's why the percentage is so significant.

(2015): The numbers of pending, incoming and resolved employment dismissal cases decreased from 2012 (compared to 2010). This variation is supposedly related to the fact that more cases are effectively resolved by the labour dispute committees, less cases arrive to the courts.
In 2014, the number of resolved litigious divorce cases increased. This is justified by the fact that courts are working more efficiently and have accelerated the proceedings.

(2014): The increase in the number of resolved litigious divorce cases in 2014 is justified by the fact that courts are working more efficiently and have accelerated the proceedings.

(2012): The decrease in the numbers of pending, incoming and resolved employment dismissal cases in 2012 is supposedly related to the fact that more cases are effectively resolved by the labour dispute committees, less cases arrive to the courts.

Finland

(2021): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 20.1.2022 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously announced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. At this point only cases registered as murder offences have been included in the statistical year of 2020. Cases from the statistical year of 2021, in addition to murder offences, include the following offences: murder, manslaughter, homicide and infanticide made with terrorist intent.

(2020): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly
changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on
12.1.2021 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is: 1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases 3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced
number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts).

(2019): The case management systems from which the data is collected are not static reporting tool but a dynamic and constantly changing system. So the exact number depends on the day the data is taken from the system. Part of the data here is collected on 22.1.2020 and reflects the situation on that day. The data available is:
1)Incoming cases 2)Resolved cases
3)Cases pending on the data collection date. The number of pending cases as of 1 January has been calculated based on the available data. Because of the dynamic nature of the system, the previously annouced number of cases on 31 December and the now announced number of cases in 1 Jan will differ. Currently the calculation is further complicated by the partial implementation of the new cases managements systems, AIPA (for general courts) and HAIPA (for administrative and special courts). According to Finnish Immigration Service the number of asylum seekers arriving to Finland continued to be low (see, for example, https://tilastot.migri.fi/#decisions/23330?l=en&start=588&end=599)
“Cases relating to the right of entry and stay of aliens”: the number of resolved cases increased considerably between 2018 and 2019 resulting in a decrease in the number of pending cases at the end of 2019. In this regard, it should be noticed that courts have reorganized their resources internally. They have allocated more resources to these types of cases, and this way keep reasonable the time the case is pending in the court. Also, in 2019 the administrative courts got 119 more staff as follows: 65 judges, 27 referendaries and 27 clerical staff.

(2018): In 2016, the number of incoming cases relating to asylum seekers increased dramatically due to the asylum crisis. In 2018, the number of incoming cases relating to asylum seekers was considerably lower than in 2016.
For the decreased number of resolved cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens, the only explanation is the general bigger case load in the administrative courts.

(2017): Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens: includes the cases conserning deportation, permits of residence and
removing from the country.
Cases related to Asylum seekers: the number of pending cases at the beginning of 2017 increased drastically as a consequence of the important number of incoming cases in 2016; the number of incoming cases in 2017 decreased compared to 2016 which allowed courts to better deal with pending cases (the number of resolved cases increased considerably in 2017, while the number of pending cases at the end of 2017 decreased).

(2016): The number of resolved cases pertaining to intentional homicide has decreased for the period 2014 - 2016. The category "Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens" includes cases concerning deportation, permits of residence and removing from the country.

(2013): The category “insolvency cases” includes only bankruptcy cases dealt with by District Courts and not restructuring of enterprises cases.

France

(2021): Source SDSE

(2020): The health crisis and the lockdown may have had an impact on TAs (resolved cases) (by reducing the capacity of courts to process cases) but also on NAs (incoming cases) (fewer offenses committed, fewer cases brought to court). Prior to this, a major lawyers' strike and a transport strike had mainly influenced TAs.

(2019): Problems related to data feedback make it impossible to have information on robberies and intentional homicides. Concerning cases relating to asylum seekers, the 2019 activity report of the National Asylum Court states that: "The year 2019 was marked by sustained activity: while the number of incoming cases stabilised in 2019 at 59,091 cases, an increase of less than 1% compared to 2018, the number of decisions handed down reached an all-time high of 66,464 cases, an increase of 40.5% compared to the previous year. This result was made possible thanks to the mobilisation of all the permanent judges, temporary judges and agents, as well as to the significant reinforcements that the Court benefited from this year. The court was thus able to create a sixth section and five new chambers in the space of a few weeks, open six new courtrooms and recruit, train and integrate more than 87 new judges on a temporary basis (“vacataires”) and 175 new staff, including 91 rapporteurs”.

(2018): The particular context of asylum applications in France and the sustained activity of the French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons (OFPRA) explain the high number of applications before the National Court of Asylum. Indeed, the CNDA's exclusive mission is to rule on appeals against decisions taken by OFPRA that do not satisfy asylum seekers. In addition, the number of appeals has tended to increase over the past ten years, increasing by a factor of 2.7 between 2008 and 2018.
Asylum seekers: National Court of Asylum
Data on the right of entry and residence of foreigners: data provided by the report of the Council of State on the number of proceedings processed by the administrative courts
For bankruptcies, business bankruptcies were used. The decrease in redundancies is explained by the increase in the number of contractual breaches of employment contracts.

(2017): With regard to cases concerning asylum seekers and cases concerning the right of entry and residence of foreigners, migratory phenomena explain this evolution.

(2016): The category “insolvency” refers to business bankruptcies (opening of receivership proceedings, opening of immediate judicial liquidation, recovery plans pronounced after protection, judicial liquidation pronounced after protection) have been taken into account. 2016 data on asylum seekers: National Court of Asylum at the State Council (Conseil d’Etat); 2016 data on the right of entry and residence of foreigners: Judge of freedoms and detention.

Germany

(General Comment): Litigious divorce cases, employment dismissal cases, insolvency cases:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts. Nationwide uniform ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistics. The courts collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the ordinances provide two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural surverys" that collect data on the specifics of the proceedings happening at a court and the "monthly surveys" that track the caseload of a court. With regard to the caseload count, the monthly surveys distinguish between "caseload of proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other caseload". For the cases from the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys), the monthly surveys collect the number of cases pending at the beginning and at the end of a month as well as the number of received and resolved cases. For the "other caseload", the monthly surveys only count the number of received cases.
2.1 General civil (and commercial) non-litigious cases: The figure represents the number of non-litigious enforcement cases. In the monthly survey for the statistics of the civil courts, these cases fall into the category of "other caseload". This is the reason why only the number of incoming cases is available.
The number of incoming cases and pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a year is unavailable because the statistics do not break down those numbers with regard to specific case types such as litigious divorce cases and employment dismissal cases. For the insolvency cases only the number of incoming cases is available because these cases fall into the category of "other cases" on the monthly surveys. With regard to the insolvency cases (but not for other case types in this category), the monthly surveys also collect the number of pending cases at the end of the month.
The number of robbery and intentional homicide cases is taken from the criminal prosecution statistics that is also published by the Federal Statistical Office and basically collects data on final convictions issued by the criminal courts. As this statistic focusses on the verdicts more than the procceding it does not include any information on caseload (incoming, pending) or timeframes.
Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to court:
With regard to the statistics of the civil, criminal, administrative, finance, social, family and labour courts, a statistical record of the day a case came to the court only exists for the cases covered by the procedural surveys. Courts submit the data from the procedural surveys to the statistical offices after the case has been concluded for the respective court and at the respective instance. This means that the duration of a proceeding is unknown for pending cases. The monthly surveys count the number of pending cases at the beginning and at the end of a month, but do not collect any information on the date the pending cases came to the court. The statistics compiled by the Federal Statistical Office include information on the percentage of cases that were resolved within certain time frames but no numbers on how many proceedings took longer than two years. The statistic on the workload of the Local Courts in matters of non-contentious jurisdiction does not collect any data regarding the date a case first came to court.

(2021): Insolvency cases: The number of insolvency cases was unusually low in 2020. Due to the pandemic, the duty to file an insolvency petition was suspended (business insolvencies). Additionally, in the last quarter of 2020 a new law on the discharge of residual debt was passed. The new law aims to facilitate a financial restart after an insolvency proceeding (consumer insolvencies). It is possible that a number of consumers decided to file for insolvency in 2021 in anticipation of the new law. The suspention of the duty to file an insolvency petition for businesses ended on 30 April 2021.
Robbery cases and intentional homicide cases (resolved cases): As of 15 November 2022, data for 2021 was not yet available.

(2020): Business insolvencies: due to the Corona crisis, the duty to file an insolvency petition was suspended until 31 December 2020; Consumer insolvencies: in the last quarter of 2020 a new law on the discharge of residual debt was passed. The new law aims to facilitate a financial restart after an insolvency proceeding: it is possible that a number of consumers decided to file for insolvency at a later point in anticipation of the new law.

(2019): 2017 was the peak of cases at the administratition courts regards asylum-seeker. The cases decrease constantly since then:
(2015: 50 422 / 2016: 141 046 / 2017: 260 160 / 2018: 108 917 / 2019: 82 598)

(2018): Regarding the number of cases relating to asylum seekers, there were many unresolved cases in 2017 (see Scoreboard data 2017 (rise of asylum seekers since 2015)). Schleswig-Holstein: With regard to this question, no data are available for 2018 for Employment dismissal cases for pending cases on 31 Dec ref. year. The data from 2017 have therefore been included.
With regard for all Länder, no data are available for 2018 for the cases of Robbery and Intentional homicide (resolved cases) yet. The data from 2017 have therefore been included.

(2017): Cases relating to asylum seekers: there is an important increase due to the rise of asylum seekers since 2015.
Pending cases on 31 Dec ref - Insolvency:
With regard to this question, no data are available for 2017 from Bavaria, Bremen and Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. The data from 2016 have therefore been included.
Hamburg
The figures show the number of insolvency proceedings at the end of the reporting period in terms of natural and legal persons (IN) and according to foreign law (IE) but excluding consumer insolvency proceedings (IK), Source: judicial statistics
Hesse
Total number of insolvency proceedings as of 31 December 2017, not broken down into proceedings that have already been opened or into IN/IK/IE proceedings. The data were taken from table Z1.4 “Civil matters before the local courts” provided by the Hesse Statistics Office (serial numbers 161.00, 161.50, 162.00 und 163.00).

(2016): Employment dismissal cases: The variation between this cycle and the previous cycle for resolved cases is not explained.

(2015): A substancial number of the Länder was unable to provide information, meaning that any amount cited would not be meaningful in substantive terms.

(2014): The 2014 data are the same as those that have been provided in 2013. No update was available.

(2013): For 2013, two Lander did not communicate any reply. As to dispute divorce cases only the number of conclusions by way of an order of divorce was provided. As to divorce proceedings (2013) overall, the following data were available: pending on 1 January 2013: 85 780; incoming: 119 123; resolved: 156 951; pending on 31 December 2013: 85 124. As to insolvency cases, only data on incoming cases was provided as well as on legal cases still pending at year end. Nevertheless, not all Lander were able to give information on both of these points. To this extent the information is incomplete.

(2012): The number of resolved litigious divorce cases refers to resolution by divorce decree only. However, the data in respect of the total number of divorce cases (2011) are complete: pending on 1 January 2011: 63 363; incoming: 66 194; resolved: 215 769 (of which 190 258 by divorce decree); pending on 31 December 2011: 58 773.

Greece

(General Comment): In criminal matters, the justice system in Greece presents the following peculiarity: postponed cases get to the prosecutor offices and then to the courts, in repeat 2-3 times, during the period (year). The definition of the pending cases includes postponed cases or the cases for which the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn’t been determined during the year. Accordingly, there are horizontal discrepancies in the table.

(2021): In criminal matters, the justice system in Greece presents the following peculiarity: postponed cases get to the prosecutor offices and then to the courts, in repeat 2-3 times, during the period (year). The definition of the pending cases includes postponed cases or the cases for which the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn’t been determined during the year. Accordingly, there are horizontal discrepancies in the table.

(2020): Evidence has been provided by different courts, but not by their totality, so there is not enough data to give a full answer.

(2019): Competent Authorities and Courts did not provide us with the relevant data

(2017): "cases relating to asylum seekers": the number of incoming cases and the number of resolved cases increased compared to 2016 due to an increased inflow of cases. As regards the number of pending cases at the end of the year: the deviation between the respective data of 2016 is due to the transition of the data from hard copy to a new information (IT) system called "Integrated Court Management System for the Administrative Justice (OSDDY-DD)". This deviation that has already been taken into account by the Central Organizational Committee for the due implementation of OSDDY-DD, is expected to lapse gradually within the next years. Furthermore, deviations have also emerged from the new way of collecting statistical data that the central Organizational Committee is trying to establish in order to ensure the uniform input of data by each court and from recent verifications of relevant numerical data that were subsequently sent by the courts. Finally, discrepancies are also due to errors of the information system itself, for which an effort is being made to identify and inform about, the contractor of the system. Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens: the number of acts of removal/expulsion of foreigners has been reduced, since most of them who are now entering the county, seek asylum, something that explains the respective increase in asylum cases within 2017.

(2016): Except for the categories “cases relating to asylum seekers (refugee status under the 1951 Geneva Convention)” and “cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens”, the relevant data are not available electronically for the moment, therefore their extraction is not possible.

Hungary

(2020): The pandemic situation had a huge effect on the case flow of the courts on every level of the court system. Special regulations were adopted by the legislator to promote videoconferencing and the courts were "closed between the 16th of March and the 31th of March (during this period no procedural events could be performed at the courts). Although the courts carried out their main activities, many cases were prolonged e.g. because the parties were not able to attend the hearings. The increase of the number of incoming and resolved Employment dismissal cases is the result of technical changes and transfer of responsibilities from the Administrative and Labour Courts to the Regional Courts. In March 2020, the Administrative and Labour Courts were dismissed, and the pending cases were transferred to the Regional Courts, which deal with these cases on first instance since April 1, 2020. As a result, these cases were technically administered as "incoming" cases at the Regional Court and as "resolved" cases at the Administrative and Labour Courts.

(2017): Regarding the categories “insolvency”, "robbery" and "intentional homicide" the number of pending cases on 1st of January differ from the closing number of the previous year because of data collection problems at certain regional courts.

(2016): With regard to the category “employment dismissal cases”, as the number of incoming cases decreased it resulted in a decrease in the other categories as well. The reason of the decrease in the number of incoming cases might be outside of the court system. With regard to the category “insolvency cases”, the methodology of data collection changed from the year 2015 to 2016. Accordingly, there is a discrepancy between the number of insolvency cases pending on 31 December 2015 and the number of insolvency cases pending on 1 January 2016.
With regard to "robbery cases" and "intentional homicide", currently the database contains some invalid data for these categories, so before solving this problem no valid data may be given.

(2015): Regarding the category "litigious divorce cases", the data provided for 2015 cannot be compared with the previous years as the statistical system has changed. As a result of an amendment of the code of civil procedure, litigious divorce cases were included in a new statistical category. This resulted in a starting number of "0" litigious divorce case at the beginning of the year 2015.

(2014): The decrease in the number of pending employment dismissal cases on 31 December over the period 2012-2014 is a consequence of the decrease in the number of incoming cases. Another reason was the establishment of 20 Administrative and Labour courts and 6 Regional Administrative and Labour Divisions in January 2013. The former are specialized first instance courts dealing with cases concerning the review of administrative decisions and employment relationships. The latter are special departments that coordinate the professional work of Administrative and Labour Courts, providing a professional platform for judges to discuss actual issues in administrative and labour matters.

Ireland

(General Comment): Under the Insolvency category above the figures reflect both corporate and personal insolvency cases. Insolvency figures include both litigious and non-litigious cases.

(2021): For serious crimes, our systems include robbery cases with fraud and other crimes of dishonesty and therefore we cannot provide a number of robbery cases disposed of. The numbers are correct and no explanation of the discrepancies can be provided.

(2020): We have no explanation as to why more of litigious divorce and insolvency cases were received. We have validated the figures and they are correct. There was a significant decrease in the number of resolved robberies in 2020. Covid-19 had a significant effect across the Courts.

(2019): There was a decrease in bankruptcy and alternative personal insolvency application by debtors and to bankruptcy as a remedy by creditors in 2019. The overall amount of personal insolvency cases fell from 2,909 in 2016 to 1,496 in 2019

(2018): There was a decrease in bankruptcy and alternative personal insolvency application by debtors and to bankruptcy as a remedy by creditors in 2018. The overall amount of personal insolvency cases fell from 2,909 in 2016 to 1,526 in 2018"

(2017): The entered under "Cases relating to asylum seekers (refugee status under the 1951 Geneva Convention)" represent judicial review applications relating to asylum cases generally. We are not in a position to provide definitive data on the specific case category indicated on "Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens ".
"Employment dismissal cases": we regret that we cannot definitively explain the reason for the decrease: there is no necessary connection between improvement in the economy and the number of disputes arising from employment dismissal.

(2016): With regard to the category "insolvency cases", 2016 data on incoming and resolved cases reflect a significant increase in recourse to personal insolvency procedures by debtors (there were 2730 personal insolvency and bankruptcy proceedings in 2016 compared to 941 in 2014).

(2015): 2015 figure should be 2368. The large increase is substantially due to a large increase in the number of applications for Debt Relief notices, Debt Settlement Arrangements and Personal Insolvency Arrangements

(2014): The significant increase in the number of incoming and resolved insolvency cases between 2013 and 2014 reflects the introduction of a new range of statutory personal insolvency remedies.

Italy

(General Comment): With regard to the insolvency cases, the peculiarity of the Italian system consists in distinguishing between “insolvency applications” and “insolvency cases”. The former category concerns the litigious part of the proceeding where creditors and debtors have different goals (dispute). The latter category concerns the part of the proceeding where the judge has already established the insolvency / bankruptcy of the debtor and the case is all about the management of the assets and proceeds of the debtor. Figures at questions 101 and 102 refer to “insolvency applications” rather than “insolvency cases”.

(2021): The decrease in the number of incoming employment dismissal cases might partially be explained by the extension of the ban on dismissal which was initially intended to address the covid emergency. Therefore, the decrease in the number of pending cases is the result of the decrease of incoming cases.

(2018): Employment dismissal cases are strongly correlated with the economic trend. The number of employment dismissal cases used to be very high when the economic crisis was at its peak. Now the economy is getting better and therefore the number of these cases is going down.
The strong increase of cases related to asylum seekers was even addressed by the president of the Supreme Court during his speech on the occasion of the inauguration of the judicial year. The reason of such increase depends on the immigration flow. Cases related to the right of entry and stay for aliens are dealt by the administrative justice and for this reason they were not considered in 2016.

(2017): Asylum seekers cases represent a growing phenomenon. For this reason, a new piece of legislation (L.46/2017) which came into force in 2017, introduced a series of procedures with the aim of speeding up this kind of proceedings. In particular, the main innovations of the above regulatory intervention include the establishment of specialized sections within the courts. Such specialized sections deal exclusively with immigration and international protection cases. The Italian courts are not involved in the activities concerning the right of entry and stay of aliens. The competent body is the Ministry of internal affairs. For further information about this topic please visit http://poliziadistato.it/articolo/10618-Entering_Italy

(2016): With the introduction of the data warehouse system we can now identify specific types of proceedings (e.g. employment dismissal cases) more precisely.
The figures provided for both litigious divorce and insolvency cases (year 2016) are correct but there is no particular reason explaining the observed variations. With regard to the insolvency cases, the peculiarity of the Italian system consists in distinguishing between “insolvency applications” and “insolvency cases”. The former category concerns the litigious part of the proceeding where creditors and debtors have different goals (dispute). The latter category concerns the part of the proceeding where the judge has already established the insolvency / bankruptcy of the debtor and the case is all about the management of the assets and proceeds of the debtor. The figures at questions 101 and 102 refer to “insolvency applications” (the litigious part of this kind of proceedings) rather than “insolvency cases”.

(2015): Litigious divorce case in 2015 have been extracted from the “Civil Data warehouse”. While in 2014 they were taken from the previous system. To harmonise the data between the cycles the 2014 was updated with the values derived from the data warehouse too

(2014): The project called “Civil Datawharehouse” supposed to enable to look at each single procedure individually, has been implemented. However, the output is still under “test phase”.

(2012): The number of litigious divorce cases, has been affected by the implementation of a different classification of civil cases.

Latvia

(2021): Limiting the spread of COVID-19 and mitigating the economic difficulties that may arise with restrictions, in March 2021 the Saeima adopted the Law on the Suppression of Consequences of the Spread of COVID-19 Infection, Section 22 of which stipulated that Until 1 September 2021, the creditor are prohibited from submitting an application for insolvency proceedings of a legal person if any of the features of insolvency proceedings of a legal person referred to in Section 57, Paragraph one, Clause 1, 2, 3, or 4 of the Insolvency Law exists, which affected the number of cases received in court. In 2021, there was a decrease in resolved insolvency cases, which was related to the restrictive measures in the field of insolvency process due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
In 2021, the number of received and resolved cases of the intentional homicide has returned to the level of previous years, and the decrease in the number of cases found in 2020 is no longer observable.
The number of pending cases (pending for more then 2 years) has significantly increased for litigious divorce cases, robbery cases and intentional homicide cases. The changes are related to the decisions taken in previous years to limit the spread of the COVID-19: resolving cases in the written procedure if it was possible. However, the types of cases mentioned above (specific Litigous cases) often require face-to-face meetings.

(2020): There are minor changes in statistical data due to Covid-19 pandemic. The pandemic affected the hearings of the cases and procedure, because there were several case groups that were solved in written way affecting average length of the hearings.

(2019): Data on court statistics are being calculated by automated systems, we do not keep track on any changes that affect data in database.

(2018): Partially due to court system reform, Court Information System database has undergone several error checks and data clean-ups, that has affected amount of cases, especially – unresolved. Data on court statistics are being calculated by automated systems, we do not keep track on any changes that affect data in database. Any changes to the Court Information System can affect the data.

(2017): Data updated after court reorganisation in 2018.

(2016): Data updated after court reorganisation in 2018.

(2013): The number of pending insolvency cases in the beginning and in the end of the year increased because of the special handling procedures for insolvency cases set forth by the Civil Procedure Law. The duration of insolvency proceedings is mostly affected by external economic factors. The increase in the number of incoming insolvency cases is justified by external factors such as public activity submitting applications on legal protection of individuals in cases of insolvency. The increase of the resolved insolvency cases is due to the gradual improvement of the capacity of the courts work following the adoption of the new provisions of the Civil Procedure Law in 2012.

(2012): The decrease in the number of “litigious divorce cases” (pending, incoming, resolved) is due to the decrease in the number of incoming cases owing to the impact of external factors such as depopulation, decline in the number of marriages etc. As to the category “employment dismissal cases”, the decreases noticed in respect of all the items can be explained by external socio-economic factors such as the decrease of the unemployment after the end of the economic crisis.

Lithuania

(2021): The decrease in insolvency cases category could be due to the initiative of the Council of Judges adopted in 21 April 2020
entered into force in 25 April 2020 The impact of the consequences of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) on Lithuania
Law no. XIII-2861, which was temporarily (until 31 December 2020) the initiation of the insolvency process was suspended. It is noteworthy that out of 1212 civil cases on bankruptcy of legal entities, which had been examined in 2021, the majority - 860 cases - were received by 25 April 2020.

(2020): Pending on 31 December 2020 litigious divorce cases: the result of the decrease in the number of incoming cases and the compulsory mediation in pretrial stage.
Insolvency cases: general decrease in number of cases
Roberry cases: general decrease in number of cases

(2019): In common the number of pending cases decreeses, this shows the efficient work of the courts.
Employment dismissal cases - the decrease of incoming and resolved cases might be due to the effective functioning of the Labor Disputes Commission (a mandatory pre-litigation labor dispute resolution body for individual and collective labor disputes).
Insolvency cases - in 2019 the number of bankruptcy proceedings compared to 2018 remained stably consistent, depending on the economic situation. The general number of received criminal cases has decreased. This may have been caused by the reduced level of crime in the Republic of Lithuania. In 2019, compared to 2018, fewer crimes were registered and fewer criminal proceedings were received. According to the publications of the Department of Informatics and Communications under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuaniadata, in 2019 51 449 criminal offenses were recorded (57 830 in 2018 and 63 846 in 2017). Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens - general political situation in Lithuania and situation in EU on this issue led to the decrease of incoming cases in 2019.

(2018): Employment dismissal cases - the decrease of incoming and resolved cases might be due to the effective functioning of the Labor Disputes Commission (a mandatory pre-litigation labor dispute resolution body for individual and collective labor disputes).
Insolvency cases - the decrease of incoming cases might be due to the decrease of debtors (legal entities). Robbery cases - the decrease of incoming and resolved cases might be due to a general decrease in crimes to property. Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens - general situation in EU on this issue led to the increase of incoming cases in 2017 and consequently to the increase of pending cases at the beginning of 2018. The number of ressolved cases is higher due to higher number of incoming and correspondently pending cases. Cases relating to asylum seekers fall within the cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens or other administrative cases.

(2017): Cases relating to asylum seekers fall within the cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens or other administrative cases.
The number of incoming cases related to the right of entry and stay for aliens is related to the number of requests from residents of countries where were no requests before (countries where are no military actions carried) and such requests are often declined by the Migration department.
The decrease in the number of pending employment dismissal cases at the end of the year is explained by the fact that courts are successfully fighting the backlog.
Variations observed in respect of the number of pending litigious divorce cases appear important mainly due to the small numbers.

(2016): For the reference year 2016 cases relating to asylum seekers fall within the cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens or other administrative cases.

(2013): Variations observed in respect of the categories “employment dismissal cases” and “litigious divorce cases” are justified mainly by fluctuations in the number of incoming cases (due to the crisis, developments of the constitutional doctrine or amendments in law). In 2013, the number of district courts has been reduced to 49, resulting in a transfer of cases from one year to another from several/two courts to one court.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The unavailability of the number of pending and incoming criminal cases is explained by the specific organisation of the workflow between courts and prosecution offices. Cases are only transferred to the courts shortly before the hearing and, if a case is not heard on the given date, it is physically returned to the prosecution until the new hearing date. Thus, there are - with a few exceptions - no cases pending before the criminal courts over a long period of time, and the number of incoming cases is more or less equal to the number of resolved cases.

(2021): "Robbery cases": After the strict health measures in 2020, robbery cases dealt with by criminal and correctional chambers of the courts returned in 2021 to a level 17% above the level observed in 2018.
"Intentional homicide": After the strict health measures in 2020, the number of resolved intentional homicide cases returned in 2021 to a level 5% higher than in 2018.

(2020):
""""Contentious divorce"": compared to the figures provided for the court systems assessment for 2018, new divorce cases had already increased significantly in 2019. It appears that at the end of 2018, there were a number of pending divorce petitions, awaiting the entry into force of the June 27, 2018 law establishing the family court judge (JAF law) on November 1, 2018. During the first two semesters of 2019, divorces were pronounced in a dual regime: on the one hand, cases filed under the old law were evacuated, and the JAF law, providing for very short deadlines, made it possible to close a greater number of cases in less time than was the case under the old procedure. Compared to the 1,070 new cases recorded in 2019, there is actually a 14% decrease in new cases in 2020.
""Robbery with violence"" The decrease observed between 2018 and 2020 of 23% of completed cases in violent robbery can be explained on the one hand by the decrease in new cases in this area and on the other hand by the general decrease in judgments issued during 2020 and related to the health situation.
Voluntary manslaughter cases include attempted homicides. The observed decrease between 2018 and 2020 of 27% of completed cases in intentional homicide can be explained on the one hand by the decrease in new cases in this area and on the other hand by the general decrease in judgments handed down during the year 2020 and related to the health situation. "

(2019): Compared to 2018 data, the number of incoming divorce cases has increased significantly. It seems that at the end of 2018, there was a number of pending divorce petitions, awaiting the entry into force of the law of 27 June 2018 establishing the family court judge (JAF law) on 1 November 2018. During the first two semesters of 2019, divorces were pronounced under a dual regime: on the one hand, cases filed under the old law were dismissed, and on the other hand, the JAF law, which provides for very short deadlines, made it possible to close a greater number of cases in less time than was the case under the old procedure.
“Cases relating to asylum seekers”: as we previously indicated in our 2018 comment, variations in the number of incoming and the number of resolved cases depend on factors external to the administrative courts. The variations are probably related to applications for international protection and especially the decisions taken in relation to these applications by the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (see https://maee.gouvernement.lu/content/dam/gouv_maee/directions/d8/publications/statistiques-en-mati%C3%A8re-d-asyle/Bilan-2019-Asile-Immigration-et-Accueil.pdf).

(2018): With regard to the number of incoming divorce cases, compared to the numbres provided for the 2017 scoreboard, they increased by only 8%. Since 2017, we have seen an acceleration in the number of divorce applications in 2018 since, before the entry into force of the law of the 27th of June 2018 establishing the Family Court (JAF law) and reforming the divorce procedure, many proceedings initiated under the former law were dismissed as a priority. In addition, the numbers for asylum seeker cases have decreased by 5% compared to the numbers available for 2017. The variation in incoming cases and resolved cases is linked to factors which are external to administrative courts and it is probably linked to the decrease in 2018 in applications for international protection and especially in decisions taken in relation to these issues. Finally, the number of cases resolved in 2016 concerning the entry and residence of foreigners was particularly high, this can be explained, among other things, with the creation of a new chamber in 2016 at the Administrative Court, the complexity of the cases, which can vary, as well as the delays in the investigation which can affect the date of delivery. The number of resolved cases related to the right of entry and residence of foreigners remains unchanged from the cases resolved in 2017.

(2017): Litigious divorce cases: The increase in the number of incoming cases in 2017 may have its origin in the fact that parliamentary proceedings had been initiated to reform the existing divorce procedure, which was intended to repeal the contentious divorce procedure. The Act of 27 June 2018 establishing the Family Court (juge aux affaires familiales) and reforming divorce and parental authority was initially supposed to come into force in the beginning of 2018 but it will only come into force on 1 November 2018. This law is also amending: 1. the New Code of Civil Procedure; 2. the Civil Code; 3. the Criminal Code; 4. the Social Security Code; 5. the Labour Code; 6. the amended Act of 11 November 1970 on the transfer and seizure of work pay and pensions; 7. the amended Act of 7 March 1980 on the organisation of the judiciary; 8. the amended law of 10 August 1992 on the protection of young people; 9. the amended law of 27 July 1997 on insurance contracts; 10. the amended law of 9 July 2004 on the legal effects of certain partnerships; 11. the law of 27 June 2017 adopting a multiannual programme for recruitment to the judiciary and amending the amended law of 7 March 1980 on judicial organisation. In addition, an increasing number of divorces between asylum seekers can be noticed.

Cases relating to asylum-seekers (refugee status under the 1951 Geneva Convention)[incoming cases and resolved cases]: the increase in the number of incoming and resolved cases is due to factors external to administrative courts and is probably linked to the general increase in 2017 in the number of applications and decisions taken in relation to asylum claims (see https://statistiques.public.lu/fr/actualites/population/population/2018/01/20180117/20180117.pdf).

Cases relating to the right of entry and residence of aliens [resolved cases]: the number of resolved cases in 2016 was particularly high, which can be explained by, inter alia, the creation of a new chamber in 2016 at the Administrative Court, the complexity of cases which may vary as well as the length of investigation proceedings, which may affect the date of delivery of the decision.

(2016): For insolvency cases the number of incoming and resolved cases is identical because these cases are treated immediately.

(2013): The number of employment dismissal cases corresponds to the incoming cases brought before the three competent courts. All these cases, with some exceptions, are generally heard and resolved within a few months. Regarding insolvency cases, they are all considered as urgent and are heard, at the latest one month after they are brought before the court.

Malta

(2021): There was a registered increase in insolvency cases throughout 2021 that has been confirmed by the Court Services Agency.

(2020): Less incoming and resolved cases due to court closure.

(2019): Following the establishment of the Civil Court, Commercial Division, a number of insolvency cases previously filed before other courts were still being transferred to the new Court and hence the relatively high number of incoming cases in previous years. The Commercial Court is now fully operational and receiving new cases filed before it. Hence this figure is presumed to reflect more faithfully the cases of insolvency filed within a year.

(2017): The employment dismissal cases are not heard by the courts but rather by the Industrial Tribunal which is separate from courts and has no connection whatsoever to courts or the Ministry of Justice. Cases related to asylum seekers are processed by the Refugee Commission and heard by the Refugee Appeals Board, which is an entity separate from the courts. Therefore such data is NAP. The Office of the Refugee Commissioner (RefComm) is regulated by The Refugees Act, Chp 420 of the Laws of Malta, and its main responsibly is to receive, process and determine applications for international protection in Malta, as stipulated by the Refugees Act, amended by Act VI and VII in 2015 and its Subsidiary Legislation 420.07 on Procedural Standards in Examining Applications for Refugee Status Regulations. This Office is also bound by the obligations assumed by Malta under the 1951 Geneva Convention relating to the status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol, as well as its obligations under European Directive 2011/95/EU, European Directive 2013/32/EU and the Dublin Regulation.
RefComm implements a single asylum procedure. It first examines whether the applicant fulfils the criteria to be recognised as a refugee according to law, and in the case of those applicants who do NOT meet the criteria to be recognised as refugees, the Office proceeds to examine whether the applicant fulfils the criteria for subsidiary protection according to law. The applicant is informed in writing about the decision issued by the Office of the Refugee Commissioner. The reasons in fact and in law are stated in the decision. In the case of a negative decision, applicants are informed of their right to enter an appeal against this decision to the Refugee Appeals Board. Information on how to challenge a negative decision is given in writing to those applicants whose application was rejected with regards to refugee status and/or subsidiary protection status. This is an administrative review and involves the assessment of facts and points of law. An asylum seeker has 2 weeks to appeal since the day in which the written negative decision by the Refugee Commission has been received. Whilst the Refugee Appeals Board does not accept late appeals, it does have suspensive effect.
An onward appeal is not provided in the law in case of a negative decision from the Refugee Appeals Board. However, judicial review of the decisions taken by the Board is possible before the First Hall of the Civil Court, limited only to an enquiry into the validity of the administrative act. However, such information is not available. Judicial review does not deal with the merits of the asylum claim, but only with the manner in which the concerned administrative authority reached its decision. At this stage, applicants could be granted legal aid if eligible under the general rules for legal aid in court proceedings.

(2016): Litigious cases: the number of incoming and resolved cases has been on the increased every year.

Netherlands

(General Comment): There are a few numbers available, but NL does not register whether cases are litigious or not in the manner asked here.

(2020): There are some numbers available on this, but we don’t register whether cases are litigious or not in this manner.

(2018): As for the number of resolved employment dismissal cases, it dropped significantly in recent years, most probably because of the shortage in labour or low unemployment

(2017): The distinction of litgious cases is only available for resolved cases.

(2016): A the moment the Supreme Court has not the data available to answer this question. The National Correspondent is consulting the Supreme Court to improve this situation.

Poland

(General Comment): As regards criminal cases heard in cours - only total numer of such cases is collected (without the breakdown by the type of crime commited). The breakdown by the articles of Criminal Code is used while collecting statistics on convicted persons (both in first and second instance).
Lack of horizontal consistency in the table in respect of divorce cases: in respect of this case type, he horizontal consistency is not always ensured. Sometimes the case incoming to the court as „divorce" may be adjudicated as „separation" or the case incoming to the court as „separation" may be adjudicated as „divorce".

(2020): The discrepancies in Table 101. Number of specific litigious cases received and processed by first instance courts - compared to the previous period (2018) are mainly due to the significant increase in number of cases of personal bankruptcy (in the „incolvency" category). The amendment to the bankruptcy law made it much easier to obtain the right to bankruptcy for a natural person, therefore the number of such cases brought to court has been increasing for several last years.

(2019): *) In divorces cases the number of Pending cases on 31 Dec ref. year is not equal to pending cases on January + Incoming cases - resolved cases because some cases brought to the court as a divorce cases may be judged after a trial as a separation.
*)The number of incoming insolvency cases has been increasing in recent years, inter alia, due to the significant increase in number of cases of personal bankruptcy. The amendment to the bankruptcy law made it much easier to obtain the right to bankruptcy for a natural person, therefore the number of such cases brought to court has increased many times.

(2018): In regard to litigious divorce cases, please note that pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year plus incoming cases minus resolved cases are not equal pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year. In some judicial proceedings parties decided to change their decision and do not get divorce but they get separation. In that situations incoming cases are classified as divorce cases but in resolved cases they are classified as separation cases which are included in different statistical position.

(2017): Changes in insolvency cases pending on 31 Dec are probably caused by implemented organizational changes in courts.

(2016): The growth of the number of insolvency cases is a result of the amendment of The Bankruptcy and Reorganisation Act which entered into force on the 31 December 2016.
It should be noted, that this is a very important change, which simplifies the submission of requests for consumer bankruptcy. It also implemented solutions for insolvent consumers which facilitate reaching deal with their creditors. The amended regulations do not establish automatisation in declaring consumer bankruptcy - it is still a legal proceeding. Every time the consumer must fulfil a number of conditions, which are subject to an individual assessment conducted by the judge.
Since the implementation of this act, the number of incoming insolvency cases has increased singnificantly (300 in 2014, 8694 in 2016).

Portugal

(General Comment): Since 2007, statistical data concerning pending cases in 1st instance judicial courts are collected through the courts information systems. Being dynamic systems, allowing regular corrections and up-dating, the data collection may lead to oscillation data from previous years resulting in variations in pending cases.

(2021): The increase in the number of pending cases on 1 January 2021 is related to the fact that in 2020 the number of incoming cases was higher than the number of completed cases. This situation should be contextualised, in our view, within the framework of the effects of the Covid 19 pandemic and the consequent confinement, with a reflection on the functioning of the courts in 2020, considering that in certain periods face-to-face services were interrupted or conditioned.

(2020): The increase in the number of employment dismissal cases pending from 2018 to 2020 is largely justified by the fact that in 2020 the number of the cases filed was much higher than the number of cases completed. This is be partly justified by the decrease in court activity in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.
The number of pendinginsolvency cases as of January 1, 2020 has decreased compared to the number of cases pending as of January 1, 2018, as the number of cases completed in 2018 and 2019 was relatively higher than the number of cases entered in those years. The decrease in the number of insolvency cases completed between 2018 and 2020 is justified by the decrease in court activity in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation.
Robbery and intentional homicide: At the trial stage, the classification of the type of crime in criminal cases is done only at the time the case ends, so it is not possible to provide data on the movement of cases before the case is finished.

(2019): The number of insolvency pending cases has decreased in relation to 2018, because the number of resolved cases has increased. In addition, the number of insolvency cases in 2018 decreased due to a more favourable economic situation. Finally, this decrease follows the decrease in pending cases in the civil procedural area in global terms.

(2018): The decrease of the number of pending cases follows the global general tendency of decrease of the number of civil and labor cases filed and pending. We have not identified any legislative or other changes that could directly justify the decrease of such cases.

(2017): The number of pending employment dismissal cases decreased in 2017 in relation to2016. This was due to the fact that the numer of resolved cases in 2016 was superior to the number of new cases that year. The number of cases in 2016 decreased as a result of a better economic environment.
In addition, labour cases have been decreasing in global terms.
The number of pending insolvency cases decreased in 2017 in relation to2016. This was due to the fact that the numer of resolved cases in 2016 was superior to the number of new cases that year. The number of cases in 2016 decreased as a result of a better economic environment.
In addition, civil procedural cases have been decreasing in global terms.

(2016): - The decrease in the number of pending cases in the beginning of 2016 in relation to 2015 in respect of litigious divorce cases, employment dismissal cases and insolvency is explained by the fact that the number of resolved cases in 2015 was superior to the number of incoming cases that year. There is no specific explanation as regards the decrease in the number of these cases (for example legislative changes). However the decrease of these cases follow the general trend of the decrease of incoming and pending cases in civil and labour matters.
- The decrease in the number of pending cases in the end of 2016 in relation to 2015 in respect of litigious divorce cases, employment dismissal cases and insolvency is explained by the fact that the number of resolved cases in 2016 was superior to the number of incoming cases that year. There is no specific explanation as regards the decrease in the number of these cases (for example legislative changes). However the decrease of these cases follow the general trend of the decrease of incoming and pending cases in civil and labour matters.

(2015): The decrease in the number of employment dismissal cases follow the general trend of the decrease of incoming and pending cases in labour matters.

(2013): The number of incoming litigious divorce cases is decreasing since 2010, entailing a decrease in the number of pending cases. Between 2010 and 2013, the clearance rate has remained stable, with values above 100%. Besides, the number of marriages has decreased in these last years. In 2012, legislative and other measures were adopted with the objective to accelerate procedural times of insolvency cases. These measures have allowed courts to respond more promptly to the increasing number of insolvency cases.

Romania

(General Comment): In the national Statis system, the cases are recorded on different categories of pending cases. So, in the last column, there are number of cases pending for more than 3 years instead of 2.

(2021): The decrease in the number of incoming employment dismissal cases is linked to the decrease in the number of this type of pending cases. A similar explanation can be given for the robbery cases. The decrease in the number of resolved cases of intentional homicide is linked to the decrease in the number of incoming intentional homicide cases. However, at least some of the increase, such as for the divorce cases, may be caused by the context of Covid 19 pandemic period since the number of pending cases on January 2021 increased since the previous cycle.

(2020): The increase in the number of employment dismissal cases may be attributed to a complex set of socio-economical factors and we do not have the data analisis in this matter. However, at least some of the increase may be caused by the context of Covid 19 pandemic that affected a lot of economic sectors that may have caused a suge in employment dismissal cases.

(2019): As to the increased number of cases relating to asylum seekers at the beginning of 2019, the reason is the increased number of incoming cases in 2018 due to the increase of the migration as a phenomenon

(2018): The augmentation of cases related to asylum seekers is due to the increase of the migration as a phenomenon

(2017): With regard to "cases related to asylum seekers" the increase in the number of incoming cases in 2017 may be determined by the extended phenomenon of immigration lately registered in Europe. Referring to the decrease in the number of resolved cases related to the right of entry and stay for aliens (resulting in an increased number of pending cases on 31 December 2017) there is not an objective reason that may explain this statistical data.

(2016): The decrease of pending Employment dismissal cases is due to high Clearance Rate in 2015. Regarding insolvency cases, the decrease observed for the period 2014-2016 was determined, on the one hand, by the change in economic conditions and the re-launching of the companies' potential. On the other hand, the reform of insolvency legislation (Law 85/2014) encouraged early recovery prior to insolvency and, balancing the protection of creditors with that enjoyed by debtors, has reduced the tendency of borrowers to use this judicial procedure.

(2015): One may notice an important decrees of first instance new cases in administrative law and insolvency as a cause of legislative amendments dating from 2012. The same reason is for increases of numbers in appeal and decreases in second appeal, except for special laws like administrative law.

(2014): By the decision n° 46/2012, the Superior Council of Magistracy has decided that all the courts will implement by 1 January 2014 the IT system of collecting data. The new method is based on new definitions of the indicators. Accordingly, a case is transferred from the field “stocks” to the field “closed” only when the final decision, including its reasoning is drafted signed and communicated to the parties. For that reason, the number of pending cases on 31 December 2013 cannot be identical with the number of pending cases on 1st January 2014.
The decrease of the number of resolved litigious divorce cases between 2013 and 2014 was due to the socio-economic conditions.

(2013): In respect of the category “litigious divorce cases”, the decrease of the number of cases in 2013 may have social causes and may also reflect the alternative instruments to litigious divorce (.g. divorce in front of notaries).
In respect of the category “employment dismissal cases”, because of the delays on the first hearings allocated by the new automatic system implemented with the new Civil Procedure Code, even if the number of the new entered cases has decreased, the total volume of activity was focused on stocks. The problem enters on a normal path in 2013.

(2012): In respect of the category "litigious divorce cases", the decrease of the number of cases in 2012 may have social causes and may also reflect the alternative instruments to litigious divorce (.g. divorce in front of notaries).

Slovak Republic

(2021): The data listed in the category "Roberry case" and "Intentional homicide" represent the number of convicted persons in legally closed cases. These are data obtained from the database of legally closed cases, which are marked as completed in statistical reporting, and therefore the data is only available for the category " Resolved cases". Since 2018, the number of convicted persons is not reported according to the most severe criminal offense, but convictions for all criminal offenses are taken into account (i.e. in the event that a person was convicted of committing several criminal offenses, the person in question is reported as convicted for each criminal offense separately).

(2020): More significant decline of incoming cases and resolved cases as well in the courts as a result of a pandemic situation. In the employment dismissal cases the rate of the discrepancy is not so high in comparison with 2019.

(2019): Note 1: The data in the "Roberry case" and "Intentional homicide" categories represent the number of convicted persons in legally finished cases (resolved cases). These are the data obtained from the database of legally completed/finished cases, which are reported as resolved cases in the statistical reporting, and therefore the data are only available in the category "Resolved cases". Since 2018, the number of convicted persons has not been reported according to the most severe criminal offense, but convictions for all criminal offenses are taken into account. This means that if a person has been convicted of more than one crime (for example 2), the person is reported as convicted of each crime separately (it means twice).
Note 2: The difference between pending cases on 1 Jan. 2019 and the final state pending cases on 31st of December 2018, is due to the findings of a non-uniform method of reporting cases in the insolvency agenda among the our courts. Based on these findings, the courts were instructed/directed on how to report the number of decided insolvency cases. Subsequently, the courts were allowed to record the actual state of pending cases on 1 Jan. 2019, that the methodology is the same for all courts and in the whole year (2019) period. For the next year, these differences should not occur, due to the automatic transfer of the data from the end of period (2019) into the beginning of the monitored period 2020 in the electronic data collection.

(2018): Note 1:Differences in the initial states of things as of 1 January 2018 different from the final states as of 31 December 2017 are due to the introduction of electronic data collection through the Data Collection Application (hereinafter referred to as AZU). When introducing electronic data collection in 2018, the courts were allowed to record the actual state of pending cases as of 1 January 2018 with the aim of not transmitting any inaccuracies from paper collection of previous periods. These differences should not occur in the next year, given the introduction of automatic transfer of the number of undecided cases from the end of the previous period in the electronic data collection.
Note 2: The increasing number of insolvency cases is caused by an important amendment of the Act on bankruptcy. The personal bankruptcy of the natural persons has been introduced in march 2017 and in 2018 we registered significant increase of new cases. Note 3: Data in the "Robbery case" and "Intentional homicide" categories represent the number of convicted persons in lawfully completed cases. These are data obtained from the lawfully completed database, which are classified as equipped in the statistical reporting and therefore data are only available for " Since 2018, the number of convicted persons has not been reported according to the strictest crime, but convictions for all crimes are taken into account (i.e. if the person has been convicted of several offenses, the person is reported as convicted for each crime separately).

(2017): Q101 : The data in the table are not horizontally consistent. This is caused by the fact, that the data on pending cases on 1. January 2017 (the same as data on 31. December 2016 given for the previous cycle) were collected in a one-shot collection for the Justice Scoreboard 2017 and were not bound by control patterns of horizontal consistency as it is in the new electronic data collection active since January 2018.
As regards the variations, some inconsistencies in data between the old and new system persist, and they can be explained as the transition between the old system of collecting the statistical data to new one is more complicated than was expected, with the setting up of Analytical centre of the MoJ, application of CEPEJ methodology and its tools is one of the targets in the on-going project between CEPEJ and Ministry of justice of the Slovak republic.
There are still two different IT tools used to collect the statistical data from the courts to Analytical centre. The Analytical centre makes every effort to complete the transition between two systems as soon as possible to get reliable data as soon as possible.
The increase in litigious divorce cases is influenced by significant decrease in the clearance rate (CR) to 79% in previous year 2016. The reason for the reduced CR can be found in the change of records of divorce without children from register C to the register of Pc, which was carried out in the middle of 2016, and with this change the organizational shift of the relevant number of judges into another department was not parallel.
The increase in the numbers of insolvency cases was significantly influenced by the legislative changes related to the personal bankruptcy of natural persons. Since 1.3.2017 the simplified access to personal bankruptcy and the possibility of debt elimination of natural persons is in effect. The impact of this changes was immediate in both incoming and resolved cases.

(2016): Comparison with previous cycles is not possible due to the change of methodology of calculation of cases introduced by the Analytical centre. The methodology now can identify cases finalised at each instance. The inconsistency between pending cases at the beginning of 2016 and pending at the end of 2015 is disturbed because of introduction of new methodology of calculation by the Analytical centre .

Slovenia

(General Comment): The number of litigious cases does not include litigious cases regarding the custody of children without divorce (as partners were not married to begin with).

(2021): Litigious divorce cases- Pending cases on 1 Jan.: increase by 26%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in pending cases at the beginning of 2021.
Litigious divorce cases - Resolved cases: increase by 24%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions. Cconsequently, the number of resolved cases decreased. In 2021 with the loosening of Covid-19 restrictions, the number of resolved cases increased.
Employment dismissal cases - Pending cases on 1 Jan.: increase by 61%
In 2020, the functioning of first instance courts was limited due to Covid-19 restrictions, hence the increase in pending cases at the beginning of 2021.
Employment dismissal cases - Incoming cases: decrease by 29%
The number of incoming cases most probably decreased due to numerous state measures aiming to aid the economy. Cconsequently, the employers delayed their preventive measures (in 2022, the number of incoming cases increased).
Employment dismissal cases - Resolved cases: increase by 27%
Employment dismissal cases are considered urgent, therefore the courts were working on cases despite Covid-19 restrictions.
Employment dismissal cases - Pending cases on 31 Dec.: decrease by 27%
The number of incoming cases decreased and the number of resolved cases increased (see above). Cconsequently, the number of pending cases decreased. Employment dismissal cases - Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - decrease by 25%:
Please note the small (absolute) number of cases.
Insolvency - Pending cases older than 2 years from the date the case came to the first instance court - decrease by 19%:
The biggest decrease is in the number of personal bankrupcies, which reppresent 71% of all pending cases, older than 2 years. Intentional homicide cases and Robbery cases: Please note the small (absolute) number of cases.
GC
Insolvency - Pending cases older than 2 years
Please note that the personal insolvency cases are considered resolved only when the assets have been liquidated and the trial period for the discharge of debts (that can be set to last from 6 months to 5 years) has ended.

(2020): Litigious divorce cases - the decrease in number of incoming and resolved cases is due to limitations of operation of courts due to the Covid-19 pandemics.
Employment dismissal cases – the number of incoming cases increased by 29% in 2020 (increase by 1% in 2019), which is likely connected to Covid-19 (downsizing of businesses as a consequence of the impact of Covid-19 pandemics to some economy sectors e.g. tourism, restaurants and bars, catering, etc.), while the number of resolved cases decreased by 7%, due to limitations of operation of courts due to the Covid-19 pandemics. Consequently, the number of pending cases has increased by 61%. Insolvency cases - The number of incoming cases is decreasing (personal bankruptcy from 2014 on and bankruptcy of legal persons from 2018 on), therefore the number of resolved and pending cases is also decreasing.
The discrepancies regarding other categories are due to a small (absolute) number of cases.

(2019): The change in case-flow of cases related to asylum seekers and cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens cannot be contribuited to legislature or organisational changes, but rather to the enforcement of policies of the state regarding the general immigration situation in the region.
The absolute number of these cases are low. In 2018, the clearance rate for cases related to asylum seekers had been 94% (for cases related to aliens above 100%) and in 2019 the clearance ratio had been very close to 100% for both types of cases.

(2018): Employment dismissal cases- No special reason for decreased number of incoming cases can be given. The decreased number of incoming cases affecte the number of resolved and pending cases.
Insolvency- Personal insolvency accounts for more than half of the insolvency cases. The decrease in incoming insolvency cases reflects the smaller number of new personal insolvency cases (we can speculate that the higher number of personal insolvency cases in previous years was the effect of the past economic crisis). The increase in resolved cases can be explained by the elapse of probation periods (typically 2-5 years) in personal insolvency cases and more efficient liquidation of assets in cases of business subject insolvency. The number of insolvency cases for business subjects did not vary significantly in recent years.
Cases related to asylum seekers - A decreased number of incoming cases can be attributed to the immigration crisis. The increased number of incoming cases affecte the number of resolved and pending cases.
Cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens - No special reason for decreased number of incoming cases can be given. The decreased number of incoming cases affecte the number of resolved cases.
Robbery - The difference in number of resolved cases can be attributed to small (absolute) number of cases.
Intentional homicide - The difference in number of resolved cases can be attributed to small (absolute) number of cases.

(2017): Personal insolvency accounts for more than half of the insolvency cases (61% new cases in 2017 and 75% in 2015). The decrease in incoming insolvency cases reflects the smaller number of new personal insolvency cases (we can speculate that the higher number of personal insolvency cases in previous years was the effect of the past economic crisis). The increase in resolved cases can be explained by the elapse of probation periods (typically 2-5 years) in personal insolvency cases and more efficient liquidation of assets in cases of business subject insolvency. The number of insolvency cases for business subjects (approx 34% of all new cases in 2017) did not vary significantly in recent years.

(2016): Differences (insolvency cases):
The effects of the past economic situation are still producing a high number of incoming insolvency cases, with a high percentage of personal bankruptcies. Following the legislation changes, introducing new, simplified types of (preventive) compulsory settlement, there has been an increase in pending cases due to the overburdening of courts with new cases, as well as lengthy procedures (the case cannot be resolved until the debtor's assets are liquidated – corporate; the case cannot be resolved until the end of probation period for the discharge of debt – personal insolvency; in this period the court cannot influence the duration and the case is still classified as not finished).

(2015): The effect of the economic situation are still effecting a high number of incoming insolvency cases, with a high percentage of personal bankruptcies (approx. 70%). The recent legislation changes introduced new, simplified types of (preventive) compulsory settlement which also led to new incoming cases.
The increase in pending cases is due to the overburdening of courts with new cases, as well as lengthy procedures (the case cannot be resolved until the debtor's assets are liquidated – corporate; the case cannot be resolved until the end of probation period for the discharge of debt – 2-5 years; in this period the court cannot influence the duration and the case is still classified as not finished).
Differences for robbery and intentional homicide is due to the small absolute number of cases.

(2014): The number of incoming insolvency cases is still high due to the effect of financial crisis. Besides, legislative amendments (2013) abolished the right for legal persons to apply for legal aid for financing the advances of the costs of the bankruptcy proceedings (legal persons are now exempt from paying such advance in all cases). The insolvency case is deemed resolved when the assets are liquidated and the creditors are paid (or in case of personal bankruptcy, if the dismissal of debts was requested, until such decision takes place). In cases of big companies as debtors, the sale of all assets can take years; and in cases of physical persons the "probation" period (between 2 and 5 years) must elapse, before the court can decide on dismissal of the debts.

(2013): The number of incoming insolvency cases constantly rises due to the effect of general economic crisis which resulted in a higher number of insolvent companies. The increase in the number of unresolved cases can also be attributed to a high number of proceedings of bankruptcies of physical persons. In these cases most debtors apply for conditional release of debt, where the trial period can last from 2-5 years.

(2012): The number of pending employment dismissal cases on 1 January 2012 decreased because employment dismissal cases are priority cases within labour courts. As robbery cases, are included criminal offences defined in the Criminal Code as Robbery and Larceny in the Form of Robbery. As intentional homicide, are included criminal offences defined in the Criminal Code as Murder, Voluntary Manslaughter and Infanticide. The data includes criminal cases against adult and juvenile offenders and excludes attempts.

Spain

(General Comment): When an error is detected in the statistics of a Court, the latter is allowed doing regularization, what means that the Court communicates the correct figure and rectifies the wrong one even if this does not concord with figures offered for previous exercises. This situation can happen for example in the specific control of cases that the Court makes when a judge leaves the Court (called “alarde”), but in general, in any case in which the Judicial Counsellor detects an error that comes from previous exercises but cannot be localized. The system prefers to correct the data than continue and amplify the error.
These regularizations and the cumulated cases and the re-opened cases are the causes for the horizontal inconsistencies.

(2021): Explanation of the increased number of resolved employment dismissal cases: The recovery of greater activity (after the restrictions of the pandemic) has been able to contribute to greater efficiency.
Explanation of the increased number of incoming insolvency cases: The complex economic context, derived in part from the pandemic.
Explanation of the increased number of resolved insolvency cases: The recovery of greater activity (after the restrictions of the pandemic) has been able to contribute to greater efficiency.

(2020): The decreasing number of resolved divorces cases has been parallel to that of incoming cases, which has also decreased, with a special decrease in 2020 in part as effect of pandemic on work of courts.
Increase in dismissal cases is observed since 2019.
The increase in incoming and resolved insolvency cases is mainly focused on the cases of insolvency of natural persons.

(2019): Concerning cases relating to asylum seekers and cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens, the increased number of pending cases at the beginning of 2019 is coherent with the increase in incoming cases in previous cycle.

(2018): Variations in respect of cases relating to asylum seekers and cases relating to the right of entry and stay for aliens are due to the migration crisis

(2017): Migratory crisis can explain the raise of asylum seekers judicial cases.

(2016): As concerns employment dismissal cases: in 2014, 2015 and 2016 an important decrease in the number of incoming cases has been observed. While the resolved cases have kept similar numbers, so, every year the number of resolved cases has been higher than the number of incoming cases. As concerns insolvency cases: the decrease in the number of incoming cases may be due to a certain decrease in some effects of the economic crisis.

(2015): The horizontal consistency can not be respected because of reopened, cumulated and regularised cases.
Because of the economic restrictions and the increasing number of companies with financing problems, the number of employment dismissal cases and the number of insolvency cases brought to courts have remarkably increased in 2014.

(2014): Because of the economic restrictions and the increasing number of companies with financing problems, the number of employment dismissal cases and the number of insolvency cases brought to courts have remarkably increased in 2014.

Indicator 4: Public prosecution services - Case flow management

Table 4.1.1 (2021): Public prosecution: Case flow management in 2021
Absolute values (Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases in 2021												Figures provided include traffic offence cases
	1. Pending cases on 1 Jan.	2. Incoming/ received cases	3. Processed cases (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)	3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.)	*3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified*	*3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation*	*3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity*	*3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons*	3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor	3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons	3.4. Cases brought to court	4. Pending cases on 31 Dec.	
Austria	20 536	390 025	391 135	290 057	*164 134*	*91 219*	*NA*	*34 704*	33 609	25 882	41 587	19 426	
Belgium	229 446	613 026	621 717	341 720	*73 753*	*147 451*	*120 348*	*168*	100 567	123 845	55 585	220 755	
Bulgaria	4 119	100 584	168 588	101 626	*NAP*	*101 626*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	37 987	28 975	4 205	Yes
Croatia	52 201	41 100	40 170	16 953	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	3 903	19 314	53 009	Yes
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	Yes
Czech Republic	35 546	169 006	168 446	95 306	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	2 426	29 649	54 418	36 086	Yes
Denmark	61 014	194 540	411 362	208 106	*NA*	*NA*	*3 875*	*NA*	50 243	NAP	153 013	52 163	
Estonia	2 397	25 982	8 758	3 692	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	5 066	2 088	Yes
Finland	17 725	89 256	88 979	27 916	*NAP*	*136*	*15 904*	*11 876*	16	4 683	56 364	18 002	Yes
France	NA	4 306 541	2 792 471	1 730 908	*918 574*	*619 017*	*193 317*	*NAP*	474 452	NAP	587 111	NA	Yes
Germany	711 539	4 927 905	4 896 694	2 631 439	*NA*	*1 477 233*	*1 150 548*	*3 658*	152 013	1 231 257	881 985	743 050	Yes
Greece	43 348	372 069	306 632	144 994	*95 713*	*38 356*	*10 543*	*10 925*	1 460	6 868	153 310	62 134	
Hungary	NA	74 876	146 490	20 489	*88*	*9 493*	*10 890*	*18*	4 653	2 135	119 213	NA	Yes
Ireland	NA	18 256	NA	5 508	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*292*	NA	NA	5 153	NA	Yes
Italy	1 461 475	2 563 983	2 492 622	1 674 916	*967 930*	*699 104*	*7 882*	*0*	6 520	353 579	457 607	1 532 836	Yes
Latvia	362	11 529	11 147	1 424	*10*	*71*	*655*	*688*	3 210	452	6 061	616	Yes
Lithuania	23 200	42 567	43 234	19 129	*1 764*	*15 545*	*1 820*	*NAP*	NAP	73	24 032	23 740	Yes
Luxembourg	NA	58 313	36 414	23 984	*3 210*	*4 408*	*16 327*	*39*	877	NAP	11 553	NA	Yes
Malta	15 883	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	NA	11 624	15 806	Yes
Netherlands	53 393	187 200	182 100	53 600	*NAP*	*40 000*	*13 600*	*NAP*	44 000	4 600	79 900	64 506	Yes
Poland	123 331	1 111 383	1 165 894	409 160	*160 372*	*68 234*	*138 476*	*42 078*	54 389	415 692	286 653	123 209	Yes
Portugal	246 519	415 544	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	45 154	253 665	Yes
Romania	1 161 346	594 371	612 743	476 945	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	84 664	NAP	51 134	1 142 974	Yes
Slovak Republic	NA	53 113	NA	15 366	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	1 355	NA	21 391	NA	
Slovenia	281 211	51 857	54 217	43 400	*NAP*	*41 237*	*2 163*	*NAP*	1 597	NAP	8 408	289 273	Yes
Spain	NA	1 994 943	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NAP	NA	NA	Yes
Sweden	112 271	464 707	477 877	184 139	*NA*	*32 178*	*36 356*	*115 605*	49 310	60 239	184 189	108 581	Yes
Average	232 843	754 907	719 890	370 469	238 555	211 582	114 847	18 338	59 187	153 390	133 952	238 306	
Median	52 797	187 200	182 100	95 306	84 733	40 619	13 600	2 173	20 065	25 882	51 134	57 572	
Minimum	362	11 529	8 758	1 424	10	71	655	0	16	73	5 066	616	
Maximum	1 461 475	4 927 905	4 896 694	2 631 439	967 930	1 477 233	1 150 548	115 605	474 452	1 231 257	881 985	1 532 836	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	
% of NA	26%	7%	19%	15%	48%	41%	37%	37%	19%	22%	7%	26%	
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	0%	15%	0%	7%	19%	15%	22%	0%	0%	

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Slovenia: In 2021, the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).

Legend
Yes
No

Table 4.1.2 (2021): Public prosecution: Case flow management in 2021
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases per 100 inhabitants in 2021												Figures provided include traffic offence cases
	1. Pending cases on 1 Jan.	2. Incoming/ received cases	3. Processed cases (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)	3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.)	*3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified*	*3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation*	*3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity*	*3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons*	3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor	3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons	3.4. Cases brought to court	4. Pending cases on 31 Dec.	
Austria	0,23	4,34	4,36	3,23	*1,83*	*1,02*	*NA*	*0,39*	0,37	0,29	0,46	0,22	
Belgium	1,98	5,30	5,37	2,95	*0,64*	*1,27*	*1,04*	*0,00*	0,87	1,07	0,48	1,91	
Bulgaria	0,06	1,47	2,47	1,49	*NAP*	*1,49*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,56	0,42	0,06	Yes
Croatia	1,35	1,06	1,04	0,44	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	0,10	0,50	1,37	Yes
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	Yes
Czech Republic	0,34	1,61	1,60	0,91	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,02	0,28	0,52	0,34	Yes
Denmark	1,04	3,31	7,00	3,54	*NA*	*NA*	*0,07*	*NA*	0,86	NAP	2,61	0,89	
Estonia	0,18	1,95	0,66	0,28	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	0,38	0,16	Yes
Finland	0,32	1,61	1,60	0,50	*NAP*	*0,00*	*0,29*	*0,21*	0,00	0,08	1,02	0,32	Yes
France	NA	6,37	4,13	2,56	*1,36*	*0,92*	*0,29*	*NAP*	0,70	NAP	0,87	NA	Yes
Germany	0,85	5,92	5,88	3,16	*NA*	*1,77*	*1,38*	*0,00*	0,18	1,48	1,06	0,89	Yes
Greece	0,41	3,48	2,87	1,36	*0,90*	*0,36*	*0,10*	*0,10*	0,01	0,06	1,44	0,58	
Hungary	NA	0,77	1,51	0,21	*0,00*	*0,10*	*0,11*	*0,00*	0,05	0,02	1,23	NA	Yes
Ireland	NA	0,36	NA	0,11	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*0,01*	NA	NA	0,10	NA	Yes
Italy	2,48	4,35	4,23	2,84	*1,64*	*1,19*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,01	0,60	0,78	2,60	Yes
Latvia	0,02	0,61	0,59	0,08	*0,00*	*0,00*	*0,03*	*0,04*	0,17	0,02	0,32	0,03	Yes
Lithuania	0,83	1,52	1,54	0,68	*0,06*	*0,55*	*0,06*	*NAP*	NAP	0,00	0,86	0,85	Yes
Luxembourg	NA	9,04	5,64	3,72	*0,50*	*0,68*	*2,53*	*0,01*	0,14	NAP	1,79	NA	Yes
Malta	3,08	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	NA	2,25	3,06	Yes
Netherlands	0,30	1,07	1,04	0,31	*NAP*	*0,23*	*0,08*	*NAP*	0,25	0,03	0,46	0,37	Yes
Poland	0,32	2,92	3,06	1,07	*0,42*	*0,18*	*0,36*	*0,11*	0,14	1,09	0,75	0,32	Yes
Portugal	2,38	4,01	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	0,44	2,45	Yes
Romania	6,10	3,12	3,22	2,51	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,44	NAP	0,27	6,00	Yes
Slovak Republic	NA	0,98	NA	0,28	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,02	NA	0,39	NA	
Slovenia	13,35	2,46	2,57	2,06	*NAP*	*1,96*	*0,10*	*NAP*	0,08	NAP	0,40	13,73	Yes
Spain	NA	4,21	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NAP	NA	NA	Yes
Sweden	1,07	4,45	4,57	1,76	*NA*	*0,31*	*0,35*	*1,11*	0,47	0,58	1,76	1,04	Yes
Average	1,8	3,1	3,1	1,6	*0,7*	*0,8*	*0,5*	*0,2*	0,3	0,4	0,9	1,9	
Median	0,8	2,9	2,9	1,4	*0,6*	*0,6*	*0,1*	*0,0*	0,2	0,3	0,5	0,9	
Minimum	0,0	0,4	0,6	0,1	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	0,0	0,1	0,0	
Maximum	13,3	9,0	7,0	3,7	*1,8*	*2,0*	*2,5*	*1,1*	0,9	1,5	2,6	13,7	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	
% of NA	26%	7%	19%	15%	48%	41%	37%	37%	19%	22%	7%	26%	
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	0%	15%	0%	7%	19%	15%	22%	0%	0%	

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Slovenia: In 2021, the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).

Legend
Yes
No

Table 4.1.1 (2020): Public prosecution: Case flow management in 2020
Absolute values (Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases in 2020												Figures provided include traffic offence cases
	1. Pending cases on 1 Jan.	2. Incoming/ received cases	3. Processed cases (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)	3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.)	*3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified*	*3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation*	*3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity*	*3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons*	3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor	3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons	3.4. Cases brought to court	4. Pending cases on 31 Dec.	
Austria	27 279	407 162	413 905	307 431	*181 242*	*94 249*	*NA*	*31 940*	37 178	24 928	44 368	20 536	
Belgium	189 151	642 678	600 531	342 062	*73 555*	*144 393*	*124 082*	*32*	88 614	122 581	47 274	231 298	
Bulgaria	4 695	100 508	142 299	74 567	*NAP*	*74 567*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	39 853	27 879	4 119	
Croatia	48 601	39 926	33 822	14 406	*NA*	*NA*	*381*	*NA*	NA	6 389	18 481	52 201	
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Czech Republic	41 936	181 924	188 314	95 306	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	2 793	33 574	56 641	35 546	
Denmark	60 656	223 459	420 204	207 165	*NA*	*NA*	*769*	*NA*	47 560	NAP	165 479	61 014	
Estonia	2 397	25 817	9 378	3 895	*765*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	5 483	2 397	
Finland	13 991	91 246	87 530	25 888	*NAP*	*389*	*16 809*	*8 690*	12	4 917	56 713	17 707	
France	NA	4 124 168	2 655 865	1 648 743	*903 345*	*553 520*	*191 878*	*NAP*	477 768	NAP	529 354	NA	
Germany	731 988	4 984 552	5 004 542	2 682 373	*NA*	*1 457 907*	*1 213 206*	*11 260*	161 653	1 199 972	960 544	711 530	
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Hungary	NA	75 231	137 936	17 994	*140*	*8 871*	*8 949*	*34*	4 989	2 812	112 141	NA	
Ireland	NA	12 602	NA	4 178	*131*	*NA*	*NA*	*4 047*	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Italy	1 587 721	2 503 277	2 487 994	1 657 870	*971 314*	*679 742*	*6 814*	*0*	6 281	388 574	435 269	1 603 004	
Latvia	490	12 734	12 255	1 545	*16*	*330*	*242*	*957*	2 337	285	8 088	362	
Lithuania	25 339	46 361	50 855	24 632	*5 066*	*17 092*	*2 474*	*NAP*	NAP	280	25 943	23 035	
Luxembourg	NA	62 116	35 563	23 366	*3 600*	*3 875*	*15 725*	*166*	673	NAP	11 524	NA	
Malta	11 899	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	NA	11 086	15 883	
Netherlands	73 800	184 900	179 500	55 100	*NAP*	*39 800*	*15 300*	*NAP*	44 700	3 900	75 800	59 300	
Poland	124 866	1 057 665	1 084 834	387 521	*128 486*	*74 940*	*141 856*	*42 239*	25 635	398 037	273 641	123 332	
Portugal	217 314	434 878	402 243	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	40 328	249 949	
Romania	1 144 581	571 501	564 155	442 820	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	75 636	NAP	45 699	1 161 346	
Slovak Republic	20 692	57 244	NA	10 236	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	1 556	NA	22 978	20 390	
Slovenia	275 591	61 789	28 472	38 743	*NAP*	*35 984*	*2 759*	*NAP*	1 298	NAP	9 130	281 332	
Spain	NA	1 840 128	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NAP	NA	NA	
Sweden	118 858	497 291	514 851	193 763	*NA*	*31 944*	*39 505*	*122 314*	55 915	65 159	200 014	112 271	
Average	236 092	759 965	716 907	375 437	206 151	214 507	118 717	20 153	60 859	163 662	138 429	239 328	
Median	54 629	183 412	188 314	64 834	5 066	39 800	15 300	4 047	25 635	29 251	45 699	55 751	
Minimum	490	12 602	9 378	1 545	16	330	242	0	12	280	5 483	362	
Maximum	1 587 721	4 984 552	5 004 542	2 682 373	971 314	1 457 907	1 213 206	122 314	477 768	1 199 972	960 544	1 603 004	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	
% of NA	26%	11%	19%	19%	44%	44%	37%	41%	26%	26%	15%	26%	
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	0%	15%	0%	7%	19%	11%	22%	0%	0%	

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Legend
Yes
No

Table 4.1.2 (2020): Public prosecution: Case flow management in 2020
Per 100 inhabitants (Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases per 100 inhabitants in 2020												Figures provided include traffic offence cases
	1. Pending cases on 1 Jan.	2. Incoming/ received cases	3. Processed cases (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)	3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.)	*3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified*	*3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation*	*3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity*	*3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons*	3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor	3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons	3.4. Cases brought to court	4. Pending cases on 31 Dec.	
Austria	0,31	4,56	4,63	3,44	*2,03*	*1,06*	*NA*	*0,36*	0,42	0,28	0,50	0,23	
Belgium	1,64	5,58	5,21	2,97	*0,64*	*1,25*	*1,08*	*0,00*	0,77	1,06	0,41	2,01	
Bulgaria	0,07	1,45	2,06	1,08	*NAP*	*1,08*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	0,58	0,40	0,06	
Croatia	1,20	0,99	0,84	0,36	*NA*	*NA*	*0,01*	*NA*	NA	0,16	0,46	1,29	
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Czech Republic	0,39	1,70	1,76	0,89	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,03	0,31	0,53	0,33	
Denmark	1,04	3,83	7,20	3,55	*NA*	*NA*	*0,01*	*NA*	0,81	NAP	2,83	1,04	
Estonia	0,18	1,94	0,71	0,29	*0,06*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	0,41	0,18	
Finland	0,25	1,65	1,58	0,47	*NAP*	*0,01*	*0,30*	*0,16*	0,00	0,09	1,02	0,32	
France	NA	6,12	3,94	2,45	*1,34*	*0,82*	*0,28*	*NAP*	0,71	NAP	0,79	NA	
Germany	0,88	5,99	6,02	3,23	*NA*	*1,75*	*1,46*	*0,01*	0,19	1,44	1,16	0,86	
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Hungary	NA	0,76	1,39	0,18	*0,00*	*0,09*	*0,09*	*0,00*	0,05	0,03	1,13	NA	
Ireland	NA	0,25	NA	0,08	*0,00*	*NA*	*NA*	*0,08*	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Italy	2,68	4,22	4,20	2,80	*1,64*	*1,15*	*0,01*	*0,00*	0,01	0,66	0,73	2,71	
Latvia	0,03	0,67	0,65	0,08	*0,00*	*0,02*	*0,01*	*0,05*	0,12	0,02	0,43	0,02	
Lithuania	0,91	1,66	1,82	0,88	*0,18*	*0,61*	*0,09*	*NAP*	NAP	0,01	0,93	0,82	
Luxembourg	NA	9,79	5,60	3,68	*0,57*	*0,61*	*2,48*	*0,03*	0,11	NAP	1,82	NA	
Malta	2,31	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	NA	2,15	3,09	
Netherlands	0,42	1,06	1,03	0,32	*NAP*	*0,23*	*0,09*	*NAP*	0,26	0,02	0,43	0,34	
Poland	0,33	2,77	2,84	1,01	*0,34*	*0,20*	*0,37*	*0,11*	0,07	1,04	0,72	0,32	
Portugal	2,11	4,22	3,91	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	0,39	2,43	
Romania	5,97	2,98	2,94	2,31	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,39	NAP	0,24	6,05	
Slovak Republic	0,38	1,05	NA	0,19	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	0,03	NA	0,42	0,37	
Slovenia	13,07	2,93	1,35	1,84	*NAP*	*1,71*	*0,13*	*NAP*	0,06	NAP	0,43	13,34	
Spain	NA	3,89	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NAP	NA	NA	
Sweden	1,15	4,79	4,96	1,87	*NA*	*0,31*	*0,38*	*1,18*	0,54	0,63	1,93	1,08	
Average	1,8	3,1	3,1	1,5	*0,6*	*0,7*	*0,5*	*0,2*	0,3	0,5	0,9	1,8	
Median	0,9	2,8	2,8	1,0	*0,3*	*0,6*	*0,1*	*0,1*	0,1	0,3	0,5	0,8	
Minimum	0,0	0,3	0,6	0,1	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	*0,0*	0,0	0,0	0,2	0,0	
Maximum	13,1	9,8	7,2	3,7	*2,0*	*1,8*	*2,5*	*1,2*	0,8	1,4	2,8	13,3	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	
% of NA	26%	11%	19%	19%	44%	44%	37%	41%	26%	26%	15%	26%	
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	0%	15%	0%	7%	19%	11%	22%	0%	0%	

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Legend
Yes
No

Table 4.1.3: Public prosecution: Case flow management: variation (%) between 2020 and 2021
Per 100 inhabitants (Q1, Q107)

States	Public prosecution: Variation (%) of the total number of first instance criminal cases per 100 inhabitants between 2020 and 2021											
	1. Pending cases on 1 Jan.	2. Incoming/ received cases	3. Processed cases (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)	3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.)	*3.1.1 Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified*	*3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation*	*3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity*	*3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons*	3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor	3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons	3.4. Cases brought to court	4. Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	-25%	-5%	-6%	-6%	*-10%*	*-4%*	*NA*	*8%*	-10%	3%	-7%	-6%
Belgium	21%	-5%	3%	-1%	*0%*	*2%*	*-3%*	*423%*	13%	1%	17%	-5%
Bulgaria	-11%	1%	20%	38%	*NAP*	*38%*	*NAP*	*NAP*	NAP	-4%	5%	3%
Croatia	12%	7%	24%	23%	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	-36%	9%	6%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-14%	-5%	-9%	2%	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	-12%	-10%	-2%	3%
Denmark	0%	-13%	-3%	0%	*NA*	*NA*	*401%*	*NA*	5%	NAP	-8%	-15%
Estonia	0%	1%	-7%	-5%	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	-8%	-13%
Finland	26%	-2%	1%	8%	*NAP*	*-65%*	*-6%*	*36%*	33%	-5%	-1%	1%
France	NA	4%	5%	5%	*1%*	*11%*	*0%*	*NAP*	-1%	NAP	11%	NA
Germany	-3%	-1%	-2%	-2%	*NA*	*1%*	*-5%*	*-68%*	-6%	3%	-8%	4%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	2%	8%	16%	*-36%*	*9%*	*24%*	*-46%*	-5%	-22%	9%	NA
Ireland	NA	41%	NA	28%	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*-93%*	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-8%	3%	1%	1%	*0%*	*3%*	*16%*	*-*	4%	-9%	6%	-4%
Latvia	-25%	-9%	-8%	-7%	*-37%*	*-78%*	*173%*	*-27%*	39%	60%	-24%	72%
Lithuania	-9%	-9%	-15%	-23%	*-65%*	*-9%*	*-27%*	*NAP*	NAP	-74%	-8%	3%
Luxembourg	NA	-8%	1%	1%	*-12%*	*12%*	*2%*	*-77%*	28%	NAP	-1%	NA
Malta	33%	NA	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NAP	NA	5%	-1%
Netherlands	-28%	1%	1%	-3%	*NAP*	*0%*	*-11%*	*NAP*	-2%	18%	5%	9%
Poland	-1%	6%	8%	6%	*25%*	*-9%*	*-2%*	*0%*	113%	5%	5%	0%
Portugal	13%	-5%	NA	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	NA	NA	11%	1%
Romania	2%	5%	9%	9%	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	13%	NAP	13%	-1%
Slovak Republic	NA	-7%	NA	51%	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	*NA*	-13%	NA	-6%	NA
Slovenia	2%	-16%	91%	12%	*NAP*	*15%*	*-22%*	*NAP*	23%	NAP	-8%	3%
Spain	NA	8%	NAP	NA	*NA*	*NA*	*NAP*	*NA*	NA	NAP	NA	NA
Sweden	-6%	-7%	-8%	-6%	*NA*	*0%*	*-9%*	*-6%*	-12%	-8%	-9%	-4%
Average	-1,1%	-0,6%	5,7%	6,7%	*-14,8%*	*-4,9%*	*38,1%*	*15,0%*	12,4%	-5,7%	0,2%	3,0%
Median	-0,8%	-1,8%	1,0%	1,6%	*-9,9%*	*1,2%*	*-2,7%*	*-16,8%*	4,3%	-4,3%	-0,9%	0,9%
Minimum	-27,8%	-16,0%	-15,3%	-22,6%	*-65,3%*	*-78,3%*	*-26,7%*	*-93,0%*	-12,5%	-74,0%	-24,4%	-15,0%
Maximum	33,1%	40,7%	90,6%	50,8%	*25,3%*	*37,8%*	*401,0%*	*422,8%*	113,0%	60,1%	17,1%	71,8%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27
% of NA	30%	11%	22%	19%	52%	44%	41%	42%	22%	26%	15%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	0%	15%	0%	7%	19%	15%	22%	0%	0%

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.
Slovenia: In 2021, the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).

Table 4.1.4 (2021): Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor in 2021 (Q55, Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor in 2021				Figures provided include traffic offence cases
	1. Pending cases on 1 Jan.	2. Incoming/ received cases	3. Processed cases	4. Pending cases on 31 Dec.	
Austria	58,2	1 104,9	1 108,0	55,0	
Belgium	312,2	834,0	845,9	300,3	
Bulgaria	4,6	111,3	186,5	4,7	
Croatia	120,3	94,7	92,6	122,1	
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Czech Republic	42,6	202,6	202,0	43,3	
Denmark	102,7	327,5	692,5	87,8	
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
France	NA	2 698,3	1 749,7	NA	
Germany	125,5	869,4	863,9	131,1	
Greece	111,7	958,9	790,3	160,1	
Hungary	NA	43,3	84,7	NA	
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Italy	759,6	1 332,6	1 295,5	796,7	
Latvia	1,2	39,1	37,8	2,1	
Lithuania	41,7	76,6	77,8	42,7	
Luxembourg	NA	1 214,9	758,6	NA	
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Netherlands	61,2	214,4	208,6	73,9	
Poland	32,7	294,4	308,8	32,6	
Portugal	177,5	299,2	NA	182,6	
Romania	1 007,2	515,5	531,4	991,3	
Slovak Republic	NA	81,6	NA	NA	
Slovenia	1 952,9	360,1	376,5	2 008,8	
Spain	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Average	307,0	583,7	567,3	314,7	
Median	107,2	313,3	454,0	105,0	
Minimum	1,2	39,1	37,8	2,1	
Maximum	1 952,9	2 698,3	1 749,7	2 008,8	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	
% of NA	19%	4%	11%	19%	
% of NAP	22%	22%	22%	22%	

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Slovenia: In 2021, the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).

Legend
Yes
No

Table 4.1.4 (2020): Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor in 2020 (Q55, Q107 and Q109)

States	Public prosecution: Total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor in 2020				Figures provided include traffic offence cases
	1. Pending cases on 1 Jan.	2. Incoming/ received cases	3. Processed cases	4. Pending cases on 31 Dec.	
Austria	76,2	1 137,3	1 156,2	57,4	
Belgium	268,3	911,6	851,8	328,1	
Bulgaria	5,3	113,7	161,0	4,7	
Croatia	110,7	90,9	77,0	118,9	
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Czech Republic	51,0	221,3	229,1	43,2	
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
France	NA	2 569,6	1 654,7	NA	
Germany	131,6	896,2	899,8	127,9	
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Hungary	NA	62,3	114,3	NA	
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Italy	818,8	1 291,0	1 283,1	826,7	
Latvia	1,6	42,2	40,6	1,2	
Lithuania	44,0	80,5	88,3	40,0	
Luxembourg	NA	1 321,6	756,7	NA	
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Netherlands	86,8	217,5	211,2	69,8	
Poland	33,2	281,4	288,6	32,8	
Portugal	164,0	328,2	303,6	188,6	
Romania	1 000,5	499,6	493,1	1 015,2	
Slovak Republic	34,1	94,3	NA	33,6	
Slovenia	1 825,1	409,2	188,6	1 863,1	
Spain	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Average	310,1	587,1	517,5	316,7	
Median	86,8	304,8	288,6	69,8	
Minimum	1,6	42,2	40,6	1,2	
Maximum	1 825,1	2 569,6	1 654,7	1 863,1	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	
% of NA	22%	11%	15%	22%	
% of NAP	22%	22%	22%	22%	

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Legend
Yes
No

Table 4.1.5: Public prosecution: Variation (%) of the number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor between 2020 and 2021 (Q55, Q107)

States	Public prosecution: Variation (%) of the total number of first instance criminal cases per first instance prosecutor between 2020 and 2021			
	1. Pending cases on 1 Jan.	2. Incoming/ received cases	3. Processed cases	4. Pending cases on 31 Dec.
Austria	-23,7%	-2,9%	-4,2%	-4,1%
Belgium	16,4%	-8,5%	-0,7%	-8,5%
Bulgaria	-14,2%	-2,1%	15,9%	-0,2%
Croatia	8,6%	4,1%	20,1%	2,7%
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	-16,5%	-8,4%	-11,8%	0,1%
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	5,0%	5,7%	NA
Germany	-4,6%	-3,0%	-4,0%	2,5%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	-30,6%	-25,9%	NA
Ireland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	-7,2%	3,2%	1,0%	-3,6%
Latvia	-24,4%	-7,3%	-6,9%	74,2%
Lithuania	-5,1%	-4,9%	-11,9%	6,8%
Luxembourg	NA	-8,1%	0,3%	NA
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	-29,6%	-1,4%	-1,2%	5,9%
Poland	-1,6%	4,6%	7,0%	-0,5%
Portugal	8,2%	-8,8%	NA	-3,2%
Romania	0,7%	3,2%	7,8%	-2,4%
Slovak Republic	NA	-13,5%	NA	NA
Slovenia	7,0%	-12,0%	99,7%	7,8%
Spain	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	-6,1%	-5,1%	5,7%	5,5%
Median	-4,9%	-3,9%	-0,2%	-0,1%
Minimum	-29,6%	-30,6%	-25,9%	-8,5%
Maximum	16,4%	5,0%	99,7%	74,2%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	26%	11%	19%	26%
% of NAP	22%	22%	22%	22%

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Slovenia: In 2021, the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).

Table 4.1.6 (2021): Public prosecution: Ratio of processed cases as well as pending cases with incoming cases in 2021 (Q107)

States	Public prosecution cases in 2021	
	Ratio between processed and incoming cases	Ratio between Pending cases 31 Dec and incoming cases
Austria	1,00	0,05
Belgium	1,01	0,36
Bulgaria	1,68	0,04
Croatia	0,98	1,29
Cyprus	NA	NA
Czech Republic	1,00	0,21
Denmark	2,11	0,27
Estonia	0,34	0,08
Finland	1,00	0,20
France	0,65	NA
Germany	0,99	0,15
Greece	0,82	0,17
Hungary	1,96	NA
Ireland	NA	NA
Italy	0,97	0,60
Latvia	0,97	0,05
Lithuania	1,02	0,56
Luxembourg	0,62	NA
Malta	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,97	0,34
Poland	1,05	0,11
Portugal	NA	0,61
Romania	1,03	1,92
Slovak Republic	NA	NA
Slovenia	1,05	5,58
Spain	NAP	NA
Sweden	1,03	0,23
Average	1,06	0,68
Median	1,00	0,23
Minimum	0,34	0,04
Maximum	2,11	5,58
Nb of values	27	27
% of NA	19%	30%
% of NAP	4%	0%

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Slovenia: In 2021, the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).

Table 4.1.6 (2020): Public prosecution: Ratio of processed cases as well as pending cases with incoming cases in 2020 (Q107)

States	Public prosecution cases in 2020	
	Ratio between processed and incoming cases	Ratio between Pending cases 31 Dec and incoming cases
Austria	1,02	0,05
Belgium	0,93	0,36
Bulgaria	1,42	0,04
Croatia	0,85	1,31
Cyprus	NA	NA
Czech Republic	1,04	0,20
Denmark	1,88	0,27
Estonia	0,36	0,09
Finland	0,96	0,19
France	0,64	NA
Germany	1,00	0,14
Greece	NA	NA
Hungary	1,83	NA
Ireland	NA	NA
Italy	0,99	0,64
Latvia	0,96	0,03
Lithuania	1,10	0,50
Luxembourg	0,57	NA
Malta	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,97	0,32
Poland	1,03	0,12
Portugal	0,92	0,57
Romania	0,99	2,03
Slovak Republic	NA	0,36
Slovenia	0,46	4,55
Spain	NAP	NA
Sweden	1,04	0,23
Average	1,00	0,63
Median	0,99	0,27
Minimum	0,36	0,03
Maximum	1,88	4,55
Nb of values	27	27
% of NA	19%	30%
% of NAP	4%	0%

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Table 4.1.7: Public prosecution: Variation (%) of the ratio between processed and incoming cases and variation (%) of the ratio between pending cases at the year with incoming cases, between 2020 and 2021 (Q107)

States	Public prosecution cases: variations (%) between 2020 and 2021	
	Variation (%) of the ratio between processed and incoming cases (2020-2021)	Variation (%) of the ratio between Pending cases 31 Dec and incoming cases (2020-2021)
Austria	-1,3%	-1,2%
Belgium	8,5%	0,1%
Bulgaria	18,4%	2,0%
Croatia	15,4%	-1,4%
Cyprus	NA	NA
Czech Republic	-3,7%	9,3%
Denmark	12,4%	-1,8%
Estonia	-7,2%	-13,4%
Finland	3,9%	3,9%
France	0,7%	NA
Germany	-1,0%	5,6%
Greece	NA	NA
Hungary	6,7%	NA
Ireland	NA	NA
Italy	-2,2%	-6,6%
Latvia	0,5%	88,0%
Lithuania	-7,4%	12,2%
Luxembourg	9,1%	NA
Malta	NA	NA
Netherlands	0,2%	7,4%
Poland	2,3%	-4,9%
Portugal	NA	6,2%
Romania	4,4%	-5,4%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA
Slovenia	126,9%	22,5%
Spain	NAP	NA
Sweden	-0,7%	3,5%
Average	9,3%	7,0%
Median	1,5%	2,8%
Minimum	-7,4%	-13,4%
Maximum	126,9%	88,0%
Nb of values	27	27
% of NA	22%	33%
% of NAP	4%	0%

Bulgaria: The number of discontinued cases includes also those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations which number is a fact of objective reality, not depending on the prosecution.

Denmark: The high value for processed cases is due to the “post-registration of charges” that takes place after the case has been reported to the prosecution office. The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor.

Slovenia: In 2021, the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).

Table 4.1.8 (2021): Public prosecution: Distribution of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases in 2021 (Q107)

States	Public prosecution: Distribution in % of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases in 2021							
	% of discontinued cases within all processed cases	*% of discontinued cases because the offender could not be identified within all discontinued cases*	*% of discontinued cases due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation within all discontinued cases*	*% of discontinued cases for reasons of opportunity within all discontinued cases*	*% of discontinued cases for other reasons within all discontinued cases*	% of concluded cases by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor within all processed cases	% of cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons within all processed cases	% of cases brought to court within all processed cases
Austria	74%	57%	31%	NA	12%	9%	7%	11%
Belgium	55%	22%	43%	35%	0%	16%	20%	9%
Bulgaria	60%	NAP	100%	NAP	NAP	NAP	23%	17%
Croatia	42%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	10%	48%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	57%	NA	NA	NA	NA	1%	18%	32%
Denmark	51%	NA	NA	2%	NA	12%	NAP	37%
Estonia	42%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	58%
Finland	31%	NAP	0%	57%	43%	0%	5%	63%
France	62%	53%	36%	11%	NAP	17%	NAP	21%
Germany	54%	NA	56%	44%	0%	3%	25%	18%
Greece	47%	66%	26%	7%	8%	0%	2%	50%
Hungary	14%	0%	46%	53%	0%	3%	1%	81%
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	5%	NA	NA	NA
Italy	67%	58%	42%	0%	0%	0%	14%	18%
Latvia	13%	1%	5%	46%	48%	29%	4%	54%
Lithuania	44%	9%	81%	10%	NAP	NAP	0%	56%
Luxembourg	66%	13%	18%	68%	0%	2%	NAP	32%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	29%	NAP	75%	25%	NAP	24%	3%	44%
Poland	35%	39%	17%	34%	10%	5%	36%	25%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	78%	NA	NA	NA	NA	14%	NAP	8%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	80%	NAP	95%	5%	NAP	3%	NAP	16%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Sweden	38%	NA	17%	20%	63%	10%	13%	39%
Average	49%	32%	43%	28%	16%	9%	12%	35%
Median	51%	30%	39%	25%	6%	5%	10%	32%
Minimum	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%
Maximum	80%	66%	100%	68%	63%	29%	36%	81%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	48%	41%	37%	37%	22%	22%	22%
% of NAP	0%	15%	0%	7%	19%	15%	22%	0%

Table 4.1.8 (2020): Public prosecution: Distribution of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases in 2020 (Q107)

States	Public prosecution: Distribution in % of different categories of processed cases within all processed cases in 2020							
	% of discontinued cases within all processed cases	*% of discontinued cases because the offender could not be identified within all discontinued cases*	*% of discontinued cases due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation within all discontinued cases*	*% of discontinued cases for reasons of opportunity within all discontinued cases*	*% of discontinued cases for other reasons within all discontinued cases*	% of concluded cases by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor within all processed cases	% of cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons within all processed cases	% of cases brought to court within all processed cases
Austria	74%	59%	31%	NA	10%	9%	6%	11%
Belgium	57%	22%	42%	36%	0%	15%	20%	8%
Bulgaria	52%	NAP	100%	NAP	NAP	NAP	28%	20%
Croatia	43%	NA	NA	3%	NA	NA	19%	55%
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	51%	NA	NA	NA	NA	1%	18%	30%
Denmark	49%	NA	NA	0%	NA	11%	NAP	39%
Estonia	42%	20%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	58%
Finland	30%	NAP	2%	65%	34%	0%	6%	65%
France	62%	55%	34%	12%	NAP	18%	NAP	20%
Germany	54%	NA	54%	45%	0%	3%	24%	19%
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	13%	1%	49%	50%	0%	4%	2%	81%
Ireland	NA	3%	NA	NA	97%	NA	NA	NA
Italy	67%	59%	41%	0%	0%	0%	16%	17%
Latvia	13%	1%	21%	16%	62%	19%	2%	66%
Lithuania	48%	21%	69%	10%	NAP	NAP	1%	51%
Luxembourg	66%	15%	17%	67%	1%	2%	NAP	32%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA
Netherlands	31%	NAP	72%	28%	NAP	25%	2%	42%
Poland	36%	33%	19%	37%	11%	2%	37%	25%
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10%
Romania	78%	NA	NA	NA	NA	13%	NAP	8%
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	136%	NAP	93%	7%	NAP	5%	NAP	32%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NA
Sweden	38%	NA	16%	20%	63%	11%	13%	39%
Average	52%	26%	44%	26%	25%	9%	14%	35%
Median	50%	21%	41%	20%	10%	7%	14%	32%
Minimum	13%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%	8%
Maximum	136%	59%	100%	67%	97%	25%	37%	81%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	26%	44%	44%	37%	41%	30%	26%	22%
% of NAP	0%	15%	0%	7%	19%	11%	22%	0%

Table 4.2 (2021) Number of cases concluded with the guilty plea procedure in 2021 (Q107-1)

States	Number of cases concluded with guilty plea procedure in 2021								
	Total			Before the main trial			During the main trial		
	Total	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Total	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Total	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	21 346	NA	NA	10 504	NA	NA	10 842	NA	NA
Croatia	521	279	242	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	1 593	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	20 941	NAP	NAP	20 941	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	101 706	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	101 706	NA	NA
Germany	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Greece	3 102	728	2 374	3 096	728	2 368	6	0	6
Hungary	10 978	NA	NA	9 924	NA	NA	1 054	NA	NA
Ireland	29 259	10 583	18 676	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	1 586	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	14 365	NA	NA	14 365	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	64	NAP	64	64	NAP	64	0	NAP	0
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	54 389	NA	NA	51 198	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	2 171	NAP	NAP	2 171	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1 422	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	342	342	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NAP
Spain	204 177	201 286	2 891	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Average	29 428	42 644	4 849	7 831	27 559	1 216	22 722	25 599	3
Median	7 040	728	2 374	6 510	27 559	1 216	1 054	25 599	3
Minimum	64	279	64	64	728	64	0	0	0
Maximum	204 177	201 286	18 676	20 941	54 389	2 368	101 706	51 198	6
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	22%	44%	44%	41%	52%	52%	44%	52%	52%
% of NAP	26%	37%	37%	30%	41%	41%	37%	41%	41%

Table 4.2 (2020) Number of cases concluded with the guilty plea procedure in 2020 (Q107-1)

States	Number of cases concluded with guilty plea procedure in 2020								
	Total			Before the main trial			During the main trial		
	Total	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Total	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases	Total	Severe criminal cases	Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases
Austria	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	19 155	NA	NA	8 934	NA	NA	10 221	NA	NA
Croatia	504	238	266	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	222	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	28 468	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	28 468	NAP	NAP
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	78 600	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	78 600	NA	NA
Germany	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	9 675	NA	NA	8 455	NA	NA	1 220	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	1 630	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	16 672	NA	NA	16 672	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	32	NAP	32	32	NAP	32	0	NAP	0
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	57 735	NA	NA	53 072	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	2 175	NAP	NAP	2 175	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1 356	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	255	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NAP
Spain	152 254	149 904	2 350	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Average	25 781	75 071	883	6 316	57 735	32	23 702	53 072	0
Median	5 925	75 071	266	5 315	57 735	32	10 221	53 072	0
Minimum	32	238	32	32	57 735	32	0	53 072	0
Maximum	152 254	149 904	2 350	16 672	57 735	32	78 600	53 072	0
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	30%	56%	52%	44%	56%	56%	48%	56%	56%
% of NAP	26%	37%	37%	33%	41%	41%	33%	41%	41%

Table 4.3.1 (a) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q13)

States	Approved bughet of public prosecution									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	81 248 370	83 191 279	93 698 490	95 590 817	103 474 815	111 702 235	117 132 394	137 635 835	152 917 818	168 983 884
Croatia	42 040 323	40 667 128	40 820 393	40 018 315	45 315 977	46 536 649	48 037 039	57 035 536	58 737 144	55 773 565
Cyprus	17 971 759	16 600 696	15 798 704	18 562 103	21 953 972	18 184 425	20 478 203	22 640 515	21 117 635	34 446 594
Czech Republic	84 706 722	83 826 142	85 213 339	93 199 782	93 217 029	110 580 595	115 530 744	126 534 122	133 683 358	136 195 988
Denmark	94 400 000	94 400 000	97 116 986	99 140 896	99 406 787	110 570 966	93 961 349	111 398 062	121 432 125	134 145 358
Estonia	9 256 322	9 798 246	10 627 825	11 042 407	11 533 359	11 525 880	12 936 652	14 146 518	15 159 770	16 002 372
Finland	45 312 000	45 947 000	46 223 000	43 800 000	46 243 000	44 000 000	45 042 000	48 848 000	51 540 000	57 320 000
France	729 425 027	742 704 493	780 762 888	774 262 280	809 515 806	816 441 201	848 000 592	886 722 963	894 309 558	744 155 981
Germany	523 346 503	510 067 405	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	125 851 993	128 848 473	119 744 000	126 336 480	128 900 776	139 697 479	134 304 383	131 117 610	137 313 106	154 484 011
Ireland	40 528 000	38 389 000	37 813 000	37 834 000	38 886 000	41 094 000	43 502 000	43 502 000	44 813 000	44 704 000
Italy	1 435 025 477	1 302 805 287	1 460 367 057	1 582 477 640	1 400 480 991	1 490 299 039	1 556 454 804	1 552 866 070	1 599 418 728	1 675 736 480
Latvia	20 495 958	20 498 625	21 771 366	22 491 558	22 557 706	24 121 346	26 921 451	32 256 193	35 924 143	39 947 984
Lithuania	26 101 135	25 428 485	28 563 485	28 810 734	34 962 778	31 042 246	31 620 164	35 043 782	37 323 466	36 818 727
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	1 828 559	1 757 000	1 900 000	2 116 000	2 200 000	2 500 000	2 630 000	2 750 000	2 500 000	2 250 000
Netherlands	636 924 000	627 057 000	568 734 000	525 593 000	549 596 000	NA	566 176 000	576 365 000	535 469 000	557 302 000
Poland	424 128 567	-	437 424 395	-	480 141 000	588 482 409	566 825 248	623 467 890	631 630 571	687 218 210
Portugal	97 551 326	96 640 967	88 786 150	96 054 391	110 412 452	106 000 000	109 000 000	111 132 465	113 728 078	114 613 180
Romania	148 321 292	169 122 126	238 801 232	228 155 155	194 760 300	263 489 280	269 902 871	293 276 421	322 119 974	385 786 430
Slovak Republic	60 309 536	65 324 149	70 099 751	76 888 494	83 121 003	95 273 918	98 894 576	106 705 475	113 790 569	115 422 855
Slovenia	17 655 253	17 086 402	16 730 967	18 276 528	19 383 835	20 309 563	21 348 447	22 418 592	22 442 890	23 933 518
Spain	211 352 960	-	270 480 209	266 685 555	272 791 497	288 087 745	293 102 752	297 010 077	305 162 654	353 544 607
Sweden	144 485 809	142 719 691	138 456 474	151 769 003	156 090 472	154 793 265	149 975 424	NA	232 518 046	250 676 000
Average	218 185 517	202 994 266	212 269 714	206 624 054	214 770 253	214 987 250	235 080 777	249 184 435	253 775 074	263 157 352
Median	84 706 722	83 191 279	86 999 745	93 199 782	96 311 908	106 000 000	103 947 288	111 132 465	117 611 347	124 784 107
Minimum	1 828 559	1 757 000	1 900 000	2 116 000	2 200 000	2 500 000	2 630 000	2 750 000	2 500 000	2 250 000
Maximum	1 435 025 477	1 302 805 287	1 460 367 057	1 582 477 640	1 400 480 991	1 490 299 039	1 556 454 804	1 552 866 070	1 599 418 728	1 675 736 480
Nb of values	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	15%	16%	19%	19%	19%	22%	19%	22%	19%	19%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 4.3.1 (b) Evolution of the approved budget of public prosecution per inhabitant from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q13)

States	Approved budget of public prosecution per inhabitant									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	11,15	11,48	13,01	13,36	14,57	15,84	16,73	19,80	22,11	24,71
Croatia	9,86	9,58	9,66	9,55	10,91	11,34	11,78	14,05	14,55	14,40
Cyprus	20,76	19,35	18,41	21,88	25,88	21,27	23,38	25,50	23,57	38,08
Czech Republic	8,06	7,98	8,10	8,83	8,81	10,44	10,85	11,86	12,49	12,95
Denmark	16,85	16,79	17,16	17,37	17,29	19,13	16,18	19,13	20,79	22,84
Estonia	7,20	7,45	8,09	8,39	8,77	8,76	9,81	10,68	11,40	12,03
Finland	8,35	8,43	8,45	7,98	8,40	7,98	8,16	8,84	9,31	10,33
France	11,12	11,28	11,77	11,62	12,08	12,15	12,66	13,22	13,27	11,00
Germany	6,52	6,31	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	12,70	13,04	12,15	12,85	13,16	14,14	14,00	13,42	13,88	15,94
Ireland	8,83	8,34	8,17	8,11	8,32	8,57	8,96	8,84	9,00	8,73
Italy	24,04	21,83	24,02	26,09	23,11	24,64	25,79	25,78	26,99	28,41
Latvia	10,02	10,13	10,88	11,42	11,46	12,37	14,02	16,91	18,98	21,30
Lithuania	8,69	8,64	9,78	9,97	12,28	11,05	11,32	12,54	13,35	13,12
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	4,33	4,09	4,32	4,70	4,78	5,26	5,53	5,57	4,86	4,36
Netherlands	37,96	37,26	33,65	30,96	32,17	NA	32,76	33,11	30,64	31,83
Poland	11,01	NA	11,36	NA	12,49	15,31	14,76	16,23	16,52	18,04
Portugal	9,30	9,27	8,56	9,29	10,71	10,30	10,61	10,79	11,05	11,07
Romania	6,96	8,48	10,72	11,55	9,92	13,50	13,91	15,11	16,79	20,26
Slovak Republic	11,15	12,06	12,93	14,17	15,29	17,50	18,14	19,55	20,84	21,24
Slovenia	8,58	8,29	8,12	8,85	9,38	9,83	10,26	10,70	10,64	11,36
Spain	4,59	NA	5,82	5,74	5,86	6,17	6,24	6,26	6,45	7,45
Sweden	15,12	14,80	14,20	15,41	15,62	15,30	14,66	NA	22,40	23,98
Average	11,88	12,14	12,24	12,77	13,24	12,90	14,11	15,14	15,90	17,43
Median	9,86	9,58	10,80	11,42	11,77	12,15	13,28	13,42	14,22	15,17
Minimum	4,33	4,09	4,32	4,70	4,78	5,26	5,53	5,57	4,86	4,36
Maximum	37,96	37,26	33,65	30,96	32,17	24,64	32,76	33,11	30,64	38,08
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	15%	22%	19%	22%	19%	22%	19%	22%	19%	19%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 4.3.2 (a) Evolution of the absolute implemented budget of public prosecution from 2014 to 2021 (Q13)

States	Implemented budget of public prosecution							
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	243 867 402
Bulgaria	93 356 800	94 966 603	102 876 460	110 387 845	116 412 630	136 392 502	149 281 332	166 149 076
Croatia	40 782 068	39 923 058	45 263 844	46 524 690	48 003 998	57 004 436	58 715 444	55 703 867
Cyprus	NA	NA	36 139 641	31 872 434	19 706 797	13 807 046	20 126 033	33 317 620
Czech Republic	85 249 102	107 147 762	107 167 590	110 483 428	116 129 722	130 137 857	131 805 533	140 386 954
Denmark	115 870 009	101 749 306	110 435 917	108 228 822	112 402 737	120 724 723	133 276 866	142 722 702
Estonia	9 774 016	10 761 496	11 322 578	11 337 479	12 936 652	13 993 648	15 290 154	15 779 134
Finland	46 223 000	42 200 000	46 243 000	44 800 000	45 042 000	48 848 000	50 210 000	51 760 000
France	793 313 171	778 590 473	807 160 505	811 386 286	833 119 054	875 628 332	884 666 227	736 277 006
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	117 130 667	NA	133 882 353	NA	150 355 723	NA	143 320 003	153 468 293
Ireland	37 675 000	37 622 987	38 626 000	40 094 000	42 582 000	42 582 000	44 248 000	44 472 000
Italy	1 428 912 997	1 549 305 236	1 367 145 490	1 413 360 888	1 488 952 381	1 393 017 479	1 355 540 428	1 476 653 273
Latvia	21 393 412	22 478 776	22 533 408	24 053 679	26 860 729	31 714 248	34 357 696	37 234 561
Lithuania	28 622 712	28 810 734	34 948 538	30 980 453	31 607 079	34 994 181	37 129 523	36 451 943
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	2 350 041	2 340 000	2 484 390	2 656 005	2 888 321	2 746 631	3 001 578
Netherlands	586 562 000	607 219 000	598 708 000	NA	610 915 000	636 963 000	603 770 000	621 331 000
Poland	441 872 463	-	478 772 000	587 923 359	563 400 019	623 440 944	631 595 690	687 121 234
Portugal	114 412 314	121 925 994	126 441 757	127 911 008	131 069 729	131 916 484	142 691 962	135 334 444
Romania	236 693 083	225 564 926	192 213 562	259 590 883	267 694 743	290 155 076	311 524 523	368 873 677
Slovak Republic	83 601 297	83 902 472	95 238 564	97 666 837	101 256 967	115 723 212	114 694 261	118 620 409
Slovenia	17 244 379	18 134 349	19 351 893	20 242 054	21 283 779	22 345 112	21 981 158	23 263 042
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	309 499 786	336 445 888
Sweden	138 875 248	147 410 202	150 418 994	153 528 265	147 464 139	NA	232 692 480	248 433 000
Average	233 555 986	223 336 856	215 582 385	212 255 621	232 850 090	248 540 874	246 780 170	255 507 309
Median	93 356 800	89 434 538	102 876 460	97 666 837	112 402 737	115 723 212	132 541 200	140 386 954
Minimum	9 774 016	2 350 041	2 340 000	2 484 390	2 656 005	2 888 321	2 746 631	3 001 578
Maximum	1 428 912 997	1 549 305 236	1 367 145 490	1 413 360 888	1 488 952 381	1 393 017 479	1 355 540 428	1 476 653 273
Nb of values	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	30%	31%	22%	30%	22%	30%	19%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 4.3.2 (b) Evolution of the implemented budget of public prosecution per inhabitant from 2014 to 2021 (Q1, Q13)

States	Implemented budget of public prosecution per inhabitant							
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	21,08
Bulgaria	12,96	13,28	14,49	15,66	16,63	19,62	21,58	24,29
Croatia	9,65	9,53	10,90	11,33	11,78	14,05	14,55	14,39
Cyprus	NA	NA	42,60	37,29	22,50	15,55	22,46	36,83
Czech Republic	8,10	10,15	10,13	10,43	10,90	12,20	12,32	13,35
Denmark	20,47	17,83	19,21	18,72	19,36	20,73	22,82	24,30
Estonia	7,44	8,18	8,61	8,62	9,81	10,56	11,50	11,86
Finland	8,45	7,69	8,40	8,13	8,16	8,84	9,07	9,33
France	11,96	11,69	12,05	12,08	12,44	13,06	13,12	10,89
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	11,88	NA	13,66	NA	15,68	NA	14,49	15,84
Ireland	8,14	8,07	8,26	8,37	8,77	8,65	8,89	8,68
Italy	23,50	25,54	22,56	23,37	24,67	23,12	22,88	25,04
Latvia	10,69	11,42	11,44	12,33	13,99	16,62	18,15	19,85
Lithuania	9,80	9,97	12,27	11,03	11,31	12,52	13,28	12,99
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NA	5,22	5,08	5,22	5,58	5,85	5,34	5,82
Netherlands	34,70	35,76	35,05	NA	35,35	36,59	34,55	35,49
Poland	11,48	NA	12,46	15,30	14,67	16,23	16,51	18,04
Portugal	11,03	11,79	12,26	12,43	12,75	12,81	13,86	13,07
Romania	10,62	11,42	9,79	13,30	13,80	14,95	16,24	19,38
Slovak Republic	15,42	15,46	17,52	17,94	18,58	21,20	21,01	21,83
Slovenia	8,37	8,79	9,37	9,79	10,23	10,66	10,42	11,04
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6,54	7,09
Sweden	14,25	14,96	15,05	15,17	14,41	NA	22,42	23,77
Average	13,10	13,15	14,82	14,03	14,83	15,46	16,00	17,58
Median	11,03	11,42	12,26	12,33	13,80	14,05	14,52	15,84
Minimum	7,44	5,22	5,08	5,22	5,58	5,85	5,34	5,82
Maximum	34,70	35,76	42,60	37,29	35,35	36,59	34,55	36,83
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	30%	33%	22%	30%	22%	30%	19%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Indicator 4: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 055. Number of public prosecutors (on 31 December of the reference year). (Please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled, for all types of courts – general jurisdiction and specialised courts).

Question 107. Public prosecutors: Total number of 1st instance criminal cases.

Question 107-1. If the guilty plea procedure exists, how many cases were concluded by this procedure?

Question 109. Do the figures provided in Q107 include traffic offence cases?

Question .

Question .

Austria

Q055 (General Comment): Data is presented in full time equivalent.

Q055 (2014): The numerical values provided in the table are rounded. The accurate figures are: total – 344,83 (171,52 males and 173,31 females); prosecutors at first instance level – 308,69 (147,13 males and 161,56 females); prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level – 20,94 (13,04 males and 7,90 females); prosecutors at Supreme Court level – 15,20 (11,35 males and 3,85 females).

Q055 (2012): In 2012, the various tasks were more exactly assigned to the number of full time equivalents - dealing with tasks of the prosecution on the one hand and the administrative tasks on the other hand.

Q107 (General Comment): "3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity": discontinued investigations for reasons of opportunity are only counted by persons against which the investigation was discontinued. In one case, more than one person can be accused and the investigation can be discontinued for reasons of opportunity against more than one accused person. Therefore, the person-count was not delivered because it is inconsistent with the case-count (3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.4). The number of cases in which an investigation was discontinued for reasons of opportunity is included in the number provided for 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 but cannot be evaluated separately with the standard statistic tools of the Federal Ministry of Justice of Austria.

The provided number of cases discontinued for other reasons (3.1.4) contains cases discontinued because the offender is fugitive or an investigation may not be instituted or continued by law (e.g. because of diplomatic immunity of the offender), also cases (investigations) that were not instituted in the first place because the of a lack of an initial suspicion and all other cases that were discontinued but can not be allocated to one of the above mentioned reasons or the other reasons under 3.1.

Under 3.3, closed cases against unidentified offenders were counted which were discontinued because of another reason than not identifying the offender in the end (mostly cases in which at least one formerly unidentified offender could be identified and therefore the case against the unidentified offender(s) is closed and another (new) case against the known offender(s) is opened).

Q107 (2020): The Austrian code of criminal procedure knows measures that the public prosecutor can take in cases of minor criminal offences (“Diversion”). Comparable measures have to be taken by the public prosecutor under certain circumstances under the addictive drug act (“Suchtmittelgesetz”). Until 2019, the last-mentioned cases were counted as files “discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation” (3.1.2). Since 2020, these cases are now counted as “concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor” (3.2). These changes explain the higher number of cases under 3.1.2. Cases brought to court declined mainly because in 2020 there were far less incoming cases (-13 % compared to 2018).
The number of persons against which an investigation was discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity in 2020 is 9 672.

Q107-1 (General Comment): There is no guilty plea procedure in Austria.

Q109 (General Comment): The courts only deal with damages to property and negligent bodily injuries caused by traffic accidents in civil and criminal proceedings; offences which do not lead to damages or injuries are punished by administrative bodies (e.g. speeding, having worn-out tires, drunk-driving).

Belgium

Q055 (2021): Source: FPS Justice - Directorate General for the Judiciary, HR Department of the Judiciary, Notaries and Enforcement agents
Q055 (2020): Support Service of the College of Public Prosecutors

Q055 (2014): In 2014, the number of professional prosecutors includes the heads of division of the 15 public prosecutors' offices and the heads of the 8 prosecution offices within labour courts.
Q107 (General Comment): "Since the reform of the judicial landscape that came into effect on April 1, 2014, our country has 15 "first degree" public prosecutors' offices (14 public prosecutors' offices + federal prosecutor's office). The data of the federal prosecutor's office are not included here.
The data only concern correctional offenses committed by persons of legal age and persons who are not (yet) identified. Proceedings against minors are handled by the youth section of the public prosecutor's office. The unit of account is a criminal case: a case can have none, one or more defendants and/or one or more offences.
Dismissals for 'other reasons' refer only to cases in which it was possible to determine in the database that they had been closed by a dismissal for which the reason was not entered or was not correctly registered. In fact, when the reason is correctly recorded, the case is then entered under headings 3.1.1, 3.1.2 or 3.1.3. Therefore, the 'other reasons' heading is for 'unknown reasons' and therefore does not include 'special' reasons." "

Q107 (2021): Annual statistics of the Public Prosecution services - Search and prosecution of criminal cases by the public prosecutor's offices at the courts of first instance (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9 and 11.
The figures in the table have been extracted from the database of the College of General public prosecutors, which is fed by the records of the correctional sections of the public prosecutors' offices at the courts of first instance (MaCH system).
The unit of account is a criminal case: a case can have none, one or more defendants and/or one or more offences.
For point 3.4: In order to count the number of cases brought to courts (55 585 cases), we counted on the one hand all the cases that were closed as a result of a direct summons (41 324 cases) and on the other hand all the cases that were closed as a result of a first fixation before the council chamber in the framework of the settlement of the proceedings (14 261 cases). Indeed, all these cases are also counted as cases closed by the prosecution in the annual statistics of the Public Prosecution services (see table 9).
Additional information on point 3.2:
Of the 100 567 cases closed by a sanction or a measure imposed or negotiated by the King prosecutor (see table 9), 55 167 cases were closed following the payment of a penal transaction; 23 743 cases were closed following an administrative sanction; 19 169 cases were closed as a result of pre-trial probation; 2 446 cases were closed following a successful mediation procedure and measures; 42 cases were closed after referral to the head of the corps.

Q107 (2020): "The figures in the table have been extracted from the Data Bank of the College of Public Prosecutors, which is fed by the records of the correctional sections of the Public Prosecutor's Offices at the first instance courts (MaCH system). The data presented below correspond to the status of the database as of January 9, 2021. Useful notes for the interpretation of the data:
Of the 88,614 cases that ended with a sanction or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor
- 48,205 cases were closed following the payment of a penal transaction, - 22,091 cases were closed following an administrative sanction
- 15.969 cases were closed as a result of pre-trial probation,
- 2.308 cases were closed following a successful criminal mediation procedure, - 41 cases were closed after referral to the head of the corps.
Of the 122,581 cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons. These are :
- 6,249 cases in which the suspect is the subject of an alert. Once the suspect has been discovered, the case can be reopened.
- 40,748 cases that were referred for disposition. A case that has been sent for disposal is a closed case for the prosecutor's office (its division) that made the decision. The recipient of this case will open a new case and start the judicial investigation.
- 75,584 cases were joined. If one or more cases are joined to a parent case, all subsequent decisions are registered in the parent case. The daughter case receives the joinder decision.
In order to count the number of cases brought before the courts (47,274 cases), in contrast to previous years, we counted on the one hand all cases that were closed as a result of a direct summons (33,105 cases) and on the other hand all cases that were closed as a result of a first determination before the council chamber within the framework of the settlement of the proceedings (14,169 cases). In fact, all these cases are also counted as cases closed by the public prosecutor's office in the annual statistics of the public prosecutor's office.
In the previous questionnaires we only counted direct summonses from the Public Prosecutor's Office to the correctional chambers (31,737 cases in 2020), summonses via accelerated procedure (1,159 cases in 2020) and correctionalizations (78 cases in 2020) and referrals to the correctional chambers of the courts following a first fixation before the council chamber within the framework of the settlement of the procedure (7,592 cases in 2020). A part of these referrals relates to cases that were initiated as a result of a civil action. Therefore, these cases were not initiated by the prosecution.
The numbers of incoming, processed and pending cases have all increased for the same reason. Indeed, in 2020, the health crisis due to the outbreak of COVID-19 began. The government took measures to combat this crisis, including several periods of containment. The Public Prosecutor's Office was responsible for taking criminal action against non-compliance with these measures, which explains the sharp increase in the number of new cases and the fact that, at the same time, the flow of other types of cases did not decrease in the same proportions.
Pending cases are cases that are being processed at a given time. If the inflow increases significantly, the number of pending cases will increase accordingly and reach a higher level.
The increase in the "terminated with penalty" and "brought to court" headings is also related to the health crisis. The primary response to a COVID-19 non-compliance violation was a settlement (recorded under "terminated by penalty"). In the case of
Q107 (2016): 2016 statistical data are not (yet) available due to the change in ITC applications used in Public Prosecution.

Q107 (2014): In 2014, on top of the 447 132 discontinued cases listed in Q107 and Q108, 36 914 other discontinued cases have to be added (administrative fine, pretorian probation, identification of the offender, unknown reason). Actually, in 2014, 484 046 cases were discontinued. Out of the 10 126 cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor, 7 363 cases were concluded by the payment of a criminal transaction and 2 763 cases - by a successful criminal mediation procedure.

Q107 (2012): In 2012, on top of the 478 505 discontinued cases listed in Q107 and Q108, 37 471 other discontinued cases have to be added (administrative fine, pretorian probation, identification of the offender, unknown reason). Actually, in 2012, 515 976 cases were discontinued. Out of the 9 477 cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor, 6 677 cases were concluded by the payment of a criminal transaction and 2 800 cases - by a successful criminal mediation procedure.

Q107-1 (General Comment): The guilty plea procedure was introduced by the law of February 5, 2016 (Article 216 of the Code of Criminal Investigation), which entered into force on February 29, 2016.
According to Article 216 of the CIC, §1, al.1 "For acts that do not appear to be of a nature to be punishable by a main correctional imprisonment of more than five years, the public prosecutor may, either ex officio or at the request of the suspect or defendant or his/her lawyer, propose the application of the "procedure of prior acknowledgement of guilt" defined in this article, if the suspect or defendant admits to being guilty of the acts attributed to him/her".

Q109 (General Comment): The data do not include traffic law cases, cases handled by the labor auditorates, or appeals against police decisions handled by the correctional prosecutor's office.
Q109 (2021): The data do not include traffic law cases, cases handled by the labor auditorates, or appeals against police decisions handled by the correctional prosecutor's office.

Bulgaria

Q055 (General Comment): The provided data refers to the actual number of employed persons for the year of reference.

Q055 (2016): 1511 is the total number of working prosecutors at 31.12.2016; 888 prosecutors at first instance level includes – the prosecutors from 113 Regional Prosecutor`s Offices and 1 Specialized Prosecotr`s Office; 500 prosecutors work in 28 District Prosecutor`s Offices, 7 Appelate Prosecutor`s Offices and 3 Military District Prosecutor`s Offices; 123 are the prosecutors working in Supreme Prosecutor`s Office of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Prosecutor`s Office and 1 Prosecutor General. (The indicated numbers do not include the number of the investigative magistrates in the investigative departments at District Prosecutor`s Offices and National Investigation Service and their administrative heads.

Q055 (2014): For 2014, the number of prosecutors acting at 1st instance includes prosecutors of the regional prosecutor's offices, specialized prosecutor's offices and the military prosecutor's offices. The number of prosecutors acting at 2nd instance includes prosecutors from district and appellate prosecutor's offices. The number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level includes prosecutors from the Supreme Prosecutor's Office of Cassation, Supreme Administrative Public Prosecutor's Office, and the Prosecutor GeneralIn contrast with the 2012 evaluation, the number of investigators in the District Investigation Departments at the District Prosecutor's Offices and the National Investigation Service is not taken into consideration for 2014.

Q055 (2012): For 2012, the total includes 512 magistrates with position of "investigator in the Investigation Department at the District Prosecution Office". Conversely, these 512 magistrates are not subsumed in the number of prosecutors at 1st instance level. The number of prosecutors at 2nd instance level including Prosecutor's Office of Appeal and Military District Prosecutor's Office encompasses 451 prosecutors and 433 investigators in the Investigation Departments at the District Prosecution Offices and military investigators. The number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level includes 128 prosecutors and 79 investigators at the National Investigation Service.

Q107 (General Comment): 1) "Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year": the unresolved pre-trial proceedings (PTPs) by a prosecutor as of 1 January of the reference year are reported.
2) "Incoming/received cases": the closed PTPs;
3) "Processed cases": the decided PTPs by a prosecutor and is the total value of the data from four indicators (3.1 + 3.2 + 3.3 + 3.4), with reflected types of decisions under the PTPs;
3.1.) "Discontinued during the reference year": the terminated PTPs (including those by prescription) are reported and the total value of the data from the next four indicators (3.1.1 + 3.1.2 + 3.1.3 + 3.1.4.), with reflected types of terminations;
3.1.1) "Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified" indicates NAP ;
3.1.2) "Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offense or a specific legal situation": the terminated PTPs, incl. those by prescription;
3.1.3) "Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity " the NAP is indicated (analogous to the previous questionnaires); 3.1.4) the indicator "Discontinued for other reasons" indicates NAP;
3.2) "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor " is indicated NAP;
3.3) "Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons": the suspended PTPs are reported, as well as the PTPs sent by competence (for the respective prosecutor's office, although these cases are essentially unresolved they are closed);
3.4) "Cases brought to court" the submitted PDs in the court are reported;
4) "Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year": the number of pending cases at the end of the year refers to the unresolved pre-trial proceedings by a prosecutor. Regarding the cases sent by competence, the mathematical calculation for collecting the values is not applicable for the two prosecutor's offices - one that sent it by competence (according to the rules of local, functional or special competence), for which the case was decided "closed case for other reasons" and the other, which accepted it within its competence, if at the end of the year the same case remained pending, the latter is included in the above data.

Q107 (2021): 3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.)
The number of discontinued cases in the reference year (in the case of 2021) is 101626. This number includes all discontinued criminal proceedings by the prosecutor in the year on the basis of Art. 24 of the Criminal Procedure Code, including those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations on the basis of Art. 24, para. 1, item 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code (criminal liability is extinguished due to the expiration of the statute of limitations).
The number of cases terminated on statute of limitations grounds is a fact of objective reality, which does not depend on the prosecution. This number is a function of the number of the pending pre-trial proceedings, incl. suspended (predominantly due to failure to establish the perpetrator of the crime during the investigation), as well as the specific crime on which the case is being prosecuted, as the absolute statute of limitations for seeking criminal liability is different and depends on the amount of the penalty provided for in the Criminal Code for the relevant crime (according to Art. 81 of the Criminal Code).
The increase in the number of dismissed cases for 2021 compared to those dismissed in 2020 is mainly due to the greater number of dismissed cases by the prosecutor on the grounds of absolute statute of limitations for prosecution, which obliges the prosecutor to dismiss the case on the basis of Art. 24, para. 1, item 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code. This conclusion is supported by the statistical data for the two years - in 2021, the dismissed cases, on grounds other than the statute of limitations, are relatively similar: 32,400 for 2021 compared to 32,002 for 2020. However, those dismissed on statute of limitations grounds in 2021 are 69,226, and in 2020 - 42565. It can be seen that in 2021 the terminated pre-trial proceedings were significantly more than in the previous year. There is no evidence that this increase is due to any special or extraordinary circumstance that occurred in 2021. Each year the number of cases dismissed on statute of limitations grounds is different and this is due to the above reasons.

Q107 (2020): Question 107:
1)"Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year" the unresolved pre-trial proceedings (PTPs) by a prosecutor as of 1 January of the reference year are reported.
2)“Incoming/received cases” are reported the closed PTPs (analogous to the previous questionnaires);
3)“Processed cases” are reported the decided PTPs by a prosecutor and is the total value of the data from four indicators (3.1 + 3.2 + 3.3 + 3.4), with reflected types of decisions under the PTPs;
3.1.)“Discontinued during the reference year” the terminated PTPs (including those by prescription) are reported and is the total value of the data from the next four indicators (3.1.1 + 3.1.2 + 3.1.3 + 3.1.4.), with reflected types of terminations;
3.1.1)"Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified" indicates NAP (similar to the previous questionnaire);
3.1.2 "Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation" are reported the terminated PTPs, incl. those by prescription (similar to the previous questionnaires);
3.1.3)"Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity " the NAP is indicated (analogous to the previous questionnaires); 3.1.4) the indicator "Discontinued for other reasons" indicates NAP (similar to the previous questionnaire);
3.2)"Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor " is indicated NAP (analogous to the previous questionnaires);
3.3)“Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons” the suspended PTPs are reported, as well as the PTPs sent by competence (for the respective prosecutor's office, although these cases are essentially unresolved they are closed). It is not obligatory for the prosecutor's office, which sent the case within its competence, to conduct a full investigation. If a ground for the competence of another prosecutor's office is established under the rules of local, functional or special competence, the case shall be sent to the respective prosecutor's office for continuation of the investigation. The grounds for determining the competence are exhaustively specified in the CPC (Chapter Four, Section II of the CPC, Article 35 et seq. Of the CPC, Article 195 of the CPC, Articles 396-398 of the CPC, Article 411a of the CPC);
3.4) in the indicator “Cases brought to court” the submitted PDs in the court are reported (analogous to the previous questionnaires);
4) in the indicator “Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year” the unresolved PDs by a prosecutor as of December 31of the reference year are reported;
Concerning the increase in the number of processed cases between 2018 and 2020, the number of "cases closed by the prosecutor for other reasons", taken into consideration for this cycle, makes the differnce.

Q107 (2018): 1) The number of the terminated pre-trial proceedings has been given under indicator 'Received during the reference year' (similar to previous questionnaires);
2) The number of the terminated pre-trial proceedings, including those on limitation has been given under indicator "Discontinued during the reference year (see Q108 below)";
3) NAP has been indicated under indicator "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" (similar to previous questionnaires);
4) The number of the pre-trial proceedings that have been brought to court is given under indicator "Cases brought to court" (similar to previous questionnaires).

Q107 (2014): In 2014, prosecutors dealt with 139153 pre-trial proceedings for which cases were transferred to court; 75834 were terminated on account of the absence of a crime or other grounds provided for by law. A prosecutor may not terminate the pre-trial proceeding on the ground the perpetrator cannot be identified, unless the limitation period for prosecution has expired (42 588). A prosecutor cannot impose punishment without the approval of a judge. The parties can conclude an agreement (approved by the judge) for some crimes before the case is sent to court (11561), or during the trial (data is not available). Court proceedings can be reduced if during the preliminary hearing, the defendant fully admits the facts stated in the indictment (3505 cases).

Q107 (2012): In 2012, prosecutors dealt with 144950 pre-trial proceedings for which the investigation has been completed and the cases were transferred to court. 91523 pre-trial proceedings were terminated on account of the absence of a crime or other grounds explicitly provided for by the law. A prosecutor may not terminate the pre-trial proceeding on the ground the perpetrator cannot be identified, unless the prescribed limitation period for prosecution has expired. Terminated pre-trial proceedings conducted against an unknown perpetrator due to the expiration of the statutory limitation periodwere 59 063, and are part of the total of terminated cases. A prosecutor cannot impose punishment without the approval of a judge.

Q107-1 (General Comment): "Total number of guilty plea procedures" indicates the total value of the next two indicators;
"Before the main trial": the agreements submitted by a prosecutor to the court are taken into account;
"During the main trial": a value is indicated, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Article 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code (with a person or for any of the crimes), concluded by the prosecutors in a court phase (after an indictment has been filed), as well as by the number of procedures under the abbreviated court investigation under Article 371, item 2 of the CPC (under Chapter Twenty-eight of the CPC, pursuant to Article 373, para. 3, supra Article 372, para. 4, supra Article 371, item 2 CPC), under which there have been convictions and acquittals.

Q107-1 (2020): Question 107–1:
– the indicator "Total number of guilty plea procedures" indicates the total value of the next two indicators;
– in the indicator "Before the main trial" the agreements submitted by a prosecutor to the court are taken into account (analogous to the previous questionnaires);
– in the indicator "During the main trial" a value is indicated, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Article 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code (with a person or for any of the crimes), concluded by the prosecutors in a court phase (after an indictment has been filed), as well as by the number of procedures under the abbreviated court investigation under Article 371, item 2 of the CPC (under Chapter Twenty-eight of the CPC, pursuant to Article 373, para. 3, supra Article 372, para. 4, supra Article 371, item 2 CPC), under which there have been convictions and acquittals (similar to the previous questionnaires).

Q107-1 (2018): 1) The total amount of the following two indicators is given under indicator "Total number of guilty plea procedures";
2) The number of the agreements that were brought to court by a public prosecutor is given under indicator "Before the court case" (similar to previous questionnaires;
3) The indicated amount is sum of the number of the agreements under Art. 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code (with a person or for some offence) concluded by the prosecutors in the judicial phase (after an indictment), as well as the number of procedures under an expedited procedure by Art. 371, it. 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code (under Chapter Twenty Eight of the Criminal Procedure Code in accordance with Art. 373, Para. 3, in conjunction with Art. 372, Para. 4 and in conjunction with Art. 371, it. 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code) under which convictions and acquittals have been imposed, is given under indicator "During the court case".

Q109 (2021): Statistical reporting of the PORB. The data are derived from the statistical reporting of the PORB, according to indicators and order, approved by the Prosecutor General with the Instruction for the organization of the information activity in the PORB.

Croatia

Q055 (General Comment): The provided data encompasses all officials in the public prosecutors' offices, including heads of the public prosecutors' offices (the Public Prosecutor of the Republic of Croatia, county and municipal public prosecutors, the head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime) and all public prosecutors deputies. The number of prosecutors at the first instance level includes all municipal public prosecutors, their deputies, as well as the head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime and his deputies. The number of prosecutors at the second instance (court of appeal) level includes all county public prosecutors and their deputies. The number of prosecutors at the Supreme Court level includes the Public Prosecutor and his deputies.

Q055 (2018): The above information includes all officials in the public prosecutor's offices – all public prosecutors (heads of prosecution offices) and public prosecutors' deputies (deputies of the Public Prosecutor, deputies of the Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime and deputies of the county and municipal public prosecutors).
The number of prosecutors at the first instance level includes all municipal public prosecutors (heads of municipal prosecution offices and Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime), their deputies, as well as the deputies of the Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime. The number of prosecutors at the second instance level (court of appeal) includes all county public prosecutors (heads of the county prosecutors' offices) and their deputies. The number of prosecutors at the supreme court level includes the Public Prosecutor General and his deputies.

Q055 (2012): In 2012, the public prosecutors' Office of the Republic of Croatia employed 21 officials. The county public prosecutors' offices employed 155 officials, and the municipal public prosecutors' offices employed 410 officials. Out of 617 officials, 385 or 62.4% were women. The number of officials remained the same as in 2011. As of 31 December 2012, 7 public prosecutor's posts and 130 deputy public prosecutor's posts were vacant.
Q107 (General Comment): Discontinued for other reasons: cases can be discontinued for reasons such as circumstances which exclude guilt, the fact that there is no reasonable suspicion that the suspect committed particular criminal offence, in the case when criminal complaint is not credible. The reason for discontinue the case can be if the data in the criminal complaint indicate the conclusion that the complaint is not credible.
Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: cases can be closed for reasons such as the existence of circumstances that preclude the guilt of the defendant or there is no evidence that the defendant committed the offence. Other reasons: If the data in the criminal complaint indicate the conclusion that the application is not credible.

Q107 (2021): Source of information: Report of the Chief State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia on the work of State Attorney's offices in 2021
3.1. the total number of cases completed by adopting a decision rejecting criminal charges or a decision terminating the investigation is presented, however, statistical data are not kept by categories requested in the table
3.1.3. There was 523 discontinued cases by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity (data covers juvenile perpetrators only because data in relation to other perpetrators is not available).

Q107 (2020): Reason for decreased number of incoming cases same as for the courts - pandemic of COVID-19.
Discontinued cases decreased - same as for the courts (COVID-19), please see comment in Q091.
For the category 3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.), PP is not able to differ categories 3.1.1., 3.1.2 and 3.1.4.

Q107 (2018): Compared with the data discrepancies from 2016 data, it is evident that the total number of cases received in the State Attorney's Office in 2018 decreased, which is why all other reported figures from 2018 are relatively smaller compared to the 2016 data.
Q107 (2016): Under discontinued cases we consider cases in which criminal charge was dismissed and cases that were suspended during criminal proceedings.
Data on the number of cases that were concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor (conditional deferral and agreement) do not include cases against juveniles and persons aged between 18 and 21 (younger adults) because for these persons we do not have separate information on how many cases have been completed by a penalty or measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor and how much by use of opportunistic principle. Therefore data on juvenile and younger adults are reported in cases that the State Attorney discontinued (dismissal by use of opportunistic principle).

Q107 (2014): Variations between 2012 and 2014 are due to amendments in criminal law. Namely, in 2013, the new Criminal Act entered into force by which some criminal acts are decriminalized. The legal understanding of the Criminal Department of the Supreme Court of 27 December 2012, on the amount of indeterminate values, prescribes that the legal characteristics of criminal offences such as theft, embezzlement, defraudation and fraud, described as a matter of small value, represent a matter whose value does not exceed HRK 2,000.00 (instead of the previously HRK 1,000.00). Thus, a large number of criminal proceedings on offences related to property matters, which were so far initiated by the State attorney, are now initiated upon a private complaint.

Q107-1 (General Comment): In criminal proceedings, the defendant is granted the right to plead guilty (for all or a number of the counts of the charge) and reach agreement on the sanction. If the defendant pleads guilty and no agreement on the sanction is reached, the panel shall confirm the indictment and a trial must be scheduled. The parties may negotiate on the conditions of pleading guilty and agreeing on a sanction. During these negotiations, the defendant shall have a defence counsel. If the president of the panel is served with a confirmed indictment to which the accused has pleaded guilty, the proposing of evidence for the trial shall be limited only to the evidence which concerns the decision on criminal-law sanctions. Where the accused pleads guilty to all counts of the charge, the president of the panel shall instruct him/her that he/she may immediately state his/her position on all the circumstances that incriminate him/her and present all the facts in his/her favour, after which the accused shall be interrogated. The guilty plea does not exempt the court from its duty to present other evidence as well. If the confession of the accused at the trial is complete and in accordance with the evidence already gathered, the court shall, in the course of evidentiary proceedings, present only those pieces of evidence that relate to the decision on punishment or other sanction. The State Attorney's Office keeps only a track record on the judgments rendered by the court in the guilty plea procedure and no distinction can be made between the number of guilty plea procedures "before the court case" and their number "during the court case".

Q107-1 (2021): Source of information: Report of the Chief State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia on the work of State Attorney's offices in 2021
Data under Severe criminal cases refers to cases under the jurisdiction of county state attorney's offices and the Office for the Suppression of corruption and organised crime
Data under Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases refers to cases under the jurisdiction of municipal state attorney's offices, noting that certain severe criminal cases are also within their jurisdiction, however, statistical data are presented in total for all criminal offences under the jurisdiction of municipal state attorney's offices, without separating them into "lighter" and "more serious" criminal offences.

Q107-1 (2016): In total, in 2016, 440 judgements were given under the agreement of the parties in which the accused pleaded guilty (total number of guilty plea procedures is 440), but there is no data on how many cases it occurred before the court case or during the court case. Regarding the data from the previous cycle, there has been a decrease in the number of judgements by the agreement of the parties in which the defendant pleaded guilty because during the previous period in only one criminal case that was within the jurisdiction of the Office for the Suppression of Corruption and Organized Crime with over three hundred defendants, an agreement was reached with a large number of defendants, which ultimately affected a significant increase in the number of judgments given by the parties' agreement.

Cyprus

Q055 (2020): The number includes also legal advisors to the Attorney General's office.
The number increased because more positions of prosecutors were approved.
Q055 (2014): All prosecutors appear before all courts.

Czech Republic

Q055 (General Comment): The Czech Republic is endowed with a system of 4 levels of State prosecution offices: district, regional, high and supreme. The number of high public prosecutors is included in the number of prosecutors at second instance level.
Q107 (2021): In 2019, we have changed the methodology of reporting for CEPEJ.
In addition, the prosecutor can deal with the case in many ways. We tried to make the data work and the sums to make sense. E.g. Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year + Incoming/received cases - Processed cases = Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year. However, we would like to state that data comes from various sources and may be sometimes tricky to deal with.
There are many reasons why the prosecution could be discontinued. It is difficult to say under which category they should be included (3.1.2 or 3.1.4). However, the reasons may include following: 1. If such prosecution concerns a person who is exempt from the competencies of the law enforcement authorities or a person for whom the law requires an official consent for their prosecution, if such consent was not awarded by an entitled authority, unless the exemption is temporary or unless the criminal prosecution of the person is inadmissible due to lack of consent only temporarily; 2. if it concerns a person who is below the age of criminal responsibility 3. if it is against a person whose mental illness that occurred after the criminal offence was committed makes it permanently impossible for them to understand the purpose of the criminal prosecution 4. and many others.

Q107 (2020): Last year, we have changed the methodology of reporting for CEPEJ.
In addition, the prosecutor can deal with the case in many ways. We tried to make the data work and the sums to make sense. E.g. Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year + .Incoming/received cases - Processed cases = Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year. However, we would like to state that data comes from various sources and may be sometimes tricky to deal with.
There are many reasons why the prosecution could be discontinued. It is difficult to say under which category they should be included (3.1.2 or 3.1.4). However, the reasons may include following: 1. If such prosecution concerns a person who is exempt from the competencies of the law enforcement authorities or a person for whom the law requires an official consent for their prosecution, if such consent was not awarded by an entitled authority, unless the exemption is temporary or unless the criminal prosecution of the person is inadmissible due to lack of consent only temporarily; 2. if it concerns a person who is below the age of criminal responsibility 3. if it is against a person whose mental illness that occurred after the criminal offence was committed makes it permanently impossible for them to understand the purpose of the criminal prosecution 4. and many others.

Q107 (2018): This year, we have changed the methodology of reporting for CEPEJ, thus some number strongly deiffers from previous data.
Also, there are many other ways how the prosecutor can deal with the case. Thus sum of discontinued during the reference year + Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor + cases brought to court is smaller than number of cases received during the year.

Q107 (2016): The correct number of received cases for 2014 should be 313958.

Q107-1 (2021): There was a legislative change which make several changes regarding the guilty pleas - it easier to plead guilty and achieve guilty plea. The biggest change is that it is possible to get guilty plea for the most serious crimes. As a result the number of guilty pleas is rapidly rising.

Q107-1 (2020): There was a legislative change which make it easier to plead guilty and achieve guilty plea. The biggest change is that it is possible to get guilty plea for the most serious crimes.

Denmark

Q055 (General Comment): The public prosecutors are the Director of Public Prosecutions, the state prosecutors, the police directors as well as the persons who are assumed to assist them in the judicial processing of criminal cases.
Organizationally, the Prosecution Service consists of the Director of Public Prosecutions and state prosecutor's offices (central prosecution service) with associated police districts (local prosecution service).
The Director of Public Prosecutions and selected employees appear before the Supreme Court. At the end of 2021, 58 prosecutors were employed at the Director of Public Prosecutions office. 6 of them appear before the Supreme Court. The Director of Public Prosecutions is superior to the other public prosecutors and supervises them and handles complaints about decisions made by the state prosecutors office as the first instance. The state prosecutors' offices appear before the high courts (second instance – court of appeal). The state prosecutors supervise the police directors' handling of criminal cases and handle complaints about decisions made by the police directors regarding criminal prosecution.
The directors of police and the public prosecutors who are employed by them appear before the district courts.
The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire. This is why the total number of prosecutors does not add up when compared to the number of males and females.

Q055 (2021): The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire. This is why the total number of prosecutors does not add up when compared to the number of males and females.

Q055 (2016): The observed discrepancies are due to ordinary changes in staffing.

Q055 (2014): The variations over the period 2012-2014 are due to the fact that in 2012, information was missing about prosecutors engaged in tasks concerning administrative cases (Ledelsessekretatiat) and prosecutors employed by the national police (Rigspolitiet).

Q107 (General Comment): The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor. The reason that processed cases includes both the police and prosecution service is that we cannot always distinguish closed/finished cases between the police and prosecution service as they are often archived in police departments regardless of who processed the case

Q107 (2021): It is not possible to subtract numbers on discontinued cases in the format in Q 3.1.1. + 3.1.2 + 3.1.4, as the legal basis in Denmark (sections 721 and 749 of the Administration of Justice Act) is not devided in such subsectors.
Regarding point 3.1.3 in question 107, it is not possible to account for one specific reason behind the increased number of discontinued cases for reasons of opportunity. However, during 2021 we have had an increased effort in lowering the amount of pending cases. This can partly explain the surge of discontinued cases in 3.1.3.

Q107 (2020): It is not possible to subtract numbers on discontinued cases in the format in Q 3.1.1. + 3.1.2 + 3.1.4, as the legal basis in Denmark (sections 721 and 749 of the Administration of Justice Act) is not devided in such subsectors. The data source used in points 1 and 4 (data that do not include post-registration of charges) are different from the data source used in points 2 and 3 (data that includes post-registration of charges). Hence, data does not fit the formula: (pending at the beginning of the year + incoming) – resolved = pending at the end of the year) due to post-registrations of further charges. The number of incoming charges has decreased considerably between 2018 and 2020. This is due to a change in the way we measure the number of incoming charges. The new way of measure incoming cases more correctly than the previous way of measuring as the new way contains all incoming charges and not all processed charges as the previous way did. The number of incoming cases in 2018 is 245.687 when using the new way of measuring.

Q107 (2018): Please note that there has been a mistake with the previous data collection for 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014 and 2016 concerning question 107 and 108. This is due to missing information and collection of data from the Danish Administration of Justice Act. In the future we will make sure that every information is incorporated.

Q107 (2016): Cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor include cases concluded by the police as these cases are indistinguishable in the case handling system.
Q107 (2014): The increase in the number of cases charged by the public prosecutor before the courts is a result of an increased preliminary charge rate (police) and an increased prosecution rate (public prosecutor). The conviction rate is unchanged over the period despite the increase in both the preliminary charge rate and the prosecution rate.

Q107-1 (General Comment): Denmark does not have a definition of "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". The answer covers the number of counts (measured by charges per person). In 2021, the number of complexes are 2997. There has been a decrease in the number of guilty plea procedures. The Director of Public Prosecutions has no explanation for this. In Denmark, a guilty plea procedure is concluded by a court hearing, not a main trial. Instead of an indictment, the Prosecution Service sends the case to the court with a charge sheet describing the offence. The court must in a court hearing ensure that the conditions for proceeding the case as a guilty plea procedure are present. The answer regarding whether the case was concluded before/during the main trial differs from last year´s answer, as guilty plea procedures are correctly concluded before the main trial, as the confession must subsequently be validated by a judge.

Q107-1 (2021): Denmark does not have a definition of "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". The answer covers the number of counts (measured by charges per person). In 2021, the number of complexes are 2997. There has been a decrease in the number of guilty plea procedures. The Director of Public Prosecutions has no explanation for this. In Denmark, a guilty plea procedure is concluded by a court hearing, not a main trial. Instead of an indictment, the Prosecution Service sends the case to the court with a charge sheet describing the offence. The court must in a court hearing ensure that the conditions for proceeding the case as a guilty plea procedure are present. The answer regarding whether the case was concluded before/during the main trial differs from last year´s answer, as guilty plea procedures are correctly concluded before the main trial, as the confession must subsequently be validated by a judge. The data is registrered through a case-filing tool, POLSAS. POLSAS is first and foremost a case-filing tool, which may be subject to human entry-error. Furthermore, the number of guilty plea procedures can fluctuate on a yearly basis for a variety of reasons. We cannot conclude anything of substance regarding the decrease without a manual investigation.

Q107-1 (2020): The discrepancy is due to the method of calculation. In 2018 the answer covers the number of complexes of cases, and the answer in 2020 covers the number of counts (measured by charges per person). In 2020 the number om number of complexes are 3.449.

Estonia

Q055 (General Comment): The categorization of questions 55 and 56 regarding public prosecutors do not exist in Estonia.

Q107 (General Comment): The number of incoming cases is given by registered crimes while the number of cases resolved is given by the number of persons in respect of whom a procedural decision has been made.
Q107 (2020): The number of incoming cases is given by registered crimes. the number of cases resolved is given by the number of persons in respect of whom a procedural decision has been made.
Q107 (2018): The data for 2018 evaluation cycle are checked and confirmed. The data are not comparable with 2016, because the source of the data changed.

Q107 (2016): For this cycle, calculations are based on cases not persons or crimes. One case, especially when brought to court or concluded by penalty, often involves several crimes and persons.
Q107 (2012): As to the item “cases charged by the prosecutor before the courts”, the 2010 data referred to settlement proceedings, while the 2012 data includes only cases that were terminated by a prosecutor in case of lack of public interest in proceedings and in case of negligible guilt. These cases are also included under “cases discontinued by the prosecutor”. The category “cases charged by the public prosecutor before the courts” includes cases where a person has been sent to court in order to impose coercive psychiatric treatment by a court and cases which have been sent to court in order to request termination of criminal proceedings (the latter was not taken into account in previous reports).

Q107-1 (2018): The data for 2018 evaluation cycle are checked and confirmed. The data are not comparable with 2016, because the source of the data changed.
Q107-1 (2012): The total number of guilty plea procedures for 2012 was 4 980.

Q109 (2020): Only the ones that are classified as criminal offences.

Q109 (2016): It includes only a minority of traffic offences that are punisheable according to Penal code, these are more serious offences like causing an accident with injured victims, drunk driving above medium-intoxication level and repeated driving without licence.
Q109 (2014): The 2014 data encompasses only severe drunk driving and accidents with serious bodily casualties.

Finland

Q055 (General Comment): The National Prosecution Authority comprises the Office of the Prosecutor General that acts as the general administrative unit, and five prosecution districts: Southern Finland, Western Finland, Northern Finland, Eastern Finland and Åland. The National Prosecution Authority has 34 offices around Finland. The Prosecutor General is the supreme prosecutor and the head of the prosecution service. The Prosecutor General directs and develops prosecutorial activity by issuing general instructions and guidelines to the prosecutors. She/he also appoints district prosecutors. The Prosecutor General may take over a case from a prosecutor, but cannot order a prosecutor to decide the case in any given manner. She/he can also self-decide on the bringing of charges and designate a prosecutor to pursue the case in the courts. The Deputy Prosecutor General decides the matters in his/her competence on the same authority as the Prosecutor General. He/she also acts as a deputy for the Prosecutor General when necessary. For regular prosecutorial tasks, the Office of the Prosecutor General has state prosecutors whose jurisdiction covers the entire country. Most criminal matters (89 256 cases annually) are dealt with by the prosecution areas. The Office of the Prosecutor General deals mainly with criminal cases with wider significance to society as a whole, a few dozen every year. Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances, and every prosecutor is expected to, in a normal situation, to handle and prosecute the criminal case all the way to the Supreme Court, if needed.

Q055 (2020): Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

Q107 (2021): 3.2 Notice cases of summary fines are not included. The number of summary fines in 2021: 34 306.
3.3: Consist of internal transfers of cases between prosecution districts, joining of cases and technical decisions.

Q107 (2020): Comments: 3.2 Notice cases of summary fines are not included. The number of summary fines: 38433.
The decrease in the number of cases “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor” is due to a change in the law. The law on certain type of fine (rangaistusmääräysmenettely) was abolished in 2016 and replaced with the law on fines and summary penalty fee (laki sakon ja rikesakon määräämisestä (754/2010). According to this law, the police can order the summary penal fee. This page, in Finnish, shows figures of the amount in euros of these summary fines imposed by prosecutors (2nd graph) and by the police (3rd graph).
https://www.oikeusrekisterikeskus.fi/fi/index/tietopalvelu/tilastotjaavoindata/sakot.html
3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons and 3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: The prosecutor must waive prosecution if: (1) the prerequisites for the bringing of charges provided in section 6, subsection 1 are not met; (2) the prosecutor waives prosecution on the basis of section 6, subsection 2; (3) the injured party has not requested that charges be brought or another special prerequisite provided in law for the bringing of charges referred to in section 2, subsection 2 is not met and the nature of the case requires that a separate decision be made. The prosecutor may waive prosecution if: (1) if no sentence more severe than a fine is to be anticipated for the offence and the offence, with consideration to its detrimental effects or the degree of culpability of the offender manifested in it, is to be deemed petty as a whole; and (2) if the suspect had not reached the age of eighteen at the time of the commission of the suspected offence and no sentence more severe than a fine or imprisonment for at most six months is to be anticipated for this offence and it is to be deemed to be more the result of lack of understanding or thoughtlessness than of heedlessness of the prohibitions and commands of the law. In addition, the prosecutor may waive prosecution, unless an important public or private interest requires otherwise if: 1) if criminal proceedings and punishment are to be deemed unreasonable or inappropriate in view of a settlement reached by the suspect in the offence and the injured party, the other action of the suspect in the offence to prevent or remove the effects of the offence, the personal circumstances of the suspect in the offence, the other consequences of the act to him or her, the welfare and health care measures undertaken and the other circumstances; (2) under the provisions on joint punishment or on the consideration of previous punishments in sentencing, the suspected offence would not have an essential effect on the total punishment; or (3) the expenses in continuing to consider the case would be in manifest disproportion to the nature of the case and to the sanction possibly to be expected in it. Also, If charges are being considered for two or more offences for which the same person is suspected and if he or she has contributed to the clarification of one or more of the suspected offences, the prosecutor may decide not to bring charges for all of the suspected offences. However, charges shall be brought if required by an important public or private interest.

Q107 (2018): With regard to the observed decrease in the number of cases "concluded by a penalty", there were 507 penalty notices given by the prosecutor in 2016 but only 23 in 2018.
Q107 (2016): The number of discontinued cases during the reference year includes the number of cases in which the prosecutor has waved the charges before trial and restricted the preliminary investigation in a way that the case is not brought to trial. For 2014, only the cases in which the prosecutor has waved the charges before trial have been informed.

Q107 (2014): The number of 1st instance criminal cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor decreased over the years 2010, 2012 and 2014. According to the annual report for 2014 of the Prosecution Service, the number of summary penal judgments decreased by 9 % (2013 – 2014; 59 in numbers). According to the report of 2013, the number of summary penal judgments decreased by almost 19 % (2012 – 2013; 151 in numbers). Some organisational changes were carried out during that time period. Besides, the number of incoming cases decreased, but the degree of difficulty/complexity increased.
Q107-1 (General Comment): The possibility of plea bargaining was introduced to the Finnish legal system in the beginning of year 2015. The aim of the reform was to allocate the resources of the national authorities in a more effective way and to speed up both the pre-trial phase of the criminal process and the court proceedings. A defendant can agree to plead guilty to a particular charge in exchange for a more lenient sentence. The prosecutor may also decide not to prosecute for one or for several of the suspected crimes. Plea bargaining can be used if the injured party has no demands in the matter and if he/she agrees to plea bargaining. Plea bargaining can be used when a person is suspected of a crime carrying a maximum sentence of six years' imprisonment. It cannot be used for crimes like homicide, causing bodily injury and sex offences or when the injured party is a child. Plea bargain is also applicable for white-collar crimes.

Q107-1 (2020): The known number of guilty plea procedures is 80. However, the number could be higher as the use of this procedure is not systematically reported, especially when it takes place during the main trial.
Q107-1 (2018): There were less than 100 plea bargaining cases in 2018. The exact number is not available.

Q107-1 (2016): The possibility of plea bargaining was introduced to the Finnish legal system in the beginning of this year. A defendant can agree to plead guilty to a particular charge in exchange for a more lenient sentence. The prosecutor may also decide not to prosecute for one or for several of the suspected crimes. Plea bargaining can be used if the injured party has no demands in the matter and if he/she agree to plea bargaining. Plea bargaining can be used when a person is suspected of a crime carrying a maximum sentence of six years' incarceration. It cannot be used for crimes like homicide, causing bodily injury and sex offences or when the injured party is a child. Plea bargain is also applicable for white-collar crimes. Legislation regarding plea bargaining was approved in August 2014, and the changes entered into force on 1 January 2015. The aim of the reform was to allocate the resources of the national authorities in a more effective way and to speed up both the pre-trial phase of the criminal process and the court proceedings. The Parliament has required the Ministry of Justice to follow up on and evaluate how the legislation on plea bargaining is being applied and implemented and to provide the Law Committee with a report on how the legislation functions by the end of 2017.

Q107-1 (2014): The possibility of plea bargaining was introduced in 2015. A defendant can agree to plead guilty to a particular charge in exchange for a more lenient sentence. The prosecutor may also decide not to prosecute for one or for several of the suspected crimes. Plea bargaining can be used if the injured party has no demands in the matter and if s/he agrees to plea bargaining. It can be used when a person is suspected of a crime carrying a maximum sentence of six years' incarceration. It cannot be used for crimes like homicide, causing bodily injury and sex offences or when the injured party is a child. Plea bargain is also applicable for white-collar crimes.

France

Q055 (2021): Data taken from an extraction of the LOLFI SIRH - Number of public prosecutors on 31/12/2021. The values are expressed in FTEs.
Source DSJ
The data have been rounded upwards from 0.5 and downwards below, with the exception of the data relating to the number of male prosecutors at the Courts of appeal (the exact figure is 249.6) in order to ensure vertical consistency.

Q055 (2020): Only the judicial order is concerned

Q055 (2014): For 2014, State prosecutors, heads of public prosecution services, are included.

Q055 (2012): For 2012, only prosecutors of courts of law appointed by 31 December 2012 were counted.

Q107 (General Comment): The complexity and diversity of data on criminal cases do not allow an estimation of the number of pending cases.
Q107 (2021): source SDSE

Q107 (2016): Among the cases discontinued by the public prosecutor, a distinction should be carried out between the mass of cases that could not be prosecuted because they were not elucidated or insufficiently characterized (3112642) and cases that could be prosecuted but were dismissed in accordance with the opportunity principle (191430).

Q107-1 (2021):
source SDSE
Increase in the number of guilty plea procedures: 2020 was marked by a significant drop in activity (caused by the lawyers' strike movement initiated in the second half of 2019 and which continued at the beginning of 2020, then by the slowdown in court activity under the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic and successive lockdowns of the population) and 2021 by a return to normal activity in the courts. It is also necessary to take into account the impact of the law n° 2019-222 of 23 March 2019 on the nature of cases under the CRPC procedure.

Q107-1 (2016): The procedure of appearance on preliminary admission of guilt is a form of prosecution initiated by the prosecutor. In 2016, this procedure was initiated against 92213 perpetrators. Some of these proceedings failed either because the author failed to appear, or because no agreement could be reached on the sentence, or because the judge refused to approve the agreement between the author of the offence, his/her lawyer and the prosecutor. In 2016, the courts certified 75055 convictions in court on a plea of guilty.

Q107-1 (2014): It was not possible to distinguish between guilty plea agreements before the case is brought to court and guilty plea agreements concluded during judicial proceedings. Only the public prosecutor has competence for initiating such procedure when the facts are admitted. To a lesser extent, the procedure may take place at the end of a judicial investigation, before referring the case to court. The guilty plea procedure is often used for less serious offences.

Q109 (2021): source SDSE

Germany

Q055 (General Comment): The information relates to the number of job shares for public prosecutors. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons. The information on the job shares count a judge working full-time as 1. A judge working part-time is counted as the fraction of 1 which corresponds to the proportion of his/her working hours to full-time (e.g. 0.5 for a judge working half the usual number of hours).

Q055 (2021): Figures represent full-time equivalents as of 31. December 2021
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a 'Pact for the Rule of Law'. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
It should be noted that one of goals of the 'Pact for the Rule of Law' is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

Q055 (2020): Figures represent full-time equivalents as of 31. December 2020
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a 'Pact for the Rule of Law'. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
It should be noted that one of goals of the 'Pact for the Rule of Law' is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

Q055 (2016): Figures indicate the number of full-time equivalent staff (not the number of individuals). A prosecutor working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). A prosecutor working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for a prosecutor working half the usual number of hours).

Q107 (General Comment): General information on the public prosecution statistic used as a source for anwering this question:
Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the public prosecution statistic. Statistical ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistic. The public prosecution offices collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the statistical ordinance provides two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural survery" that collects data on the specifics of the investigation proceedings carried out by the public prosecution and the "monthly survey" that collects data on the caseload and other workload of the public prosecution offices. The figures entered here do not include investigations against persons unknown. The public prosecution statistic only shows the number of charges filed against unknown perpetrators. Information on the further treatment of those charges is not available. This is because the monthly survey distinguishes between "caseload of investigation proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other workload". Charges against persons unknown fall into the category "other workload". The number of resolved and pending cases is only collected with regard to the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys). If a suspect is identified in cases with an unknown perpetrator, the case receives a new file-number and then appears in the the category "covered by the procedural surveys".

Q107 (2021): 3.2 Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor:
The number represents the the cases that were discontinued in accordance with Section 153a of the Code of Criminal Procedure ("Non-prosecution subject to imposition of conditions and directions")
These cases would also fit into the category "discontinued for reasons of opportunity" (3.1.3) but were allocated to 3.2 here.
3.1.4 The number of cases discontinued for other reasons in the public prosecution statistic 2020 (and previous years) was considerably higher due to a programming issue in one of the Länder. Many of the cases that were registered in this category should have actually been registered within the category "discontinued for reasons of opportunity". The issue was noticed and fixed at the end of 2020.

Q107 (2020): 3.2 Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor:
The number represents the the cases that were discontinued in accordance with Section 153a of the Code of Criminal Procedure ("Non-prosecution subject to imposition of conditions and directions")
These cases would also fit into the category "discontinued for reasons of opportunity" (3.1.3) but were allocated to 3.2 here.

Q107 (2018): These figures include first-instance criminal cases led by the public prosecution offices based at the Regional Courts (investigations with a "Js" file number) and the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (investigations with an "OJs" file number). Regarding the latter ("OJs" investigations), figures only exist for the number of cases newly received by the prosecutor generals' offices.
Q107 (2016): These figures include first-instance criminal cases led by the public prosecution offices based at the Regional Courts (investigations with a "Js" file number) and the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (investigations with an "OJs" file number). Regarding the latter ("OJs" investigations), figures only exist for the number of cases newly received by the prosecutor generals' offices.

Greece

Q055 (General Comment): In the position of Paredron of the court of First Instance and prosecutor's office Of civil and criminal courts are appointed graduates of the National School of judges, according to what is defined in Article 36 of N. 4871/2021 (a' 246). The graduates from the directions of civil-criminal judges and prosecutors of the National School of judges are appointed in the order which have in the relevant tables and are placed preferably, respectively, in the courts of First Instance and in Public Prosecutors ' Offices In Athens, Piraeus, Thessaloniki, Patras, Heraklion and Larissa. The paredroi of First Instance and the prosecutor's office have ten (10) months trial service, during of which they have all the rights and obligations of the ordinary judicial officer and inspected, like regular judges. The reports of the paredroi of the court of First Instance on performance, statistics of their performance and any other useful information or information on the performance or their suitability are stored in a specialist individual file, which, after the end of the trial service the file is submitted to the Supreme Court Council through the Minister of Justice.

Q055 (2021): The above data are given by the Directorate of organization and operation of Justice with the cooperation of JUSTSTAT.
Q055 (2020): Positions by law have increased.Gender data are not kept.

Q107 (2021): The definition of the pending cases includes postponed cases or the cases the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn't been determined during the year. The fact is that the theoretical pending cases resulted from pending cases on 1st of January + Incoming cases (cases are related to reference + previous years). However, pending cases on 31 Dec. are only the cases that have not been determined, or cases that have been determined after the reference year. All of the pending cases on 31 of Dec. are related only to the reference year.
Considering that this is the first year where offices calculate their pending cases, and some of them do not have electronical systems to monitor their data, in the next years we will get better and more accurate statistics.

Q107 (2020): No data available for this query.
Q107 (2016): The relevant data are not available electronically for the moment, therefore their extraction is not possible.

Q107-1 (2020): No data available for this query.

Hungary

Q055 (2021): On 31 December 2021, two prosecutors were serving in the Ministry of Justice, on a temporary basis. They are included in the total number of prosecutors; however, they are not taken into account when giving the number of prosecutors serving at different instances (court levels). All prosecutors are appointed to a full-time job; however, it occurs that some prosecutors perform part-time service on a temporary basis for various reasons, such as raising children.
The 'number of prosecutors at first instance level' is an aggregate of the number of prosecutors serving at district-level prosecution services and other prosecution services equivalent to that level, as well as the number of prosecutors serving at high prosecution services. A part of the prosecutors serving at high prosecution services proceed also at second instance (high court) level. The number of prosecutors serving at high prosecution services is 520 (226 males, 294 females), while the number of prosecutors serving at district-level prosecution services (other prosecution services equivalent to that level) is 1210 (439 males, 771 females).
The 'number of prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level' means the number of prosecutors serving at appellate prosecution services.

Q055 (2016): Another 9 prosecutors were temporarily serving in the Ministry of Justice. They are included in the total number of prosecutors, but we did not take them into account at each level.

Q107 (General Comment): The data source was, similarly to our previous data provision, the Statistical Subsystem of Completed Criminal Proceedings of the Uniform Investigative Authority and Prosecution Service Statistics (ENyÜBS-BBS). In the ENyÜBS-BBS, data are recorded when the investigating authorities or the prosecution service have taken a procedural decision (e.g. dismissal of a criminal complaint, discontinuation, suspension, indictment) in relation to a criminal act which has led to the statistical reporting of the data. The ENyUBS-BBS subsystem is therefore a so-called follow-up system in terms of the time of the data-recording, and therefore does not show the number of offences occurred in the year under review, but the number of acts/conducts in respect of which a legal decision has been taken and, in relation thereof, statistical reporting (of registrative nature) has been done. From the above it follows that it is not excluded that there are ongoing criminal proceedings that are not yet included in the ENyÜBS database.

Q107 (2021): As to 'Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year' and 'Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year', please note that the number of pending cases at a given day is not recorded in the database operated by the prosecution service. As to 'Processed cases' (3.), please note that the database of the prosecution service records the number of cases where one or more procedural acts were performed by the prosecution service; besides that, it records the number of procedural acts regarding each type of act.

Q107 (2020): 3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons:
If the Special Part of the Penal Code regulates the conduct of the accused after the commencement of the proceedings as a ground for termination of criminal liability.
3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons:At the stage of preparation of the prosecution, Section 221 / A (7) of the Criminal Procedure Act provides that if the mediation proceedings are successful and the application of Section 29 (1) of the Criminal Code is appropriate, the prosecutor shall terminate the proceedings.

Q107-1 (2021): The guilty plea procedure as such does not exist in the Hungarian legal system; however, the new Code of Criminal Proceedings has introduced the so-called plea agreement, which is, in essence, a similar instrument.

Q107-1 (2020): This procedure exists only from 1 July 2018, following the entry into force of the Act XC of 2017 on the new criminal procedure law. In the event that the prosecution can prove the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt and there is no opportunity to explain what happened in an acceptable manner, the accused will do his best to admit the act and avoid a lengthy trial.
Q107-1 (2018): This procedure exists only from 1 July 2018, following the entry into force of the Act XC of 2017 on the nwe criminal procedure law.
Q109 (2012): In 2012, the total number of traffic offences cases was 3 084.

Ireland

Q055 (General Comment): Allocation of prosecutors work is not in all instances divided as per the questions above. The sub-categories at 1, 2 and 3 of the question posed do not apply in the Irish system.

Q055 (2020): Our court going staff number at the 31st December 2020 is 128 - (50 male / 78 female). This figure includes our Prosecutors and Technical staff - Legal Executive. It also includes 1 Trainee Solicitor. In our Office our Technical Staff and Trainee Solicitors are court going staff and manage the running of a prosecution at trial in the same manner as some of our Prosecutors. In relation to the increase in staff resources for the ODPP, and the context for same, please see the forewords of our Annual Report 2020 and our Annual Report 2019 available at https://www.dppireland.ie/publication-category/annual-reports/.
Q055 (2018): There were 108.7 fulltime equivalent lawyers (fte) (headcount 111) on the payroll of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at 31 December 2018 – 65.6 fte (67 headcount) of these were female and 43.1 fte (44 headcount) were male.
Q055 (2016): Of the staff complement in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at the end of the reference year, 102 were of professional or technical grade at Prosecutor equivalent level or above.

Q055 (2014): Parts' of Full Time Equivalents were counted in decimal figures and have been rounded up. The total represents the number of qualified Solicitors and Barristers employed directly in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). A proportion of these lawyers represent the DPP in the District Court. Members of the police force also prosecute in this court within a prescribed 'delegated authority' from the DPP. Members of the independent Bar act on behalf of the DPP, on a self-employed basis, in first instance and appellate courts. There are a further 32 State Solicitors contracted to provide a solicitor service to the DPP in cases heard outside of the capital.

Q107 (General Comment): As many of our cases are prosecuted by State Solicitors we don't have any data on the status of a case between the time the direction is issued and when we receive the final outcome; this is for matters on indictment. For summary cases outside of Dublin, we rarely even if ever hear back on the outcome as these directions are passed on to the police by the State Solicitor and the police execute the direction to prosecute without reference to the State Solicitor. This may change in the future if outcome data is exchange using the Criminal Justice Operational Hub. Summary cases outside of Dublin would make up a significant proportion of the files given in our figures.
As per the instructions provided, cases are counted per prosecution file which could include more than one suspect and multiple charges preferred. Therefore, the figure give for 'Discontinued' in 107.3.1 is the number of distinct files where a suspect was directed for 'no prosecution'; in some of these files, other suspects on the file may have been prosecuted in the courts.

Q107 (2021): There has been a significant increase in files received by the office in the last number of years - this is partially due to the increase in complexity of offences and investigations.
These figures were compiled by the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and will be included in the Annual Report 2021 which is published annually on the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions website. Caution should be exercised when comparing these statistics with statistics published by other organisations such as the Courts Service or An Garda Síochána. The statistics published here are based on our own classification and categorisation systems and may in some cases not be in line with the classification systems of other organisations.
Q.3.4: indictable offences

Q107 (2018): *14,856 files in total were received in 2018 including appeals of which 11,647 related to first instance cases .

Q107 (2012): Figures provided for 2012 reflect 2011 data.

Q109 (General Comment): In the vast majority of cases involving traffic offences, the police service (An Garda Síochána) will prefer charges without reference to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Only in the more serious of such cases, including causing death by dangerous driving, will the Office of the DPP receive files for a decision whether to prosecute or not. Any such traffic offence cases received by the Office of the DPP and decided upon would normally be included in the figures.

Italy

Q055 (2016): There is no specific explanation concerning the increase in the total number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level. However, numbers are small and therefore percentage changes vary more harshly.
Q107-1 (General Comment): As a matter of fact in Italy there is no "guilty plea procedure" as such. However, if someone pleads guilty there are special procedures to speed up the proceedings.

Latvia

Q055 (2020): The increase in the number of prosecutors in court district level prosecutor's offices is related to the imposition of an obligation on the prosecutor of the court district level prosecutor's office, and not on the chief prosecutor of the district (city) prosecutor's office to perform the duties of a higher prosecutor.
Regarding the decrease in the number of women working in the Prosecutor General's Office, it must be concluded that in total the number of women working has decreased by 8 persons. One of the reasons could be reaching the maximum age for performing the duties prescribed by law or the death of a person.

Q055 (2012): During 2011 and 2012, prosecutors' offices increased the number of posts which resulted in the appointment of new prosecutors. In order to decide on the promotion of prosecutors, their professional qualification has been evaluated and their quality of work performance analysed, as well as their participation in trainings, work statistical indicators, etc. Pursuant to the collected data, more male prosecutors have been promoted to higher posts.

Q107 (2021): Cases brought to court: 6061 cases with the total number of criminal offenses - 11008.
Number of incoming cases in 2021 was 11 529. This includes cases received: for initiation of criminal prosecution; after the division of cases or during the phase of investigation; in accordance with urgent procedures; from the court for the elimination of violations/deficiencies; taken over for investigation; restored previously terminated or suspended cases.
The vertical consistency cannot be ensured because in 2021 there were 370 cases that were added to other cases and 82 cases were returned to the investigative authorities to continue the investigation. These cases are not included in the subcategories of Q107. 3.1.2. Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation - according to Article 380 of the Criminal Procedure Law these preconditions (stated in Article 377, Clauses 1, 2 and 10 of the Criminal Procedure Law) are exonerating circumstances. Data for the year 2020 included also other clauses of Article 377 that contain circumstances that do not exonerate persons, which explains the remarkable difference in numbers. Accordingly, 3.1.3. has increased by the number of relevant cases (that also constitute reasons of opportunity).
3.1.4. Discontinued for other reasons: the cases included in this category are, for example, the cases in which the prosecutor took a decision to terminate criminal proceedings by conditionally releasing from criminal liability a person who has been accused of committing a serious crime and who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime that is more serious or dangerous than the criminal offence committed by the relevant person himself / herself (Paragraph prim of Section 415 of the Criminal Procedure Law). The information compiled in the information system of the Prosecution Office shows that in 2021, prosecutors took 9 decisions to terminate criminal proceedings based on the aforementioned Paragraph. Besides, for 2021, there are 675 cases in which criminal proceedings were suspended included in this category.
Just like for the year 2020, 365 cases in which the prosecutor took a decision to terminate the criminal proceedings by conditionally releasing a person from criminal liability for the commission of a criminal offense or a less serious crime were included in the category “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor". This, along with the recommendation included in the Operational Strategy of the Prosecution Office 2022-2027- on the completion of the criminal proceedings in the Prosecution Office where possible, also explains the increase in the latter category. 3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: the cases included in this category are, for example, the cases in which the Prosecutor General has made a decision to terminate criminal proceedings against a person who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime that is more serious or dangerous than a criminal offence committed by such person himself / herself. In 2021, Prosecutor General has not terminated any criminal proceedings based on Article 410 of the Criminal Procedure Law. For 2021, in this category there are 285 cases included that were sent on the basis of the jurisdiction (including – abroad).
4 Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref year: The number has increased mainly due to the COVID-19 pandemic (that affected the timely execution of procedural/investigative actions).
3.4. In 2021 there has been a significant decrease of the number of initiated criminal proceedings (-17%), furthermore the number of criminal proceedings completed in the prosecutor's office has increased (+26%).

Q107 (2020): Cases brought to court
8088 cases with the total number of criminal offenses - 14158
The vertical consistency cannot be ensured because in 2020, there were 520 cases that were added to other cases and 91 cases were returned to the investigative authorities to continue the investigation. These cases are not included in the subcategories of Q107. 3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons: the cases included in this category are, for example, the cases in which the prosecutor took a decision to terminate criminal proceedings by conditionally releasing from criminal liability a person who has been accused of committing a serious crime and who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime that is more serious or dangerous than the criminal offence committed by the relevant person himself / herself. The information compiled in the information system of the Prosecution Office shows that in 2020, prosecutors took 2 decisions to terminate criminal proceedings based on Paragraph prim of Section 415 of the Criminal Procedure Law. Besides, for 2020, in this category are included 955 cases in which criminal proceedings were suspended.
3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: the cases included in this category are, for example, the cases in which the Prosecutor General has made a decision to terminate criminal proceedings against a person who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime that is more serious or dangerous than a criminal offence committed by such person himself / herself. In 2020, Prosecutor General has not terminated any criminal proceedings based on Article 410 of the Criminal Procedure Law. For 2020, in this category are included 285 cases that were sent in accordance with the relevant jurisdiction (including – abroad). The category “3.1. Discontinued during the reference year” decreased because 365 cases in which the prosecutor took a decision to terminate the criminal proceedings by conditionally releasing a person from criminal liability for the commission of a criminal offense or a less serious crime were included in the category “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor". This also explains the increase in the latter category.

Q107 (2018): Cases brought to court
8887 cases with the total number of criminal offenses - 14569

Q107 (2016): Cases brought to court
10022 cases with the total number of criminal offenses - 16892

Q107-1 (2016): In 2016, the Prosecution Office sent a total of 699 cases to the court, in which there was concluded an agreement regarding admission of guilt and a punishment. Of all sent cases, in 21 occasions the court did not approve an agreement entered into during the pre-trial criminal proceedings. Thus in total, in 2016, the court approved 678 agreements concluded by the prosecutor at the pre-trial stage. However, data on the number of agreements approved in the court process (court) were not collected separately in 2016. Accordingly, data on the number of agreements approved in the court process (court) and in total are not available for 2016.

Q107-1 (2012): In 2012, 233 cases were brought to court by public prosecutors under a guilty plea procedure.

Q109 (2021): Data from Accountancy system

Q109 (2016): In accordance with the Latvian legal system on traffic offenses, a person can also be punished administratively, for example, for driving a vehicle under the influence of alcohol, narcotic drugs or other intoxicating substances. Therefore, in this specific case, we would like to emphasize the fact that the indicated number of cases does not include any road traffic violations that are provided for by the Latvian Administrative Violations Code. At the moment, having evaluated the comment received from you, we consider that it is acceptable to rectify the previously given response in Q-109 by indicating "Yes", as it includes road traffic violations for the commission of which there is provided criminal liability

Lithuania

Q055 (2020): After the reorganization of the prosecution service in 2011, 5 second instance prosecutors' offices were merged with 51 separate first instance prosecutor's office in their area of operation, and thus 5 regional first-second instance prosecutor's offices were established.
Q055 (2014): In 2012, the 56 territorial prosecutor’s offices have been reorganised into 5 regional prosecutor’s offices with 10 district prosecutor’s offices functioning inside them (first instance and second instance levels have been combined). Currently, only two instances exist.
Q055 (2012): In 2012, after reorganization of the prosecution service, the first and the second instances have merged. Currently, two instances exist instead of three. Besides, the total number of prosecutors has decreased because some prosecutors have left the service, but no new prosecutors have been recruited.
Q107 (2021): The number of registered crimes is gradually decreasing since 2017 in Lithuania, and this also affects other numbers.
Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Lithuania: the numbers are correct. Vertical inconsistency is a result of different sources of data and differences in formulas for calculating some statistical indicators. Numbers of „Pending cases“ and „Incoming cases“ are taken from the national register, however number of „Processed cases“ is taken from registers of the Lithuanian Prosecution Service.
Q107 (2020): Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: cases closed under Paragraph 3 Article 68 of the Criminal Procedure Code - when criminal act has been committed in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania by a citizen of a foreign country or other person who have subsequently left the Republic of Lithuania, the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Lithuania may request foreign country to take over the criminal case. When criminal case is taken over by another country, the one in Lithuania is discontinued. The number of registered crimes is gradually decreasing since 2017 in Lithuania, and this affects number of incoming cases, processed cases, discontinued cases and cases brought to court.
The reason for the non-compliance of the result of the formula used ((pending cases on 1 January 2020 + incoming cases) – processed cases = pending cases on 31 December 2020) is a result of different sources of data and their differing formulas for calculating some statistical indicators. Numbers of „Pending cases“ and „Incoming cases“ is taken from the national register, however number of „Processed cases“ is taken from registers of the Lithuanian Prosecution Service.

Q107 (2014): In contrast with the 2012 data, the 2014 data includes cases in connected investigations.

Q107 (2012): The category “cases charged before the courts” also encompasses cases discontinued by the court on the prosecutor’s request, when the measures of criminal effect can be imposed on the persons concerned.The increase in the number of cases received by the prosecutor stems from the Lithuanian economic situation and the national economic priorities, as well as from the entry into force of the Law on Domestic Violence (2011). Criminal investigation became compulsory regarding every single incident of domestic violence. Over the last few years, the prosecution service had been seeking to complete criminal investigations under economy procedures - imposing penal or reformative measures, deciding the case with a penal order or using the accelerated process.

Q107-1 (2018): On 1st January 2017 driving under the influence of alcohol has been criminalized. The majority of these cases are brought to court through the guilty plea procedure.

Q107-1 (2012): The 2012 data does not include criminal cases that were brought before court with the bill of indictment. It includes cases that were brought before court with the criminal order under a simplified procedure, and also cases that were discontinued by court on non-rehabilitating grounds.
Q109 (General Comment): A traffic offence is qualified as criminal when it causes health impairment to another person, or the offender has been driving under influence of alcohol, narcotic, psychotropic of other psychoactive substances and his/her driving resulted in health impairment to or death of another person. Other traffic offences are qualified under the administrative legislation.

Luxembourg

Q055 (General Comment): The figure in point 3 includes both second instance and Supreme Court prosecutors, as they are grouped together in the Superior Court of Justice, which is subdivided into the Court of Appeal and the Court of Cassation.

Q055 (2018): Le personnel des juridictions judiciaires et administratives a connu une croissance soutenue ces dernières années, tel que prévu par la loi modifiée du 7 mars 1980 sur l'organisation judiciaire. Ceci explique les variations importantes observées entre 2016 et 2018 au niveau du personnel de la magistrature et du personnel non-juge. Les magistrats appartenant à la cellule de renseignement financier (CRF) sont dorénavant exclus de la question 55.1 (suite au détachement de la CRF du Parquet de Luxembourg) puisqu'ils n'exercent plus de fonction juridictionnelle proprement dite. Au total, la CRF compte 4 magistrats et un attaché de justice en 2018. L'effectif du Parquet d'arrondissement reste toutefois inchangé suite à la création des nouveaux postes affectés à la CRF
Les magistrats du pool de complément sont inclus dans les chiffres de la question 55.3.

Q055 (2016): The number of prosecutors indicated here as working at the Supreme Court corresponds to the number of prosecutors working at the Superior Court of Justice (which includes prosecutors intervening at the Court of Appeal and Court of Cassation level).
Q055 (2014): The number of male public prosecutors decreased between 2012 and 2014, while the number of female public prosecutors increased for the same period. These variations have for sole explanation the normal progress of career of magistrates of the public prosecution office at first instance.
Q107 (2021): 3.1.4 " Discontinued for other reasons": due to the continuing pandemic in 2021, no "Choice18 +" measures could be initiated, nor processed, during this year. Similarly, driving courses were suspended due to the pandemic and did not resume until October 2021.
3.2 "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor": the increase in the number of cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor between 2020 and 2021 cannot be explained by a single event. The increase is mainly due to the growing number of warnings issued by the prosecution service, which is on the one hand the result of punctual measures related to the health crisis and on the other hand depends on the subject matter of the cases dealt with, as warnings are usually issued in less serious cases.

Q107 (2020): "The cases referred to under 3.2. shall be considered closed if the party concerned complies with the condition imposed by the warning or fulfills its obligations arising from the mediation. In case of non-compliance, the public action will resume.
3.1.4: These are essentially two specific measures: firstly, in the area of traffic, the obligation to follow a driving course and, only for young offenders of full age, participation in a course in the Choice 18+ program for the prevention of drug addiction (https://www.solina.lu/fr/facilities/impuls/)."
Q107 (2018): L'augmentation du nombre d'affaires classées s'explique essentiellement au niveau des affaires de police. Depuis 2017, le nombre d'affaires nouvelles a considérablement augmenté, ce qui explique partiellement le nombre important d'affaires classées en la matière. Cet accroissement des affaires ouvertes est lié à l'introduction du système de contrôle et de sanction automatisés (CSA) au cours de l'année 2016, qui a mené à une augmentation importante des affaires de circulation (vitesse), des infractions constatées via des radars fixes et mobiles. En plus, des changements au niveau de la gestion de ces affaires CSA au parquet a engendré le classement d'un nombre important d'affaires en 2018, ce qui contribue à la variation importante des affaires classées observée entre 2016 et 2018. Les affaires reçues par le procureur au cours de l'année de référence incluent les affaires 'Sans Auteur Identifié' (SAI) qui sont provisoirement classées dans l'attente de l'identification d'un auteur. En 2018, 24 799 affaires étaient qualifiées SAI.

Q107-1 (2021): In 2020 and 2021, health measures only allowed the physical presence of a reduced number of persons in hearings compared to previous years. To continue to work efficiently and resolve cases, prosecutors' offices have, as far as possible, given preference to the procedure of judgement by agreement (procédure du jugement sur accord), as it requires less physical presence of parties, defence counsel, witnesses, etc. Moreover, since the procedure of judgment by agreement was only introduced in 2015, the habit of resorting to this measure has only become established in recent years among lawyers, who now take the initiative themselves more often to launch this procedure.

Q107-1 (2020): In 2020, the sanitary measures did allow only a reduced number of people in the court hearings compared to previous years. In order to continue to work effectively and to resolve cases, the state prosecutors' offices decided to resort to the guilty plea procedure, since it does not require the same amount of physical presence of the parties, the defenders, witnesses, etc.
Q107-1 (2018): The "transaction pénale" introduced by a law of February 24th, 2015 under the name of "jugement sur accord" enables the prosecutor and the defendant to "negotiate" a penal judgment that will be rendered executory by the courts.

Q107-1 (2016): The "transaction pénale" introduced by a law of February 24th, 2015 under the name of "jugement sur accord" and enables tht prosecutor and the defendant to "negotiate" a penal judgment that will be rendered executory by the courts.

Malta

Q055 (General Comment): All the lawyers working in the Office of the AG prosecute cases in the criminal courts, but it is not possible, as yet to distinguish between 1st and 2nd Instance Courts. All full-time lawyers have been included in the above figure except the AG herself.
Q055 (2020): The increase in the number of lawyers working at the Office of the AG follows the reform in 2020 whereby the AG has taken up exclusively the role of prosecutor general (the advisory role to government has been vested in the State Advocate). Given this special focus, the Office of the AG has been recruiting more lawyers in order to meet the case demands of the courts.
Q055 (2016): All the lawyers at the Office of the Attorney General work both in Court as well as advisers to the various Ministries and Departments. All prosecuting officers at the Office of the Attorney General act at all court levels. Thus, prosecutors are not classified according to the case instance.
Q055 (2014): These past few years there has been an increase in the number of female law graduates, which will definitely reflect in the employment trends within this sector.
Q107 (2021): The Office of the Attorney General is in the process of setting up a comprehensive case management system that will keep track of all the cases that are processed by the OAG. Until then, the cases quoted above are all cases prosecuted in court at 1st Instance.
The high pending caseload at the beginning of 2021 is a direct result of the inefficiencies experienced during the Covid-19 pandemic. In fact throughout 2020, given that most of the year the courts of justice were closed, the number of incoming cases far exceeding the number of resolved cases. This led to a low CR and a concomitant high pending caseload.

Q107 (2016): The criminal cases brought to court at 1st Instance are prosecuted by the Police and not by the attorneys working in the Office of the AG.
Q109 (2016): Traffic offences are listed with the 1st instance cases filed in front of the Court of Magistrates, Criminal Jurisdiction.

Netherlands

Q055 (General Comment): The Dutch Supreme Court does not have public prosecutors. The office of the Procurator General and Advocates-General at the Dutch Supreme Court is separate from Dutch public prosecution and the Ministry of Justice. They have a different function.
Q055 (2020): The Supreme Court does not have (public) prosecutors. The office of the procurator general and attorneys general that the Supreme Court houses, is separate from the public prosecution and does not function as prosecution. They have a different function.
Q055 (2016): total 927,5 358,12 569,38
1 842,25 312,72 529,53
2 85,25 45,40 39,85
Q055 (2014): For 2014, the number of prosecutors at first instance level includes 8 prosecutors who are still in education (7 females; 1 male). Prosecutors at Supreme Court level are not employees of the National Prosecution Service and therefore not included in the total.
Q107 (General Comment): The number of pending cases at the end of the year cannot equal pending cases at the start of the year + incoming cases – processed cases, because a specific type of case can only be counted in the stock when the file has been judged, not when they are pending. This is for criminal cases where an order is given, but the case is then returned because the order cannot be executed. This specific case type return to the stock, but cannot be measured in the system the public prosecution uses. Once those cases are assessed again and stream out, they become visible in the numbers in the system.
Pending cases are cases that are yet to be judged and for which a hearing has to be planned. Cases for which the hearing has been planned, are not included in this number.

Q107 (2021): Pending cases are cases that are yet to be judged and for which a hearing has to be planned. Cases for which the hearing has been planned, are not included in this number.
Discrepancy comment Pending cases January: The way in which pending cases were counted changed in August 2020, before that time a large number of cases were included that had already been dealt with administratively. Those cases are now excluded from the number of pending cases, which explains the difference in numbers between pending cases Jan 2020 and and pending cases Jan 2021.

Q107 (2020): The number of pending cases at the end of the year cannot equal pending cases at the start of the year + incoming cases – processed cases because a certain type of case can only be counted in the stock when the file has been judged, not when they are pending. These cases are criminal cases where an order is given, but they are then returned because the order cannot be executed. These criminal cases return to the stock, but cannot be measured in the system the public prosecution uses. Once a case like that it assessed again and streams out, it becomes visible in the numbers of the system.

Q107 (2016): In 2014 there were no assistent officers. The lower input results in lower output.

Q107 (2012): The category “cases discontinued for reasons of opportunity” concerns minor cases and covers cases solved by the suspects and victims themselves and cases considered too old to be still prosecuted. Since 2012, these kinds of cases are not filtered anymore by the police and are registered at the public prosecution offices. In 2012, the number of cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the prosecutor, increased due to the Law on Public Prosecution sanctions. The latter extended the possibility for the public prosecution to impose sanctions itself, independently of the Judicial (sentence disposal).

Q107-1 (2021): In 2021, there were experiments with judgement agreements (vonnisafspraken) and trial agreements (procesafspraken), see eg. https://www.bjutijdschriften.nl/tijdschrift/NTS/2022/2/NTS_2666-6553_2022_003_002_003. These experiments were evaluated, and further specified in directives and instructions in 2022. The numbers are not yet available.

Q109 (General Comment): They include traffic offences, but NOT traffic violations. Only serious traffic issues are prosecuted as traffic offence, the less serious as violation or administrative justice (wet Mulder).
Q109 (2020): These include traffic offences, but NOT traffic violations. Only serious traffic issues are prosecuted as traffic offence, the less serious as violation of even administrative justice (wet Mulder).

Poland

Q055 (General Comment): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. Whereas under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of a prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices, since according to Article 16 of the Law of 28 January 2016 - Law on Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66) the common organizational units of the prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices. All items (1-3) include prosecutors for military matters.
The inclusion of the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutors' offices only in the total number of prosecutors is due to the design of the table. The table allows prosecutors to be entered: 1. first level, 2. second level 3. highest level. The table does not provide an opportunity to depict the full structure of the prosecutor's office in Poland, which consists of four levels: district, circuit and regional prosecutor's offices and the National Prosecutor's Office with a rank equivalent to the Supreme Court. Regional prosecutors' offices are a separate ('third') level of prosecution and the number of prosecutors employed in them cannot be 'split into instances'.

Q055 (2021): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. In contrast, under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of prosecutor of the National Prosecuting Authority. The total is higher than the sum of the sub-categories, as it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 402 prosecutors (154 women and 248 men), as, pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2022, item 1247), the common organisational units of the public prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices.
All items (1 - 3) include military prosecutors, of whom 77 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 19 women and 58 men; at the regional prosecutor's office level, 45 military prosecutors, including 9 women and 36 men; and at the National Prosecutor's Office, 17 military prosecutors (4 women and 13 men).

Q055 (2020): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. Whereas under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of a prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 391 prosecutors (151 women and 240 men), since according to Article 16 of the Law of 28 January 2016 - Law on Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66) the common organizational units of the prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices. For 2020, all items (1-3) include prosecutors for military matters, who at the level of the district prosecutor's office are employed by 85, including 22 women and 63 men; at the level of the regional prosecutor's office - 38 prosecutors for military matters, including 8 women and 30 men, and at the National Prosecutor's Office - 13 prosecutors for military matters (2 women and 11 men).

Q055 (2018): Within the organizational structure of general organizational units of the prosecution office, there are Appellate Public Prosecutor’s Offices, which function as a third rank and employ altogether 367 prosecutors (149 women and 224 men). Additionally, 65 prosecutors of military affairs (including 16 women and 49 men) are employed at the level related to the Regional Public Prosecutor’s Office; 30 prosecutors of military affairs (including 6 women and 24 men) - at the level related to the District Public Prosecutor’s Office, and 5 prosecutors of military affairs (5 men) - in the National Public Prosecutor’s Office.

Q107 (General Comment): *The number of cases discontinued for any other reason consists of cases discontinued on the basis of: - art. 17 par. 1 point 3 to 11 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: the social harm of the act is negligible; the law provides that the perpetrator is not subject to punishment; the defendant has died; the criminal statute of limitations has run; criminal proceedings for the same act of the same person have been validly terminated or previously instituted proceedings are pending; the perpetrator is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Polish criminal courts; lack of complaint from an authorized prosecutor; absence of the required authorization for prosecution or request for prosecution from an authorized person, unless otherwise provided by law; there is another circumstance excluding prosecution.
- the Act on Counteracting Drug Addiction (Article 62a and 62b);
- other discontinuances - in addition to those described in report PK-P1K on activity of common organizational units of the Public Prosecutor's Office in criminal cases.
*The number of cases closed by the prosecutor for other reasons consists of: - cases in which criminal prosecution was transferred (Article 591 para. 6 of the Code of Criminal Procedure), - refusal to start an investigation, - suspended cases, - cases finished with the transfer of the commander, - cases settled in another way (there is no data about the way of completion in the report).

Q107 (2020): *The number of cases processed in 2018 was 1,076,123. The number of cases discontinued for this period is 397,471. This number is comparable to the 2019 data. (406,770 cases discontinued) and for 2020. (387,521 cases discontinued). *The number of cases - "concluded by a penalty or measure imposed or negotiated by the prosecutor" for each year was as follows: 2018. – 43 348, in 2019. -36 167, in 2020. - 25 635.

Q107 (2018): Differences which appear between data mentioned in the form related to functioning of the Polish jurisdiction and data specified in the previous edition of research - connected with the amount of cases incoming and the amount of terminated cases - arise from at least two reasons. First, during the years the image of crime has been changing. The amount of committed crimes is not constant and it is changing dynamically. Second, normative changes affect the differences mentioned at the beginning. This is connected with: the penalization of acts which have been criminally indifferent until now and amendments to the Criminal Procedure Law. In the adversarial reform - currently in force since the 1st of July 2015 - the rule related to cases terminated by decisions of police on refusal to allow investigation or on discontinuance of investigation has been introduced. According to this rule the aforementioned cases do not have to be approved by the prosecutor. Therefore such proceedings have not been registered in the prosecution office. Amendments to the Code of Criminal Procedure, which came into force on the 15h of April 2016, cancelled this rule.

Q107 (2016): Cases "Discontinued during the reference year" - only number of staied legal proceedings.

Q107-1 (General Comment): Article 335 [Sentencing without trial - motion] -Criminal Code Procedure
§ 1. If the accused pleads guilty, and in the light of his explanations the circumstances of the commission of the offence and his guilt raise no doubts, and the attitude of the accused indicates that the objectives of the proceedings will be achieved, further proceedings may be omitted.
The public prosecutor, instead of filing a bill of indictment, shall file a motion with the court for issuing a judgment of conviction at a hearing and for agreeing with the defendant on penalties or other measures envisaged for the offence charged, also taking into account the legally protected interests of the victim. The agreement may also include a specific decision on payment of legal costs.
The public prosecutor may attach to the indictment a motion for a judgment of conviction to be handed down at a hearing and for the penalties or other measures prescribed for the offence charged to be agreed upon with the defendant, also taking into account the legally protected interests of the victim, if the circumstances of the offence and the defendant's guilt are beyond doubt, the evidentiary statements made by the defendant do not contradict the findings made, and the defendant's attitude indicates that the objectives of the proceedings will be achieved.
*Article 156 of the Fiscal Penal Code, The public prosecutor, as well as the financial pre-trial body, may attach to the indictment a motion for issuing, without a hearing, a judgment of conviction and imposing a penalty or penal measure agreed with the accused for the fiscal offence or fiscal misdemeanour charged against him, if the circumstances of the commission of the offence do not raise any doubts and the attitude of the accused indicates that the objectives of the proceedings will be achieved.

Q107-1 (2021): *) 51 198 - Data refers to persons convicted at first instance:
- Convicted as a result of granting an application under Article 335 § 1 or 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: in Regional Courts - 580 persons, in District Courts - 46,148 persons.
- Voluntary surrender to liability for criminal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 4,470 persons.

Q107-1 (2020): *during the main trial – 53 072 - *) The data pertains to persons sentenced in the first instance:
- Sentenced as a result of granting an application under Article 335 § 1 or 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: in Regional Courts - 743 persons, in District Courts - 48,762 persons
- Voluntary submission to liability for penal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 3,567 persons.
*57 735 - The data on the basis of which the information was provided are collected under the Law on Public Statistics in the Public Prosecutor office - P1K report on the activity of the common organizational units of the public prosecutor's office in criminal cases (statistical program SprawPro). The data for 2018 included only those cases in which a request under Article 335 par 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure was addressed. On the other hand, the data for 2020 included cases in which the prosecutor addressed a motion for a conviction and motions to join the indictment under Article 335 par 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and Article 156 of the Fiscal Penal Code

Portugal

Q055 (General Comment): The communicated data encompasses the number of magistrates of the Public Prosecution Service in courts of first instance, second instance and high superior courts, except the Constitutional Court.

Q055 (2020): No specific explanation for the numbers above.

Q055 (2018): In absolute terms the decrease from 2016 to 2018 is from 7 to 5 female prossecutors, which is not significative in absolute terms, but acquires a more relevant expression in relative terms.
Q055 (2012): The increase in the number of female prosecutors is due to the general tendency of increase of female prosecutors in the last decade at first instance courts. It is natural that gradually the proportion of female prosecutors in the higher courts tends to grow as a result of their career progress. The number of prosecutors in the High Judicial Court and in the High Administrative Court, increased. In particular, in the High Administrative Court there was a strong reinforcement of these professionals in 2011 in order to respond to a pressing need of prosecutors in this court.

Q107 (2020): The data indicated for «number of processed cases» corresponds to “the total number of criminal cases at the investigation stage that have been closed”.
The Public Prosecutor's Office, closes the inquiry as soon as it has gathered sufficient evidence that no crime has been committed, that the defendant has not committed it or that the procedure is legally inadmissible.
The Public Prosecutor's Office also closes the inquiry if it has not been possible to obtain sufficient evidence that a crime has been committed or who the perpetrators were.

Q107 (2014): For 2014, data concerning 1st instance courts is not available due to technical constraints.

Q107 (2012): This category of cases includes inquiry proceedings received by the public prosecutor and inquiry proceedings completed with charges proposed by the public prosecutor.
Q109 (2012): According to 2012 data, the figures include traffic offences which are criminally punished.

Romania

Q055 (General Comment): In Romania there are four level of courts/prosecution offices attached to these courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above prosecutors from prosecution offices of the tribunals and of the courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional prosecutors".

Q055 (2018): In Romania there are four level of courts/prosecution offices attached to these courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above prosecutors from prosecution offices of the tribunals and of the courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional prosecutors".

Q055 (2014): The prosecutor's offices are established in the following hierarchy: the prosecutor's offices attached to the courts of law (point 1 of the table), the prosecutor's offices attached to tribunals and prosecutor's offices attached to the courts of appeal (point 2), and the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (point 3).

Q055 (2012): The prosecutor's offices are established in the following hierarchy: the prosecutor's offices attached to the courts of law (point 1 of the table), the prosecutor's offices attached to tribunals and prosecutor's offices attached to the courts of appeal (point 2), the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (point 3).

Q107 (2020): There are no available data on grounds on which a decision to discontinue a case is taken by the public prosecutor.
Q107 (2016): As regard the increase from 2014 data related to the number of cases brought to court, most probably the new provisions in terms of guilty plea procedures introduced by the new codes may represent a reason for this increase in using this procedural institution; moreover people/parties become more aware of it/of this procedural instrument and a judicial practice has been created
Q107 (2014): The figure provided for 2014 in respect of the total number of 1st instance criminal cases received by the public prosecutor (1 756 001) corresponds to the stocks and newly entered files for this year. In 2012, the number of newly entered files was 679 193 (789 677 for 2013). The variations observed between 2012 and 2014 are due to the entry into force of the new codes.
Q109 (2020): Only serious offenses that are considered crimes, such as drunk driving or involuntary manslaughter.

Q109 (2018): Only serious offenses that are considered crimes, such as drunk driving or involuntary manslaughter.

Q109 (2016): Only serious offenses that are considered crimes, such as drunk driving or involuntary manslaughter.

Slovak Republic

Q055 (General Comment): The number of prosecutors at the Supreme Court level also includes prosecutors of the Special Prosecution Bureau. The latter deals with crimes of corruption and the most severe offences including organized crime. It intervenes in first instance, but acts as an organizational part of the General Prosecutor's Office.

Q107 (2021): The General public prosecutors office did not deliver any explanation.

Q107 (2020): The data were delivered by General prosecutor office. The number of 1st instance criminal cases are not monitored by General prosecutor office in CEPEJ requested structure.
Q107 (2018): The number of Cases received during the reference year represents the count of received cases on the Prosecution Office, not the count of terminated cases.
To the column Cases discontinued during the reference year we included the decisions of the prosecutor as well as of the police officer. If the police officer has decided on the discontinuance of the criminal prosecution, those decisions were examined by a prosecutor. The prosecutor himself/herself has discontinued the criminal prosecution in 263 cases.
Among Cases terminated by the prosecutor by imposing a sanction or negotiating a measure were included criminal prosecutions of persons against whom the criminal prosecution was conditionally suspended (1334) or the criminal prosecution was suspended by approving a conciliation between the accused and aggrieved party (479).
Among Cases brought to court were included indictments submitted by the prosecutor in the year 2018 to the court. The number of accused persons was 29 789 (the count of the accused persons might not equal the count of the indictments).

Q107 (2016): The number of cases received represents all entries in the criminal registers of the prosecution offices. The decrease of number of the received cases in comparison with the previous cycle is the objective fact out of the range of prosecution service.
Not all of the received cases are concluded in the same year. The number of cases discontinued during the reference year includes the decisions of the prosecutor as well as of the police officer. The decisions of the police officer to discontinue the criminal prosecution were examined by a prosecutor. Only in 62 cases the decision to discontinue the criminal prosecution was issued by the prosecutor (see Q 108).
Cases terminated by the prosecutor by imposing a sanction or negotiating a measure include criminal prosecutions of persons against whom the criminal prosecution was conditionally suspended (1485) or the criminal prosecution was suspended by approving a conciliation between the accused and aggrieved party (469).
The number of cases brought to court (25023) represents the number of indictments submitted to court by the prosecutor in 2016. The number of accused person was 28 612 (according to Slovak criminal law one indictment can be issued against more defendants).

Q107 (2014): For 2012, it was impossible to split the number of cases discontinued by the prosecutor and the number of cases concluded by a penalty. For 2014, both of the categories could be identified. The total is 8547 cases, which is close to the number given in 2012.
Q107-1 (2020): The data were delivered by General prosecutor office. The most of the data are not available, because these are not monitored by General prosecutor office in CEPEJ requested structure.

Slovenia

Q055 (General Comment): The number is reported in FTE.
In the Slovenian criminal justice system state prosecutors are exclusively authorized to conduct public prosecution in criminal matters on behalf of society and in the public interest. The Constitution and law guarantee autonomy in status and functioning of state prosecutors. Decisions made by the state prosecutor shall not be interfered with, except by way of general instructions and assigning of a case in the manner determined by the law.
Slovenian state prosecutors perform their function in 13 organizational units – prosecution offices. There are 11 District State Prosecutor's Offices and one Specialized State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia, where local, district and senior state prosecutors are positioned. At the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia supreme state prosecutors and the State Prosecutor General perform their functions. Some state prosecutors of lower ranks are assigned to the office perform demanding professional tasks.
There are no higher state prosecutor's offices as the proceedings at the courts of appeal are governed by the district prosecutor's offices. According to the State Prosecution Service Act prosecutors with the rank of at least local state prosecutor may represent a case at local courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least district state prosecutor may represent a case at district courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least senior state prosecutor may represent a case before higher courts and only supreme state prosecutors may represent a case at the Supreme Court. Local state prosecutors may also appear at district courts, if authorized by the head of state prosecutor's office for certain categories of matters, for a particular matter, for certain categories of procedural acts or for a particular procedural act. Local and district prosecutors may in their cases appear along with a senior prosecutor at courts of appeal, if authorized by the head of an appellate division of the state prosecutor's office for a particular case. Senior and supreme state prosecutors are competent to represent a case at before first instance courts. Local and district prosecutors are reported as prosecutors at first instance level, senior prosecutors as prosecutors at second instance level and supreme prosecutors as prosecutors at Supreme Court level, without regard to the court instance where they perform their function, or that they are assigned to another institution for a limited period of time (e.g for the administration of State Prosecutorial Council).
The number of posts of state prosecutors is set by the Government's Regulation. However the actual number of state prosecutors is lower than the number se by regulation due to different factors.

Q055 (2021): Before 2021, data was reported in gross numbers. For 2021 data, the FTE format is observed.
The above data does not include six State prosecutors who perform other duties (assigned to The Council of State Prosecutors, appointed to Eurojust, the European Public Prosecutor and the European Delegate Prosecutor).
Q055 (2020): The information is in form of gross data. According to the methodology used for reporting judges and court staff (FTE) – by which part-time employees are converted to full-time time by the calculation of working hours, the number amounts to 193, as a number of prosecutors are not working full time.

Q055 (2016): Slovenian state prosecutors perform their function in 13 organizational units. There are 11 district prosecutor's offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office of The Republic of Slovenia, where local, district and higher state prosecutors are positioned. At The Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia supreme state prosecutors and State Prosecutor General perform their functions. Here are also some state prosecutors of lower ranks assigned to perform demanding professional tasks.
There are no higher state prosecutor's offices as the proceedings before the courts of appeal are governed by the district prosecutor's offices. According to the State Prosecutor Act prosecutors with the rank of at least local state prosecutor may represent a case before local courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least district state prosecutor may represent a case before district courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least higher state prosecutor may represent a case before higher courts and only supreme state prosecutors may represent a case before the supreme court. Local state prosecutors may also appear before district courts if authorized by the head of a state prosecutor's office for certain categories of matters, for a particular matter, for certain categories of procedural acts or for a particular procedural act. According to amendment of legislation in 2015 local and district prosecutors may in their cases appear along with a higher prosecutor before the courts of appeal if authorized by the head of an appellate division of the state prosecutor's office for a particular case. Higher and supreme state prosecutors are competent to represent a case also before first instance courts.
In the context of question 55 we counted local and district prosecutors as prosecutors at first instance level (164), higher prosecutors as prosecutors at second instance level (42) and supreme prosecutors as prosecutors at Supreme Court level (11) without regard of the rang of court before they perform their function in fact or if they are assigned to other institution for a limited period of time (e.g for the administration of State Prosecutorial Council). The information is in form of full-time equivalent.

Q055 (2014): In November 2011, the new State Prosecutor Act came into force. It dissolved the special department of the Office of the State Prosecutor General, responsible for the 2d instance level. Proceedings before courts of appeal are now governed by the 4 State circuit prosecutor offices in towns where the higher courts are located. Prosecutors are organised in 12 offices (11 circuit offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office, where circuit and higher prosecutors work) and the Supreme State Prosecutor Office (where supreme State prosecutors and the general State prosecutor work). The function "assistant State prosecutor" changed in "local State prosecutor". The Specialised State Prosecutor's Office for dealing with the most severe criminal offences was established.

Q055 (2012): In November 2011, the new State Prosecutor Act came into force. It dissolved the special department of the Office of the State Prosecutor General, responsible for the 2d instance level. Proceedings before courts of appeal are now governed by the 4 State circuit prosecutor offices in towns where the higher courts are located. Prosecutors are organised in 12 offices (11 circuit offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office, where circuit and higher prosecutors work) and the Supreme State Prosecutor Office (where supreme State prosecutors and the general State prosecutor work). The function "assistant State prosecutor" changed in "local State prosecutor". The Specialised State Prosecutor's Office for dealing with the most severe criminal offences was established.

Q107 (General Comment): General remarks:
- statistical data is kept on charged, accused or convicted persons, and the data is related to the main crime per defendant (methodology as used in the Joint Annual Report on the Work of State Prosecutor's Offices and previous CEPEJ reporting).
- vertical consistency is not ensured due to the fact that the State Prosecutor's Office reports data from a dynamic information system, where subsequent changes and corrections are possible, and each category
(received, solved, unsolved) is "counted" on a certain day or for a period, which may lead to later deviations; and due to the methodology used at reporting (3.) Processed cases (see below).
- data included cases against known and unknown perpetrators. Cases against known perpetrators are counted according to persons (e.g. a denunciation against five individuals is counited as five cases), and cases against unknown perpetrators (Ktn cases) according to the number of files. It should be noted that between 27,000 and 60,000 complaints against unknown perpetrators are received per year. They are included in the statistical data as pending cases until they are closed (for example, the perpetrator is discovered, the expiration of the statute of limitations or that no legal signs of a crime have been provided).
1. Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. Year
The data represent existing unresolved criminal complaints against known perpetrators (adults, minors and legal entities) and newly received complaints against unknown perpetrators.
2. Incoming/received cases
Includes criminal denunciations against known and unknown offenders.
Criminal denunciations against known offenders include cases that were received by the
prosecution office as well as cases with unknown offenders whose identity was discovered during
the reporting period.
3. Processed cases
The reported figure represents all resolved criminal complaints in the reporting year. There is a discrepancy between the sum of following categories: [3.1 known offenders+3.2+3.4] and the number of all resolved criminal complaints reported at (3.) Processed cases, because several criminal complaints can be resolved in one criminal file.
3.1. Discontinued during the reference year The number represents the sum of dismissed criminal complaints against known perpetrators and complaints against unknown perpetrators dismissed due to the statute of limitations.
3.1.1. Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified
The public prosecutor cannot discontinue a case, because the offender could not be identified, so the answer is NAP.
3.1.2. Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a
specific legal situation Data includes cases in which it was not possible to continue the proceedings due to a lack of procedural or
material preconditions (the act is not a criminal offense, there is no reasonable suspicion that the suspect committed a criminal offence and various procedural obstacles), cases where the motion of the injured party has been withdrawn (only for so-called proposed criminal offences) and cases where the criminal complaint was dismissed due to the expiration of the statute of limitations (procedural obstacle).

Q107 (2021): In 2021 the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).
Further break-down of data reported:
(1) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year include transferred criminal complaints: - against known perpetrators: 11.951 and
- against unknown perpetrators: 269.260.
(2) Incoming cases include criminal denunciations: - against known offenders: 24.658 and
- against unknown offenders: 27.199.
(3) Processed cases include processed cases:
- against known offenders: 24.658 and
- discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations: 29.140
(3.1.) Discontinued during the reference year include dismissed criminal complaints:
- against known perpetrators: 14.260 and
- against unknown perpetrators: 29.140
(3.1.2.) Discontinued due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation include:
- a) discontinued criminal complaints against known perpetrators due to the lack of procedural or material preconditions: 10.022, b) cases discontinued (rejected) due to withdrawal of the motion of the injured party: 2.000 and c) cases discontinued due to expiration of the statue of limitation: 75 (total 12.097 cases) and
- discontinued criminal complaints against unknown perpetrators due to the expiration of statute of limitations: 29.140.
(4) Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year include unresolved criminal complaints:
- against known offenders: 11.709.
- against known offenders: 277.564.
Differences to 2020 data:
2.Incoming/received cases: decrease by 16%
Contributing factors: a) Covid-19 pandemics, especially limit of movement of population and related police control, b) changes in the registration of the number of criminal offences in police registers and c) increase in merging of diferent cases in one case at the Police and state prosecution level, compared to the previous year. 3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a
specific legal situation: increase by 17%
The increase is mainly due to a higher number of cases against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations, which is beyond control of state prosecution. The number of discontinued cases agains known offenders did not change significantly. 3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity: decrease by 22%
The number of cases remains comparable (despite the decrease in last year) and cannot be considered unusual, due to the structure of processed cases with the majority of offences against property and within it low value cases. 3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor: increase by 23%
The increase in 2021 is due to partial relief of preventive measures, related to Covid-19 pandemics.

Q107 (2020): Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year includes 12.452 cases against known perpetrators and 263.139 cases against unknown perpetrators.
Incoming/received cases includes 27.770 cases against known offenders and 34.019 cases against unknown offenders.
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year includes 12.072 cases against known offenders and 269.260 cases against unknown offenders.

Q107 (2016): The explanation by the state prosecution (data source) concerning the decrease in the number of received cases during the reference year between 2014 and 2016: - since 2013, the number of reported offences to the police is decreasing, hence the decrease in number of cases received (especially cases where the offender is unknown)
- due to several local factors (austerity measures, increased number of immigrants in 2015-2016 and a long strike of police officers in 2016), the number of cases (against identified offenders) processed by the police also decreased
As concerns the decreased number of cases brought to court:
- a decrease in new cases (see above)
- exercising a stricter selection of cases, not appropriate for court procedure (in 2014, almost 30% of resolved cases were brought to court, in 2016 only 25%). The state prosecution also noted some minor differences might be attributed to changes in their methodology for data reporting.

Q107-1 (General Comment): The defendant may plead guilty in two kinds of situations. He/she can achieve an agreement with a state prosecutor in a plea-bargaining procedure or he/she can make a guilty plea irrespectively of the state prosecutor at the pretrial hearing and until the beginning of a main hearing. Cases brought to court by the public prosecutor through the guilty plea procedure are only first mentioned kind of cases. The agreement on guilty plea between the defendant and state prosecutor may be concluded before the commencement of the criminal proceedings and not later than by the beginning of the main hearing. There is no available data on the stage of the proceeding when the agreement was concluded. There is no guilty plea procedure in misdemeanour criminal cases.

Q107-1 (2021): In the previous year (2020) the number of guilty plea procedures was unusually low due to two reasons: a stricter criminal framework (regarding illegal crossing of the state border or territory under Article 308 of the Criminal Code) and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemics.

Q107-1 (2020): The reason for fewer negotiations and fewer agreements is mainly a stricter criminal framework for crimes that were still regulated in 2018 in such a way that they could be the subject of negotiations between the prosecutor and the defendant (illegal crossing of the state border or territory under Article 308 of Criminal Code). Due to the above, there was no interest on the part of the defendants as well as the state prosecutors to agree on guilt and criminal sanction as parties to criminal proceedings. In addition to this, an epidemiological reason for measures to prevent the spread of the covid-19 epidemic is cited as the reason for the reduction in negotiations and plea agreements concluded, furthermore, the poor staffing situation and the high workload of state prosecutors who are engaged in urgent matters in the on-call service and in attending court hearings and the prompt announcement of pre-trial hearings shortly after the indictment becomes final, which significantly shortened the time for conducting negotiations and concluding a plea deal.

Q107-1 (2016): From the enforcement of the provisions on guilty plea bargaining procedures in Criminal procedure act in 2012 there is a steady rise in the number of concluded agreements between the defendant and the prosecutor. The proportion of these agreements compared to filed indictments also grows (2012: 1,1 %, 2014: 2,0%, 2016: 3,8 %). The most general interpretation of this trend would be that the parties of criminal procedures have recognised these new instrument as beneficial in terms of speeding up the process of reaching the final decision and the reduction of the sanction that would be issued, if the complete trial took place.

Q109 (General Comment): The communicated data include only traffic offences, stipulated as criminal offences (in the Penal Code) and therefore prosecuted by State prosecutors. There are two such criminal offences: causing a traffic accident through negligence whereby another person is seriously injured or died and audacious driving in road traffic which is committed by a serious breach of road safety regulations, while other cases of traffic offences are not criminal offences, but minor offences and are not included in the provided figures.

Spain

Q055 (General Comment): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories.
Article 34 of Law 50/1981, (Organic Statute of the Public Prosecutor's Office) distinguishes three categories:
1st Chamber Prosecutors of the Supreme Court, equal to Magistrates of the High Court. The Deputy Prosecutor of the Supreme Court will be considered the President of the Chamber.
2nd Prosecutors, equated to Magistrates.
3. Lawyers-Prosecutors, equated to Judges.

Q055 (2021): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category (''Fiscales de Sala'') Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 32, Males 21, Females 11 (this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second. ''Fiscal'': Total 1825, Males 701, Females 1124
Third: ''Abogado-Fiscal'': Total 774, Males 178, Females 596

Q055 (2020): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category (''Fiscales de Sala del Tribunal Supremo'') Supreme Court Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 50, Males 36, Females 14
Second. ''Fiscal'': Total 1830, Males 700, Females 1130
Third: ''Abogado-Fiscal'': Total 681, Males 158, Females 523

Q055 (2018): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, Total 33, Males 26, Females 7
Second) Total 1779, Males 696, Females 1083
Third) Total 653, Males 161, Females 492

Q055 (2016): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First) Total 25, Males 19, Females 6
Second) Total 1826, Males 738, Females 1088
Third) Total 622, Males 155, Females 467

Q107 (General Comment): In Spain the general rule is that the Prosecutor is party in the criminal cases, but the Prosecutor does not process (with exclusive competence) the criminal cases. The investigation Judge (Juez de Instrucción) does that. Data provided in question 107 tries to adapt the information in the Annual Report of the State Attorney General's Office to the criteria of CEPEJ, by offering the data of cases received by the Prosecution Service in 2020, according to the classification of procedures of the Spanish procedural legislation (diligencias previas, diligencias urgentes, procedimiento por delitos leves, sumarios y procedimientos del jurado). In addition to that, there are other two kinds of actions for which the Prosecution have exclusive competence: Investigation of criminal reponsibility of minors, and preliminary diligences of Article 773.2 of the Criminal Procedural Act.

Q107 (2020): The provided number of incoming cases is the number of the criminal proceedings received by the Prosecution Service (page 1117 of the Annual Report of the Prosecution Service). It is consistent with the explanatory note as it includes “cases submitted to public prosecutors by the police and other bodies as well as victims (if applicable) within the reference year”. It is an official data, provided by the State Attorney Office.

Q107 (2018): Certain number of cases received are re-sent to other porsecutor offices.

Q107-1 (2021): Explanation of the increased number of guilty plea procedures: Probably, coming back to normal activity after covid restrictions.

Indicator 4: Systems for measuring and evaluating the performance of courts

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

Question 055. Number of public prosecutors (on 31 December of the reference year). (Please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled, for all types of courts – general jurisdiction and specialised courts).

Question 107. Public prosecutors: Total number of 1st instance criminal cases.

Question 107-1. If the guilty plea procedure exists, how many cases were concluded by this procedure?

Question 109. Do the figures provided in Q107 include traffic offence cases?

Question .

Question .

Question 055

Austria

(General Comment): Data is presented in full time equivalent.

(2014): The numerical values provided in the table are rounded. The accurate figures are: total – 344,83 (171,52 males and 173,31 females); prosecutors at first instance level – 308,69 (147,13 males and 161,56 females); prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level – 20,94 (13,04 males and 7,90 females); prosecutors at Supreme Court level – 15,20 (11,35 males and 3,85 females).

(2012): In 2012, the various tasks were more exactly assigned to the number of full time equivalents - dealing with tasks of the prosecution on the one hand and the administrative tasks on the other hand.

Belgium

(2021): Source: FPS Justice - Directorate General for the Judiciary, HR Department of the Judiciary, Notaries and Enforcement agents

(2020): Support Service of the College of Public Prosecutors

(2014): In 2014, the number of professional prosecutors includes the heads of division of the 15 public prosecutors' offices and the heads of the 8 prosecution offices within labour courts.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The provided data refers to the actual number of employed persons for the year of reference.

(2016): 1511 is the total number of working prosecutors at 31.12.2016; 888 prosecutors at first instance level includes – the prosecutors from 113 Regional Prosecutor`s Offices and 1 Specialized Prosecotr`s Office; 500 prosecutors work in 28 District Prosecutor`s Offices, 7 Appelate Prosecutor`s Offices and 3 Military District Prosecutor`s Offices; 123 are the prosecutors working in Supreme Prosecutor`s Office of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Prosecutor`s Office and 1 Prosecutor General. (The indicated numbers do not include the number of the investigative magistrates in the investigative departments at District Prosecutor`s Offices and National Investigation Service and their administrative heads.

(2014): For 2014, the number of prosecutors acting at 1st instance includes prosecutors of the regional prosecutor's offices, specialized prosecutor's offices and the military prosecutor's offices. The number of prosecutors acting at 2nd instance includes prosecutors from district and appellate prosecutor's offices. The number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level includes prosecutors from the Supreme Prosecutor's Office of Cassation, Supreme Administrative Public Prosecutor's Office, and the Prosecutor GeneralIn contrast with the 2012 evaluation, the number of investigators in the District Investigation Departments at the District Prosecutor's Offices and the National Investigation Service is not taken into consideration for 2014.

(2012): For 2012, the total includes 512 magistrates with position of "investigator in the Investigation Department at the District Prosecution Office". Conversely, these 512 magistrates are not subsumed in the number of prosecutors at 1st instance level. The number of prosecutors at 2nd instance level including Prosecutor's Office of Appeal and Military District Prosecutor's Office encompasses 451 prosecutors and 433 investigators in the Investigation Departments at the District Prosecution Offices and military investigators. The number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level includes 128 prosecutors and 79 investigators at the National Investigation Service.

Croatia

(General Comment): The provided data encompasses all officials in the public prosecutors' offices, including heads of the public prosecutors' offices (the Public Prosecutor of the Republic of Croatia, county and municipal public prosecutors, the head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime) and all public prosecutors deputies. The number of prosecutors at the first instance level includes all municipal public prosecutors, their deputies, as well as the head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime and his deputies. The number of prosecutors at the second instance (court of appeal) level includes all county public prosecutors and their deputies. The number of prosecutors at the Supreme Court level includes the Public Prosecutor and his deputies.

(2018): The above information includes all officials in the public prosecutor's offices – all public prosecutors (heads of prosecution offices) and public prosecutors' deputies (deputies of the Public Prosecutor, deputies of the Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime and deputies of the county and municipal public prosecutors).
The number of prosecutors at the first instance level includes all municipal public prosecutors (heads of municipal prosecution offices and Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime), their deputies, as well as the deputies of the Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime. The number of prosecutors at the second instance level (court of appeal) includes all county public prosecutors (heads of the county prosecutors' offices) and their deputies. The number of prosecutors at the supreme court level includes the Public Prosecutor General and his deputies.

(2012): In 2012, the public prosecutors' Office of the Republic of Croatia employed 21 officials. The county public prosecutors' offices employed 155 officials, and the municipal public prosecutors' offices employed 410 officials. Out of 617 officials, 385 or 62.4% were women. The number of officials remained the same as in 2011. As of 31 December 2012, 7 public prosecutor's posts and 130 deputy public prosecutor's posts were vacant.

Cyprus

(2020): The number includes also legal advisors to the Attorney General's office.
The number increased because more positions of prosecutors were approved.

(2014): All prosecutors appear before all courts.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): The Czech Republic is endowed with a system of 4 levels of State prosecution offices: district, regional, high and supreme. The number of high public prosecutors is included in the number of prosecutors at second instance level.

Denmark

(General Comment): The public prosecutors are the Director of Public Prosecutions, the state prosecutors, the police directors as well as the persons who are assumed to assist them in the judicial processing of criminal cases.
Organizationally, the Prosecution Service consists of the Director of Public Prosecutions and state prosecutor's offices (central prosecution service) with associated police districts (local prosecution service).
The Director of Public Prosecutions and selected employees appear before the Supreme Court. At the end of 2021, 58 prosecutors were employed at the Director of Public Prosecutions office. 6 of them appear before the Supreme Court. The Director of Public Prosecutions is superior to the other public prosecutors and supervises them and handles complaints about decisions made by the state prosecutors office as the first instance. The state prosecutors' offices appear before the high courts (second instance – court of appeal). The state prosecutors supervise the police directors' handling of criminal cases and handle complaints about decisions made by the police directors regarding criminal prosecution.
The directors of police and the public prosecutors who are employed by them appear before the district courts.
The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire. This is why the total number of prosecutors does not add up when compared to the number of males and females.

(2021): The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire. This is why the total number of prosecutors does not add up when compared to the number of males and females.

(2016): The observed discrepancies are due to ordinary changes in staffing.

(2014): The variations over the period 2012-2014 are due to the fact that in 2012, information was missing about prosecutors engaged in tasks concerning administrative cases (Ledelsessekretatiat) and prosecutors employed by the national police (Rigspolitiet).

Estonia

(General Comment): The categorization of questions 55 and 56 regarding public prosecutors do not exist in Estonia.

Finland

(General Comment): The National Prosecution Authority comprises the Office of the Prosecutor General that acts as the general administrative unit, and five prosecution districts: Southern Finland, Western Finland, Northern Finland, Eastern Finland and Åland. The National Prosecution Authority has 34 offices around Finland. The Prosecutor General is the supreme prosecutor and the head of the prosecution service. The Prosecutor General directs and develops prosecutorial activity by issuing general instructions and guidelines to the prosecutors. She/he also appoints district prosecutors. The Prosecutor General may take over a case from a prosecutor, but cannot order a prosecutor to decide the case in any given manner. She/he can also self-decide on the bringing of charges and designate a prosecutor to pursue the case in the courts. The Deputy Prosecutor General decides the matters in his/her competence on the same authority as the Prosecutor General. He/she also acts as a deputy for the Prosecutor General when necessary. For regular prosecutorial tasks, the Office of the Prosecutor General has state prosecutors whose jurisdiction covers the entire country. Most criminal matters (89 256 cases annually) are dealt with by the prosecution areas. The Office of the Prosecutor General deals mainly with criminal cases with wider significance to society as a whole, a few dozen every year. Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances, and every prosecutor is expected to, in a normal situation, to handle and prosecute the criminal case all the way to the Supreme Court, if needed.

(2020): Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

France

(2021): Data taken from an extraction of the LOLFI SIRH - Number of public prosecutors on 31/12/2021. The values are expressed in FTEs.
Source DSJ
The data have been rounded upwards from 0.5 and downwards below, with the exception of the data relating to the number of male prosecutors at the Courts of appeal (the exact figure is 249.6) in order to ensure vertical consistency.

(2020): Only the judicial order is concerned

(2014): For 2014, State prosecutors, heads of public prosecution services, are included.

(2012): For 2012, only prosecutors of courts of law appointed by 31 December 2012 were counted.

Germany

(General Comment): The information relates to the number of job shares for public prosecutors. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons. The information on the job shares count a judge working full-time as 1. A judge working part-time is counted as the fraction of 1 which corresponds to the proportion of his/her working hours to full-time (e.g. 0.5 for a judge working half the usual number of hours).

(2021): Figures represent full-time equivalents as of 31. December 2021
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
It should be noted that one of goals of the ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’ is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

(2020): Figures represent full-time equivalents as of 31. December 2020
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a 'Pact for the Rule of Law'. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
It should be noted that one of goals of the 'Pact for the Rule of Law' is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

(2016): Figures indicate the number of full-time equivalent staff (not the number of individuals). A prosecutor working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). A prosecutor working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for a prosecutor working half the usual number of hours).

Greece

(General Comment): In the position of Paredron of the court of First Instance and prosecutor's office Of civil and criminal courts are appointed graduates of the National School of judges, according to what is defined in Article 36 of N. 4871/2021 (a' 246). The graduates from the directions of civil-criminal judges and prosecutors of the National School of judges are appointed in the order which have in the relevant tables and are placed preferably, respectively, in the courts of First Instance and in Public Prosecutors ' Offices In Athens, Piraeus, Thessaloniki, Patras, Heraklion and Larissa. The paredroi of First Instance and the prosecutor's office have ten (10) months trial service, during of which they have all the rights and obligations of the ordinary judicial officer and inspected, like regular judges. The reports of the paredroi of the court of First Instance on performance, statistics of their performance and any other useful information or information on the performance or their suitability are stored in a specialist individual file, which, after the end of the trial service the file is submitted to the Supreme Court Council through the Minister of Justice.

(2021): The above data are given by the Directorate of organization and operation of Justice with the cooperation of JUSTSTAT.

(2020): Positions by law have increased.Gender data are not kept.

Hungary

(2021): On 31 December 2021, two prosecutors were serving in the Ministry of Justice, on a temporary basis. They are included in the total number of prosecutors; however, they are not taken into account when giving the number of prosecutors serving at different instances (court levels). All prosecutors are appointed to a full-time job; however, it occurs that some prosecutors perform part-time service on a temporary basis for various reasons, such as raising children.
The 'number of prosecutors at first instance level' is an aggregate of the number of prosecutors serving at district-level prosecution services and other prosecution services equivalent to that level, as well as the number of prosecutors serving at high prosecution services. A part of the prosecutors serving at high prosecution services proceed also at second instance (high court) level. The number of prosecutors serving at high prosecution services is 520 (226 males, 294 females), while the number of prosecutors serving at district-level prosecution services (other prosecution services equivalent to that level) is 1210 (439 males, 771 females).
The 'number of prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level' means the number of prosecutors serving at appellate prosecution services.

(2016): Another 9 prosecutors were temporarily serving in the Ministry of Justice. They are included in the total number of prosecutors, but we did not take them into account at each level.

Ireland

(General Comment): Allocation of prosecutors work is not in all instances divided as per the questions above. The sub-categories at 1, 2 and 3 of the question posed do not apply in the Irish system.

(2020): Our court going staff number at the 31st December 2020 is 128 - (50 male / 78 female). This figure includes our Prosecutors and Technical staff - Legal Executive. It also includes 1 Trainee Solicitor. In our Office our Technical Staff and Trainee Solicitors are court going staff and manage the running of a prosecution at trial in the same manner as some of our Prosecutors. In relation to the increase in staff resources for the ODPP, and the context for same, please see the forewords of our Annual Report 2020 and our Annual Report 2019 available at https://www.dppireland.ie/publication-category/annual-reports/.

(2018): There were 108.7 fulltime equivalent lawyers (fte) (headcount 111) on the payroll of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at 31 December 2018 – 65.6 fte (67 headcount) of these were female and 43.1 fte (44 headcount) were male.

(2016): Of the staff complement in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at the end of the reference year, 102 were of professional or technical grade at Prosecutor equivalent level or above.

(2014): Parts' of Full Time Equivalents were counted in decimal figures and have been rounded up. The total represents the number of qualified Solicitors and Barristers employed directly in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). A proportion of these lawyers represent the DPP in the District Court. Members of the police force also prosecute in this court within a prescribed 'delegated authority' from the DPP. Members of the independent Bar act on behalf of the DPP, on a self-employed basis, in first instance and appellate courts. There are a further 32 State Solicitors contracted to provide a solicitor service to the DPP in cases heard outside of the capital.

Italy

(2016): There is no specific explanation concerning the increase in the total number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level. However, numbers are small and therefore percentage changes vary more harshly.

Latvia

(2020): The increase in the number of prosecutors in court district level prosecutor's offices is related to the imposition of an obligation on the prosecutor of the court district level prosecutor's office, and not on the chief prosecutor of the district (city) prosecutor's office to perform the duties of a higher prosecutor.
Regarding the decrease in the number of women working in the Prosecutor General's Office, it must be concluded that in total the number of women working has decreased by 8 persons. One of the reasons could be reaching the maximum age for performing the duties prescribed by law or the death of a person.

(2012): During 2011 and 2012, prosecutors' offices increased the number of posts which resulted in the appointment of new prosecutors. In order to decide on the promotion of prosecutors, their professional qualification has been evaluated and their quality of work performance analysed, as well as their participation in trainings, work statistical indicators, etc. Pursuant to the collected data, more male prosecutors have been promoted to higher posts.

Lithuania

(2020): After the reorganization of the prosecution service in 2011, 5 second instance prosecutors' offices were merged with 51 separate first instance prosecutor's office in their area of operation, and thus 5 regional first-second instance prosecutor's offices were established.

(2014): In 2012, the 56 territorial prosecutor's offices have been reorganised into 5 regional prosecutor's offices with 10 district prosecutor's offices functioning inside them (first instance and second instance levels have been combined). Currently, only two instances exist.

(2012): In 2012, after reorganization of the prosecution service, the first and the second instances have merged. Currently, two instances exist instead of three. Besides, the total number of prosecutors has decreased because some prosecutors have left the service, but no new prosecutors have been recruited.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The figure in point 3 includes both second instance and Supreme Court prosecutors, as they are grouped together in the Superior Court of Justice, which is subdivided into the Court of Appeal and the Court of Cassation.

(2018): Le personnel des juridictions judiciaires et administratives a connu une croissance soutenue ces dernières années, tel que prévu par la loi modifiée du 7 mars 1980 sur l'organisation judiciaire. Ceci explique les variations importantes observées entre 2016 et 2018 au niveau du personnel de la magistrature et du personnel non-juge. Les magistrats appartenant à la cellule de renseignement financier (CRF) sont dorénavant exclus de la question 55.1 (suite au détachement de la CRF du Parquet de Luxembourg) puisqu'ils n'exercent plus de fonction juridictionnelle proprement dite. Au total, la CRF compte 4 magistrats et un attaché de justice en 2018. L'effectif du Parquet d'arrondissement reste toutefois inchangé suite à la création des nouveaux postes affectés à la CRF
Les magistrats du pool de complément sont inclus dans les chiffres de la question 55.3.

(2016): The number of prosecutors indicated here as working at the Supreme Court corresponds to the number of prosecutors working at the Superior Court of Justice (which includes prosecutors intervening at the Court of Appeal and Court of Cassation level).

(2014): The number of male public prosecutors decreased between 2012 and 2014, while the number of female public prosecutors increased for the same period. These variations have for sole explanation the normal progress of career of magistrates of the public prosecution office at first instance.

Malta

(General Comment): All the lawyers working in the Office of the AG prosecute cases in the criminal courts, but it is not possible, as yet to distinguish between 1st and 2nd Instance Courts. All full-time lawyers have been included in the above figure except the AG herself.

(2020): The increase in the number of lawyers working at the Office of the AG follows the reform in 2020 whereby the AG has taken up exclusively the role of prosecutor general (the advisory role to government has been vested in the State Advocate). Given this special focus, the Office of the AG has been recruiting more lawyers in order to meet the case demands of the courts.

(2016): All the lawyers at the Office of the Attorney General work both in Court as well as advisers to the various Ministries and Departments. All prosecuting officers at the Office of the Attorney General act at all court levels. Thus, prosecutors are not classified according to the case instance.

(2014): These past few years there has been an increase in the number of female law graduates, which will definitely reflect in the employment trends within this sector.

Netherlands

(General Comment): The Dutch Supreme Court does not have public prosecutors. The office of the Procurator General and Advocates-General at the Dutch Supreme Court is separate from Dutch public prosecution and the Ministry of Justice. They have a different function.

(2020): The Supreme Court does not have (public) prosecutors. The office of the procurator general and attorneys general that the Supreme Court houses, is separate from the public prosecution and does not function as prosecution. They have a different function.

(2016): total 927,5 358,12 569,38
1 842,25 312,72 529,53
2 85,25 45,40 39,85

(2014): For 2014, the number of prosecutors at first instance level includes 8 prosecutors who are still in education (7 females; 1 male). Prosecutors at Supreme Court level are not employees of the National Prosecution Service and therefore not included in the total.

Poland

(General Comment): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. Whereas under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of a prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices, since according to Article 16 of the Law of 28 January 2016 - Law on Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66) the common organizational units of the prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices. All items (1-3) include prosecutors for military matters.
The inclusion of the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutors' offices only in the total number of prosecutors is due to the design of the table. The table allows prosecutors to be entered: 1. first level, 2. second level 3. highest level. The table does not provide an opportunity to depict the full structure of the prosecutor's office in Poland, which consists of four levels: district, circuit and regional prosecutor's offices and the National Prosecutor's Office with a rank equivalent to the Supreme Court. Regional prosecutors' offices are a separate ('third') level of prosecution and the number of prosecutors employed in them cannot be 'split into instances'.

(2021): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. In contrast, under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of prosecutor of the National Prosecuting Authority. The total is higher than the sum of the sub-categories, as it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 402 prosecutors (154 women and 248 men), as, pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2022, item 1247), the common organisational units of the public prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices.
All items (1 - 3) include military prosecutors, of whom 77 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 19 women and 58 men; at the regional prosecutor's office level, 45 military prosecutors, including 9 women and 36 men; and at the National Prosecutor's Office, 17 military prosecutors (4 women and 13 men).

(2020): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. Whereas under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of a prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 391 prosecutors (151 women and 240 men), since according to Article 16 of the Law of 28 January 2016 - Law on Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66) the common organizational units of the prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices. For 2020, all items (1-3) include prosecutors for military matters, who at the level of the district prosecutor's office are employed by 85, including 22 women and 63 men; at the level of the regional prosecutor's office - 38 prosecutors for military matters, including 8 women and 30 men, and at the National Prosecutor's Office - 13 prosecutors for military matters (2 women and 11 men).

(2018): Within the organizational structure of general organizational units of the prosecution office, there are Appellate Public Prosecutor’s Offices, which function as a third rank and employ altogether 367 prosecutors (149 women and 224 men). Additionally, 65 prosecutors of military affairs (including 16 women and 49 men) are employed at the level related to the Regional Public Prosecutor’s Office; 30 prosecutors of military affairs (including 6 women and 24 men) - at the level related to the District Public Prosecutor’s Office, and 5 prosecutors of military affairs (5 men) - in the National Public Prosecutor’s Office.

Portugal

(General Comment): The communicated data encompasses the number of magistrates of the Public Prosecution Service in courts of first instance, second instance and high superior courts, except the Constitutional Court.

(2020): No specific explanation for the numbers above.

(2018): In absolute terms the decrease from 2016 to 2018 is from 7 to 5 female prossecutors, which is not significative in absolute terms, but acquires a more relevant expression in relative terms.

(2012): The increase in the number of female prosecutors is due to the general tendency of increase of female prosecutors in the last decade at first instance courts. It is natural that gradually the proportion of female prosecutors in the higher courts tends to grow as a result of their career progress. The number of prosecutors in the High Judicial Court and in the High Administrative Court, increased. In particular, in the High Administrative Court there was a strong reinforcement of these professionals in 2011 in order to respond to a pressing need of prosecutors in this court.

Romania

(General Comment): In Romania there are four level of courts/prosecution offices attached to these courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above prosecutors from prosecution offices of the tribunals and of the courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional prosecutors".

(2018): In Romania there are four level of courts/prosecution offices attached to these courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above prosecutors from prosecution offices of the tribunals and of the courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional prosecutors".

(2014): The prosecutor’s offices are established in the following hierarchy: the prosecutor’s offices attached to the courts of law (point 1 of the table), the prosecutor’s offices attached to tribunals and prosecutor’s offices attached to the courts of appeal (point 2), and the Prosecutor’s Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (point 3).

(2012): The prosecutor’s offices are established in the following hierarchy: the prosecutor’s offices attached to the courts of law (point 1 of the table), the prosecutor’s offices attached to tribunals and prosecutor’s offices attached to the courts of appeal (point 2), the Prosecutor’s Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (point 3).

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The number of prosecutors at the Supreme Court level also includes prosecutors of the Special Prosecution Bureau. The latter deals with crimes of corruption and the most severe offences including organized crime. It intervenes in first instance, but acts as an organizational part of the General Prosecutor’s Office.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The number is reported in FTE.
In the Slovenian criminal justice system state prosecutors are exclusively authorized to conduct public prosecution in criminal matters on behalf of society and in the public interest. The Constitution and law guarantee autonomy in status and functioning of state prosecutors. Decisions made by the state prosecutor shall not be interfered with, except by way of general instructions and assigning of a case in the manner determined by the law.
Slovenian state prosecutors perform their function in 13 organizational units – prosecution offices. There are 11 District State Prosecutor's Offices and one Specialized State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia, where local, district and senior state prosecutors are positioned. At the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia supreme state prosecutors and the State Prosecutor General perform their functions. Some state prosecutors of lower ranks are assigned to the office perform demanding professional tasks.
There are no higher state prosecutor's offices as the proceedings at the courts of appeal are governed by the district prosecutor's offices. According to the State Prosecution Service Act prosecutors with the rank of at least local state prosecutor may represent a case at local courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least district state prosecutor may represent a case at district courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least senior state prosecutor may represent a case before higher courts and only supreme state prosecutors may represent a case at the Supreme Court. Local state prosecutors may also appear at district courts, if authorized by the head of state prosecutor's office for certain categories of matters, for a particular matter, for certain categories of procedural acts or for a particular procedural act. Local and district prosecutors may in their cases appear along with a senior prosecutor at courts of appeal, if authorized by the head of an appellate division of the state prosecutor's office for a particular case. Senior and supreme state prosecutors are competent to represent a case at before first instance courts.
Local and district prosecutors are reported as prosecutors at first instance level, senior prosecutors as prosecutors at second instance level and supreme prosecutors as prosecutors at Supreme Court level, without regard to the court instance where they perform their function, or that they are assigned to another institution for a limited period of time (e.g for the administration of State Prosecutorial Council).
The number of posts of state prosecutors is set by the Government's Regulation. However the actual number of state prosecutors is lower than the number se by regulation due to different factors.

(2021): Before 2021, data was reported in gross numbers. For 2021 data, the FTE format is observed.
The above data does not include six State prosecutors who perform other duties (assigned to The Council of State Prosecutors, appointed to Eurojust, the European Public Prosecutor and the European Delegate Prosecutor).

(2020): The information is in form of gross data. According to the methodology used for reporting judges and court staff (FTE) – by which part-time employees are converted to full-time time by the calculation of working hours, the number amounts to 193, as a number of prosecutors are not working full time.

(2016): Slovenian state prosecutors perform their function in 13 organizational units. There are 11 district prosecutor's offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office of The Republic of Slovenia, where local, district and higher state prosecutors are positioned. At The Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia supreme state prosecutors and State Prosecutor General perform their functions. Here are also some state prosecutors of lower ranks assigned to perform demanding professional tasks.
There are no higher state prosecutor's offices as the proceedings before the courts of appeal are governed by the district prosecutor's offices. According to the State Prosecutor Act prosecutors with the rank of at least local state prosecutor may represent a case before local courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least district state prosecutor may represent a case before district courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least higher state prosecutor may represent a case before higher courts and only supreme state prosecutors may represent a case before the supreme court. Local state prosecutors may also appear before district courts if authorized by the head of a state prosecutor's office for certain categories of matters, for a particular matter, for certain categories of procedural acts or for a particular procedural act. According to amendment of legislation in 2015 local and district prosecutors may in their cases appear along with a higher prosecutor before the courts of appeal if authorized by the head of an appellate division of the state prosecutor's office for a particular case. Higher and supreme state prosecutors are competent to represent a case also before first instance courts.
In the context of question 55 we counted local and district prosecutors as prosecutors at first instance level (164), higher prosecutors as prosecutors at second instance level (42) and supreme prosecutors as prosecutors at Supreme Court level (11) without regard of the rang of court before they perform their function in fact or if they are assigned to other institution for a limited period of time (e.g for the administration of State Prosecutorial Council). The information is in form of full-time equivalent.

(2014): In November 2011, the new State Prosecutor Act came into force. It dissolved the special department of the Office of the State Prosecutor General, responsible for the 2d instance level. Proceedings before courts of appeal are now governed by the 4 State circuit prosecutor offices in towns where the higher courts are located. Prosecutors are organised in 12 offices (11 circuit offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office, where circuit and higher prosecutors work) and the Supreme State Prosecutor Office (where supreme State prosecutors and the general State prosecutor work). The function "assistant State prosecutor" changed in "local State prosecutor". The Specialised State Prosecutor's Office for dealing with the most severe criminal offences was established.

(2012): In November 2011, the new State Prosecutor Act came into force. It dissolved the special department of the Office of the State Prosecutor General, responsible for the 2d instance level. Proceedings before courts of appeal are now governed by the 4 State circuit prosecutor offices in towns where the higher courts are located. Prosecutors are organised in 12 offices (11 circuit offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office, where circuit and higher prosecutors work) and the Supreme State Prosecutor Office (where supreme State prosecutors and the general State prosecutor work). The function "assistant State prosecutor" changed in "local State prosecutor". The Specialised State Prosecutor's Office for dealing with the most severe criminal offences was established.

Spain

(General Comment): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories.
Article 34 of Law 50/1981, (Organic Statute of the Public Prosecutor's Office) distinguishes three categories:
1st Chamber Prosecutors of the Supreme Court, equal to Magistrates of the High Court. The Deputy Prosecutor of the Supreme Court will be considered the President of the Chamber.
2nd Prosecutors, equated to Magistrates.
3. Lawyers-Prosecutors, equated to Judges.

(2021): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category ("Fiscales de Sala") Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 32, Males 21, Females 11 (this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second. "Fiscal": Total 1825, Males 701, Females 1124
Third: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 774, Males 178, Females 596

(2020): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category ("Fiscales de Sala del Tribunal Supremo") Supreme Court Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 50, Males 36, Females 14
Second. "Fiscal": Total 1830, Males 700, Females 1130
Third: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 681, Males 158, Females 523

(2018): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, Total 33, Males 26, Females 7
Second) Total 1779, Males 696, Females 1083
Third) Total 653, Males 161, Females 492

(2016): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First) Total 25, Males 19, Females 6
Second) Total 1826, Males 738, Females 1088
Third) Total 622, Males 155, Females 467

Question 107

Austria

(General Comment): "3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity": discontinued investigations for reasons of opportunity are only counted by persons against which the investigation was discontinued. In one case, more than one person can be accused and the investigation can be discontinued for reasons of opportunity against more than one accused person. Therefore, the person-count was not delivered because it is inconsistent with the case-count (3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.4). The number of cases in which an investigation was discontinued for reasons of opportunity is included in the number provided for 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 but cannot be evaluated separately with the standard statistic tools of the Federal Ministry of Justice of Austria.
The provided number of cases discontinued for other reasons (3.1.4) contains cases discontinued because the offender is fugitive or an investigation may not be instituted or continued by law (e.g. because of diplomatic immunity of the offender), also cases (investigations) that were not instituted in the first place because the of a lack of an initial suspicion and all other cases that were discontinued but can not be allocated to one of the above mentioned reasons or the other reasons under 3.1.
Under 3.3, closed cases against unidentified offenders were counted which were discontinued because of another reason than not identifying the offender in the end (mostly cases in which at least one formerly unidentified offender could be identified and therefore the case against the unidentified offender(s) is closed and another (new) case against the known offender(s) is opened).

(2020): The Austrian code of criminal procedure knows measures that the public prosecutor can take in cases of minor criminal offences ("Diversion"). Comparable measures have to be taken by the public prosecutor under certain circumstances under the addictive drug act ("Suchtmittelgesetz"). Until 2019, the last-mentioned cases were counted as files "discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation" (3.1.2). Since 2020, these cases are now counted as "concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" (3.2). These changes explain the higher number of cases under 3.1.2. Cases brought to court declined mainly because in 2020 there were far less incoming cases (-13 % compared to 2018).
The number of persons against which an investigation was discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity in 2020 is 9 672.

Belgium

(General Comment): "Since the reform of the judicial landscape that came into effect on April 1, 2014, our country has 15 "first degree" public prosecutors' offices (14 public prosecutors' offices + federal prosecutor's office). The data of the federal prosecutor's office are not included here.
The data only concern correctional offenses committed by persons of legal age and persons who are not (yet) identified. Proceedings against minors are handled by the youth section of the public prosecutor's office. The unit of account is a criminal case: a case can have none, one or more defendants and/or one or more offences.
Dismissals for 'other reasons' refer only to cases in which it was possible to determine in the database that they had been closed by a dismissal for which the reason was not entered or was not correctly registered. In fact, when the reason is correctly recorded, the case is then entered under headings 3.1.1, 3.1.2 or 3.1.3. Therefore, the 'other reasons' heading is for 'unknown reasons' and therefore does not include 'special' reasons." "

(2021): Annual statistics of the Public Prosecution services - Search and prosecution of criminal cases by the public prosecutor's offices at the courts of first instance (http://www.om-mp.be/stat): tables 1, 6, 9 and 11.
The figures in the table have been extracted from the database of the College of General public prosecutors, which is fed by the records of the correctional sections of the public prosecutors' offices at the courts of first instance (MaCH system).
The unit of account is a criminal case: a case can have none, one or more defendants and/or one or more offences.
For point 3.4: In order to count the number of cases brought to courts (55 585 cases), we counted on the one hand all the cases that were closed as a result of a direct summons (41 324 cases) and on the other hand all the cases that were closed as a result of a first fixation before the council chamber in the framework of the settlement of the proceedings (14 261 cases). Indeed, all these cases are also counted as cases closed by the prosecution in the annual statistics of the Public Prosecution services (see table 9).
Additional information on point 3.2:
Of the 100 567 cases closed by a sanction or a measure imposed or negotiated by the King prosecutor (see table 9), 55 167 cases were closed following the payment of a penal transaction; 23 743 cases were closed following an administrative sanction; 19 169 cases were closed as a result of pre-trial probation; 2 446 cases were closed following a successful mediation procedure and measures; 42 cases were closed after referral to the head of the corps.

(2020): "The figures in the table have been extracted from the Data Bank of the College of Public Prosecutors, which is fed by the records of the correctional sections of the Public Prosecutor's Offices at the first instance courts (MaCH system). The data presented below correspond to the status of the database as of January 9, 2021. Useful notes for the interpretation of the data:
Of the 88,614 cases that ended with a sanction or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor
- 48,205 cases were closed following the payment of a penal transaction, - 22,091 cases were closed following an administrative sanction
- 15.969 cases were closed as a result of pre-trial probation,
- 2.308 cases were closed following a successful criminal mediation procedure, - 41 cases were closed after referral to the head of the corps.
Of the 122,581 cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons. These are :
- 6,249 cases in which the suspect is the subject of an alert. Once the suspect has been discovered, the case can be reopened.
- 40,748 cases that were referred for disposition. A case that has been sent for disposal is a closed case for the prosecutor's office (its division) that made the decision. The recipient of this case will open a new case and start the judicial investigation.
- 75,584 cases were joined. If one or more cases are joined to a parent case, all subsequent decisions are registered in the parent case. The daughter case receives the joinder decision.
In order to count the number of cases brought before the courts (47,274 cases), in contrast to previous years, we counted on the one hand all cases that were closed as a result of a direct summons (33,105 cases) and on the other hand all cases that were closed as a result of a first determination before the council chamber within the framework of the settlement of the proceedings (14,169 cases). In fact, all these cases are also counted as cases closed by the public prosecutor's office in the annual statistics of the public prosecutor's office.
In the previous questionnaires we only counted direct summonses from the Public Prosecutor's Office to the correctional chambers (31,737 cases in 2020), summonses via accelerated procedure (1,159 cases in 2020) and correctionalizations (78 cases in 2020) and referrals to the correctional chambers of the courts following a first fixation before the council chamber within the framework of the settlement of the procedure (7,592 cases in 2020). A part of these referrals relates to cases that were initiated as a result of a civil action. Therefore, these cases were not initiated by the prosecution.
The numbers of incoming, processed and pending cases have all increased for the same reason. Indeed, in 2020, the health crisis due to the outbreak of COVID-19 began. The government took measures to combat this crisis, including several periods of containment. The Public Prosecutor's Office was responsible for taking criminal action against non-compliance with these measures, which explains the sharp increase in the number of new cases and the fact that, at the same time, the flow of other types of cases did not decrease in the same proportions.
Pending cases are cases that are being processed at a given time. If the inflow increases significantly, the number of pending cases will increase accordingly and reach a higher level.
The increase in the "terminated with penalty" and "brought to court" headings is also related to the health crisis. The primary response to a COVID-19 non-compliance violation was a settlement (recorded under "terminated by penalty"). In the case of non-payment of the settlement, repeat offenses, or serious violations of these measures, the criminal policy was to bring the

(2016): 2016 statistical data are not (yet) available due to the change in ITC applications used in Public Prosecution.

(2014): In 2014, on top of the 447 132 discontinued cases listed in Q107 and Q108, 36 914 other discontinued cases have to be added (administrative fine, pretorian probation, identification of the offender, unknown reason). Actually, in 2014, 484 046 cases were discontinued. Out of the 10 126 cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor, 7 363 cases were concluded by the payment of a criminal transaction and 2 763 cases - by a successful criminal mediation procedure.

(2012): In 2012, on top of the 478 505 discontinued cases listed in Q107 and Q108, 37 471 other discontinued cases have to be added (administrative fine, pretorian probation, identification of the offender, unknown reason). Actually, in 2012, 515 976 cases were discontinued. Out of the 9 477 cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor, 6 677 cases were concluded by the payment of a criminal transaction and 2 800 cases - by a successful criminal mediation procedure.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): 1) "Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year": the unresolved pre-trial proceedings (PTPs) by a prosecutor as of 1 January of the reference year are reported.
2) “Incoming/received cases”: the closed PTPs;
3) “Processed cases”: the decided PTPs by a prosecutor and is the total value of the data from four indicators (3.1 + 3.2 + 3.3 + 3.4), with reflected types of decisions under the PTPs;
3.1.) “Discontinued during the reference year”: the terminated PTPs (including those by prescription) are reported and the total value of the data from the next four indicators (3.1.1 + 3.1.2 + 3.1.3 + 3.1.4.), with reflected types of terminations;
3.1.1) "Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified" indicates NAP ;
3.1.2) "Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offense or a specific legal situation": the terminated PTPs, incl. those by prescription;
3.1.3) "Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity " the NAP is indicated (analogous to the previous questionnaires); 3.1.4) the indicator "Discontinued for other reasons" indicates NAP;
3.2) "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor " is indicated NAP;
3.3) “Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons”: the suspended PTPs are reported, as well as the PTPs sent by competence (for the respective prosecutor's office, although these cases are essentially unresolved they are closed);
3.4) “Cases brought to court” the submitted PDs in the court are reported;
4) “Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year”: the number of pending cases at the end of the year refers to the unresolved pre-trial proceedings by a prosecutor. Regarding the cases sent by competence, the mathematical calculation for collecting the values is not applicable for the two prosecutor's offices - one that sent it by competence (according to the rules of local, functional or special competence), for which the case was decided “closed case for other reasons“ and the other, which accepted it within its competence, if at the end of the year the same case remained pending, the latter is included in the above data.

(2021): 3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.)
The number of discontinued cases in the reference year (in the case of 2021) is 101626. This number includes all discontinued criminal proceedings by the prosecutor in the year on the basis of Art. 24 of the Criminal Procedure Code, including those terminated due to the expiration of the statute of limitations on the basis of Art. 24, para. 1, item 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code (criminal liability is extinguished due to the expiration of the statute of limitations).
The number of cases terminated on statute of limitations grounds is a fact of objective reality, which does not depend on the prosecution. This number is a function of the number of the pending pre-trial proceedings, incl. suspended (predominantly due to failure to establish the perpetrator of the crime during the investigation), as well as the specific crime on which the case is being prosecuted, as the absolute statute of limitations for seeking criminal liability is different and depends on the amount of the penalty provided for in the Criminal Code for the relevant crime (according to Art. 81 of the Criminal Code).
The increase in the number of dismissed cases for 2021 compared to those dismissed in 2020 is mainly due to the greater number of dismissed cases by the prosecutor on the grounds of absolute statute of limitations for prosecution, which obliges the prosecutor to dismiss the case on the basis of Art. 24, para. 1, item 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code. This conclusion is supported by the statistical data for the two years - in 2021, the dismissed cases, on grounds other than the statute of limitations, are relatively similar: 32,400 for 2021 compared to 32,002 for 2020. However, those dismissed on statute of limitations grounds in 2021 are 69,226, and in 2020 - 42565. It can be seen that in 2021 the terminated pre-trial proceedings were significantly more than in the previous year. There is no evidence that this increase is due to any special or extraordinary circumstance that occurred in 2021. Each year the number of cases dismissed on statute of limitations grounds is different and this is due to the above reasons.

(2020): Question 107:
1)"Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year" the unresolved pre-trial proceedings (PTPs) by a prosecutor as of 1 January of the reference year are reported.
2)“Incoming/received cases” are reported the closed PTPs (analogous to the previous questionnaires);
3)“Processed cases” are reported the decided PTPs by a prosecutor and is the total value of the data from four indicators (3.1 + 3.2 + 3.3 + 3.4), with reflected types of decisions under the PTPs;
3.1.)“Discontinued during the reference year” the terminated PTPs (including those by prescription) are reported and is the total value of the data from the next four indicators (3.1.1 + 3.1.2 + 3.1.3 + 3.1.4.), with reflected types of terminations;
3.1.1)"Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified" indicates NAP (similar to the previous questionnaire);
3.1.2 "Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation" are reported the terminated PTPs, incl. those by prescription (similar to the previous questionnaires);
3.1.3)"Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity " the NAP is indicated (analogous to the previous questionnaires); 3.1.4) the indicator "Discontinued for other reasons" indicates NAP (similar to the previous questionnaire);
3.2)"Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor " is indicated NAP (analogous to the previous questionnaires);
3.3)“Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons” the suspended PTPs are reported, as well as the PTPs sent by competence (for the respective prosecutor's office, although these cases are essentially unresolved they are closed). It is not obligatory for the prosecutor's office, which sent the case within its competence, to conduct a full investigation. If a ground for the competence of another prosecutor's office is established under the rules of local, functional or special competence, the case shall be sent to the respective prosecutor's office for continuation of the investigation. The grounds for determining the competence are exhaustively specified in the CPC (Chapter Four, Section II of the CPC, Article 35 et seq. Of the CPC, Article 195 of the CPC, Articles 396-398 of the CPC, Article 411a of the CPC);
3.4) in the indicator “Cases brought to court” the submitted PDs in the court are reported (analogous to the previous questionnaires);
4) in the indicator “Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year” the unresolved PDs by a prosecutor as of December 31of the reference year are reported;
Concerning the increase in the number of processed cases between 2018 and 2020, the number of "cases closed by the prosecutor for other reasons", taken into consideration for this cycle, makes the differnce.

(2018): 1) The number of the terminated pre-trial proceedings has been given under indicator ‘Received during the reference year’ (similar to previous questionnaires);
2) The number of the terminated pre-trial proceedings, including those on limitation has been given under indicator “Discontinued during the reference year (see Q108 below)”;
3) NAP has been indicated under indicator “Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor” (similar to previous questionnaires);
4) The number of the pre-trial proceedings that have been brought to court is given under indicator “Cases brought to court” (similar to previous questionnaires).

(2014): In 2014, prosecutors dealt with 139153 pre-trial proceedings for which cases were transferred to court; 75834 were terminated on account of the absence of a crime or other grounds provided for by law. A prosecutor may not terminate the pre-trial proceeding on the ground the perpetrator cannot be identified, unless the limitation period for prosecution has expired (42 588). A prosecutor cannot impose punishment without the approval of a judge. The parties can conclude an agreement (approved by the judge) for some crimes before the case is sent to court (11561), or during the trial (data is not available). Court proceedings can be reduced if during the preliminary hearing, the defendant fully admits the facts stated in the indictment (3505 cases).

(2012): In 2012, prosecutors dealt with 144950 pre-trial proceedings for which the investigation has been completed and the cases were transferred to court. 91523 pre-trial proceedings were terminated on account of the absence of a crime or other grounds explicitly provided for by the law. A prosecutor may not terminate the pre-trial proceeding on the ground the perpetrator cannot be identified, unless the prescribed limitation period for prosecution has expired. Terminated pre-trial proceedings conducted against an unknown perpetrator due to the expiration of the statutory limitation periodwere 59 063, and are part of the total of terminated cases. A prosecutor cannot impose punishment without the approval of a judge.

Croatia

(General Comment): Discontinued for other reasons: cases can be discontinued for reasons such as circumstances which exclude guilt, the fact that there is no reasonable suspicion that the suspect committed particular criminal offence, in the case when criminal complaint is not credible. The reason for discontinue the case can be if the data in the criminal complaint indicate the conclusion that the complaint is not credible.
Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: cases can be closed for reasons such as the existence of circumstances that preclude the guilt of the defendant or there is no evidence that the defendant committed the offence. Other reasons: If the data in the criminal complaint indicate the conclusion that the application is not credible.

(2021): Source of information: Report of the Chief State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia on the work of State Attorney's offices in 2021
3.1. the total number of cases completed by adopting a decision rejecting criminal charges or a decision terminating the investigation is presented, however, statistical data are not kept by categories requested in the table
3.1.3. There was 523 discontinued cases by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity (data covers juvenile perpetrators only because data in relation to other perpetrators is not available).

(2020): Reason for decreased number of incoming cases same as for the courts - pandemic of COVID-19.
Discontinued cases decreased - same as for the courts (COVID-19), please see comment in Q091.
For the category 3.1. Discontinued during the reference year (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4.), PP is not able to differ categories 3.1.1., 3.1.2 and 3.1.4.

(2018): Compared with the data discrepancies from 2016 data, it is evident that the total number of cases received in the State Attorney's Office in 2018 decreased, which is why all other reported figures from 2018 are relatively smaller compared to the 2016 data.

(2016): Under discontinued cases we consider cases in which criminal charge was dismissed and cases that were suspended during criminal proceedings.
Data on the number of cases that were concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor (conditional deferral and agreement) do not include cases against juveniles and persons aged between 18 and 21 (younger adults) because for these persons we do not have separate information on how many cases have been completed by a penalty or measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor and how much by use of opportunistic principle. Therefore data on juvenile and younger adults are reported in cases that the State Attorney discontinued (dismissal by use of opportunistic principle).

(2014): Variations between 2012 and 2014 are due to amendments in criminal law. Namely, in 2013, the new Criminal Act entered into force by which some criminal acts are decriminalized. The legal understanding of the Criminal Department of the Supreme Court of 27 December 2012, on the amount of indeterminate values, prescribes that the legal characteristics of criminal offences such as theft, embezzlement, defraudation and fraud, described as a matter of small value, represent a matter whose value does not exceed HRK 2,000.00 (instead of the previously HRK 1,000.00). Thus, a large number of criminal proceedings on offences related to property matters, which were so far initiated by the State attorney, are now initiated upon a private complaint.

Czech Republic

(2021): In 2019, we have changed the methodology of reporting for CEPEJ.
In addition, the prosecutor can deal with the case in many ways. We tried to make the data work and the sums to make sense. E.g. Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year + Incoming/received cases - Processed cases = Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year. However, we would like to state that data comes from various sources and may be sometimes tricky to deal with.
There are many reasons why the prosecution could be discontinued. It is difficult to say under which category they should be included (3.1.2 or 3.1.4). However, the reasons may include following: 1. If such prosecution concerns a person who is exempt from the competencies of the law enforcement authorities or a person for whom the law requires an official consent for their prosecution, if such consent was not awarded by an entitled authority, unless the exemption is temporary or unless the criminal prosecution of the person is inadmissible due to lack of consent only temporarily; 2. if it concerns a person who is below the age of criminal responsibility 3. if it is against a person whose mental illness that occurred after the criminal offence was committed makes it permanently impossible for them to understand the purpose of the criminal prosecution 4. and many others.

(2020): Last year, we have changed the methodology of reporting for CEPEJ.
In addition, the prosecutor can deal with the case in many ways. We tried to make the data work and the sums to make sense. E.g. Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year + .Incoming/received cases - Processed cases = Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year. However, we would like to state that data comes from various sources and may be sometimes tricky to deal with.
There are many reasons why the prosecution could be discontinued. It is difficult to say under which category they should be included (3.1.2 or 3.1.4). However, the reasons may include following: 1. If such prosecution concerns a person who is exempt from the competencies of the law enforcement authorities or a person for whom the law requires an official consent for their prosecution, if such consent was not awarded by an entitled authority, unless the exemption is temporary or unless the criminal prosecution of the person is inadmissible due to lack of consent only temporarily; 2. if it concerns a person who is below the age of criminal responsibility 3. if it is against a person whose mental illness that occurred after the criminal offence was committed makes it permanently impossible for them to understand the purpose of the criminal prosecution 4. and many others.

(2018): This year, we have changed the methodology of reporting for CEPEJ, thus some number strongly deiffers from previous data.
Also, there are many other ways how the prosecutor can deal with the case. Thus sum of discontinued during the reference year + Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor + cases brought to court is smaller than number of cases received during the year.

(2016): The correct number of received cases for 2014 should be 313958.

Denmark

(General Comment): The number of processed cases includes both cases dismissed by the police and cases dismissed by the public prosecutor. The reason that processed cases includes both the police and prosecution service is that we cannot always distinguish closed/finished cases between the police and prosecution service as they are often archived in police departments regardless of who processed the case

(2021): It is not possible to subtract numbers on discontinued cases in the format in Q 3.1.1. + 3.1.2 + 3.1.4, as the legal basis in Denmark (sections 721 and 749 of the Administration of Justice Act) is not devided in such subsectors.
Regarding point 3.1.3 in question 107, it is not possible to account for one specific reason behind the increased number of discontinued cases for reasons of opportunity. However, during 2021 we have had an increased effort in lowering the amount of pending cases. This can partly explain the surge of discontinued cases in 3.1.3.

(2020): It is not possible to subtract numbers on discontinued cases in the format in Q 3.1.1. + 3.1.2 + 3.1.4, as the legal basis in Denmark (sections 721 and 749 of the Administration of Justice Act) is not devided in such subsectors. The data source used in points 1 and 4 (data that do not include post-registration of charges) are different from the data source used in points 2 and 3 (data that includes post-registration of charges). Hence, data does not fit the formula: (pending at the beginning of the year + incoming) – resolved = pending at the end of the year) due to post-registrations of further charges. The number of incoming charges has decreased considerably between 2018 and 2020. This is due to a change in the way we measure the number of incoming charges. The new way of measure incoming cases more correctly than the previous way of measuring as the new way contains all incoming charges and not all processed charges as the previous way did. The number of incoming cases in 2018 is 245.687 when using the new way of measuring.

(2018): Please note that there has been a mistake with the previous data collection for 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2014 and 2016 concerning question 107 and 108. This is due to missing information and collection of data from the Danish Administration of Justice Act. In the future we will make sure that every information is incorporated.

(2016): Cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor include cases concluded by the police as these cases are indistinguishable in the case handling system.

(2014): The increase in the number of cases charged by the public prosecutor before the courts is a result of an increased preliminary charge rate (police) and an increased prosecution rate (public prosecutor). The conviction rate is unchanged over the period despite the increase in both the preliminary charge rate and the prosecution rate.

Estonia

(General Comment): The number of incoming cases is given by registered crimes while the number of cases resolved is given by the number of persons in respect of whom a procedural decision has been made.

(2020): The number of incoming cases is given by registered crimes. the number of cases resolved is given by the number of persons in respect of whom a procedural decision has been made.

(2018): The data for 2018 evaluation cycle are checked and confirmed. The data are not comparable with 2016, because the source of the data changed.

(2016): For this cycle, calculations are based on cases not persons or crimes. One case, especially when brought to court or concluded by penalty, often involves several crimes and persons.

(2012): As to the item “cases charged by the prosecutor before the courts”, the 2010 data referred to settlement proceedings, while the 2012 data includes only cases that were terminated by a prosecutor in case of lack of public interest in proceedings and in case of negligible guilt. These cases are also included under “cases discontinued by the prosecutor”. The category “cases charged by the public prosecutor before the courts” includes cases where a person has been sent to court in order to impose coercive psychiatric treatment by a court and cases which have been sent to court in order to request termination of criminal proceedings (the latter was not taken into account in previous reports).

Finland

(2021): 3.2 Notice cases of summary fines are not included. The number of summary fines in 2021: 34 306.
3.3: Consist of internal transfers of cases between prosecution districts, joining of cases and technical decisions.

(2020): Comments: 3.2 Notice cases of summary fines are not included. The number of summary fines: 38433.
The decrease in the number of cases “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor” is due to a change in the law. The law on certain type of fine (rangaistusmääräysmenettely) was abolished in 2016 and replaced with the law on fines and summary penalty fee (laki sakon ja rikesakon määräämisestä (754/2010). According to this law, the police can order the summary penal fee. This page, in Finnish, shows figures of the amount in euros of these summary fines imposed by prosecutors (2nd graph) and by the police (3rd graph).
https://www.oikeusrekisterikeskus.fi/fi/index/tietopalvelu/tilastotjaavoindata/sakot.html
3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons and 3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: The prosecutor must waive prosecution if: (1) the prerequisites for the bringing of charges provided in section 6, subsection 1 are not met; (2) the prosecutor waives prosecution on the basis of section 6, subsection 2; (3) the injured party has not requested that charges be brought or another special prerequisite provided in law for the bringing of charges referred to in section 2, subsection 2 is not met and the nature of the case requires that a separate decision be made. The prosecutor may waive prosecution if: (1) if no sentence more severe than a fine is to be anticipated for the offence and the offence, with consideration to its detrimental effects or the degree of culpability of the offender manifested in it, is to be deemed petty as a whole; and (2) if the suspect had not reached the age of eighteen at the time of the commission of the suspected offence and no sentence more severe than a fine or imprisonment for at most six months is to be anticipated for this offence and it is to be deemed to be more the result of lack of understanding or thoughtlessness than of heedlessness of the prohibitions and commands of the law. In addition, the prosecutor may waive prosecution, unless an important public or private interest requires otherwise if: 1) if criminal proceedings and punishment are to be deemed unreasonable or inappropriate in view of a settlement reached by the suspect in the offence and the injured party, the other action of the suspect in the offence to prevent or remove the effects of the offence, the personal circumstances of the suspect in the offence, the other consequences of the act to him or her, the welfare and health care measures undertaken and the other circumstances; (2) under the provisions on joint punishment or on the consideration of previous punishments in sentencing, the suspected offence would not have an essential effect on the total punishment; or (3) the expenses in continuing to consider the case would be in manifest disproportion to the nature of the case and to the sanction possibly to be expected in it. Also, If charges are being considered for two or more offences for which the same person is suspected and if he or she has contributed to the clarification of one or more of the suspected offences, the prosecutor may decide not to bring charges for all of the suspected offences. However, charges shall be brought if required by an important public or private interest.

(2018): With regard to the observed decrease in the number of cases "concluded by a penalty", there were 507 penalty notices given by the prosecutor in 2016 but only 23 in 2018.

(2016): The number of discontinued cases during the reference year includes the number of cases in which the prosecutor has waved the charges before trial and restricted the preliminary investigation in a way that the case is not brought to trial. For 2014, only the cases in which the prosecutor has waved the charges before trial have been informed.

(2014): The number of 1st instance criminal cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor decreased over the years 2010, 2012 and 2014. According to the annual report for 2014 of the Prosecution Service, the number of summary penal judgments decreased by 9 % (2013 – 2014; 59 in numbers). According to the report of 2013, the number of summary penal judgments decreased by almost 19 % (2012 – 2013; 151 in numbers). Some organisational changes were carried out during that time period. Besides, the number of incoming cases decreased, but the degree of difficulty/complexity increased.

France

(General Comment): The complexity and diversity of data on criminal cases do not allow an estimation of the number of pending cases.

(2021): source SDSE

(2016): Among the cases discontinued by the public prosecutor, a distinction should be carried out between the mass of cases that could not be prosecuted because they were not elucidated or insufficiently characterized (3112642) and cases that could be prosecuted but were dismissed in accordance with the opportunity principle (191430).

Germany

(General Comment): General information on the public prosecution statistic used as a source for anwering this question: Once per year, the Federal Statistical Office compiles and publishes the public prosecution statistic. Statistical ordinances define the scope and rules of data collection for these statistic. The public prosecution offices collect the data and submit it to the statistical offices of the Länder, who check and edit the data and send it to the Federal Statistical Office. In simplified terms, the statistical ordinance provides two different kinds of data collection sheets: The "procedural survery" that collects data on the specifics of the investigation proceedings carried out by the public prosecution and the "monthly survey" that collects data on the caseload and other workload of the public prosecution offices. The figures entered here do not include investigations against persons unknown. The public prosecution statistic only shows the number of charges filed against unknown perpetrators. Information on the further treatment of those charges is not available. This is because the monthly survey distinguishes between "caseload of investigation proceedings covered by the procedural surveys" and "other workload". Charges against persons unknown fall into the category “other workload”. The number of resolved and pending cases is only collected with regard to the first category (proceedings covered by the procedural surveys). If a suspect is identified in cases with an unknown perpetrator, the case receives a new file-number and then appears in the the category "covered by the procedural surveys".

(2021): 3.2 Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor:
The number represents the the cases that were discontinued in accordance with Section 153a of the Code of Criminal Procedure ("Non-prosecution subject to imposition of conditions and directions")
These cases would also fit into the category "discontinued for reasons of opportunity" (3.1.3) but were allocated to 3.2 here.
3.1.4 The number of cases discontinued for other reasons in the public prosecution statistic 2020 (and previous years) was considerably higher due to a programming issue in one of the Länder. Many of the cases that were registered in this category should have actually been registered within the category "discontinued for reasons of opportunity". The issue was noticed and fixed at the end of 2020.

(2020): 3.2 Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor:
The number represents the the cases that were discontinued in accordance with Section 153a of the Code of Criminal Procedure ("Non-prosecution subject to imposition of conditions and directions")
These cases would also fit into the category "discontinued for reasons of opportunity" (3.1.3) but were allocated to 3.2 here.

(2018): These figures include first-instance criminal cases led by the public prosecution offices based at the Regional Courts (investigations with a "Js" file number) and the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (investigations with an "OJs" file number). Regarding the latter ("OJs" investigations), figures only exist for the number of cases newly received by the prosecutor generals' offices.

(2016): These figures include first-instance criminal cases led by the public prosecution offices based at the Regional Courts (investigations with a "Js" file number) and the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (investigations with an "OJs" file number). Regarding the latter ("OJs" investigations), figures only exist for the number of cases newly received by the prosecutor generals' offices.

Greece

(2021): The definition of the pending cases includes postponed cases or the cases the trial date has been setting out of the refence year or hasn’t been determined during the year. The fact is that the theoretical pending cases resulted from pending cases on 1st of January + Incoming cases (cases are related to reference + previous years). However, pending cases on 31 Dec. are only the cases that have not been determined, or cases that have been determined after the reference year. All of the pending cases on 31 of Dec. are related only to the reference year.
Considering that this is the first year where offices calculate their pending cases, and some of them do not have electronical systems to monitor their data, in the next years we will get better and more accurate statistics.

(2020): No data available for this query.

(2016): The relevant data are not available electronically for the moment, therefore their extraction is not possible.

Hungary

(General Comment): The data source was, similarly to our previous data provision, the Statistical Subsystem of Completed Criminal Proceedings of the Uniform Investigative Authority and Prosecution Service Statistics (ENyÜBS-BBS). In the ENyÜBS-BBS, data are recorded when the investigating authorities or the prosecution service have taken a procedural decision (e.g. dismissal of a criminal complaint, discontinuation, suspension, indictment) in relation to a criminal act which has led to the statistical reporting of the data. The ENyUBS-BBS subsystem is therefore a so-called follow-up system in terms of the time of the data-recording, and therefore does not show the number of offences occurred in the year under review, but the number of acts/conducts in respect of which a legal decision has been taken and, in relation thereof, statistical reporting (of registrative nature) has been done. From the above it follows that it is not excluded that there are ongoing criminal proceedings that are not yet included in the ENyÜBS database.

(2021): As to 'Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year' and 'Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year', please note that the number of pending cases at a given day is not recorded in the database operated by the prosecution service. As to 'Processed cases' (3.), please note that the database of the prosecution service records the number of cases where one or more procedural acts were performed by the prosecution service; besides that, it records the number of procedural acts regarding each type of act.

(2020): 3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons:
If the Special Part of the Penal Code regulates the conduct of the accused after the commencement of the proceedings as a ground for termination of criminal liability.
3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons:At the stage of preparation of the prosecution, Section 221 / A (7) of the Criminal Procedure Act provides that if the mediation proceedings are successful and the application of Section 29 (1) of the Criminal Code is appropriate, the prosecutor shall terminate the proceedings.

Ireland

(General Comment): As many of our cases are prosecuted by State Solicitors we don't have any data on the status of a case between the time the direction is issued and when we receive the final outcome; this is for matters on indictment. For summary cases outside of Dublin, we rarely even if ever hear back on the outcome as these directions are passed on to the police by the State Solicitor and the police execute the direction to prosecute without reference to the State Solicitor. This may change in the future if outcome data is exchange using the Criminal Justice Operational Hub. Summary cases outside of Dublin would make up a significant proportion of the files given in our figures.
As per the instructions provided, cases are counted per prosecution file which could include more than one suspect and multiple charges preferred. Therefore, the figure give for 'Discontinued' in 107.3.1 is the number of distinct files where a suspect was directed for 'no prosecution'; in some of these files, other suspects on the file may have been prosecuted in the courts.

(2021): There has been a significant increase in files received by the office in the last number of years - this is partially due to the increase in complexity of offences and investigations.
These figures were compiled by the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and will be included in the Annual Report 2021 which is published annually on the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions website. Caution should be exercised when comparing these statistics with statistics published by other organisations such as the Courts Service or An Garda Síochána. The statistics published here are based on our own classification and categorisation systems and may in some cases not be in line with the classification systems of other organisations.
Q.3.4: indictable offences

**(2018): ***14,856 files in total were received in 2018 including appeals of which 11,647 related to first instance cases .

(2012): Figures provided for 2012 reflect 2011 data.

Latvia

(2021): Cases brought to court: 6061 cases with the total number of criminal offenses - 11008.
Number of incoming cases in 2021 was 11 529. This includes cases received: for initiation of criminal prosecution; after the division of cases or during the phase of investigation; in accordance with urgent procedures; from the court for the elimination of violations/deficiencies; taken over for investigation; restored previously terminated or suspended cases.
The vertical consistency cannot be ensured because in 2021 there were 370 cases that were added to other cases and 82 cases were returned to the investigative authorities to continue the investigation. These cases are not included in the subcategories of Q107. 3.1.2. Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation - according to Article 380 of the Criminal Procedure Law these preconditions (stated in Article 377, Clauses 1, 2 and 10 of the Criminal Procedure Law) are exonerating circumstances. Data for the year 2020 included also other clauses of Article 377 that contain circumstances that do not exonerate persons, which explains the remarkable difference in numbers. Accordingly, 3.1.3. has increased by the number of relevant cases (that also constitute reasons of opportunity).
3.1.4. Discontinued for other reasons: the cases included in this category are, for example, the cases in which the prosecutor took a decision to terminate criminal proceedings by conditionally releasing from criminal liability a person who has been accused of committing a serious crime and who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime that is more serious or dangerous than the criminal offence committed by the relevant person himself / herself (Paragraph prim of Section 415 of the Criminal Procedure Law). The information compiled in the information system of the Prosecution Office shows that in 2021, prosecutors took 9 decisions to terminate criminal proceedings based on the aforementioned Paragraph. Besides, for 2021, there are 675 cases in which criminal proceedings were suspended included in this category.
Just like for the year 2020, 365 cases in which the prosecutor took a decision to terminate the criminal proceedings by conditionally releasing a person from criminal liability for the commission of a criminal offense or a less serious crime were included in the category “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor". This, along with the recommendation included in the Operational Strategy of the Prosecution Office 2022-2027- on the completion of the criminal proceedings in the Prosecution Office where possible, also explains the increase in the latter category. 3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: the cases included in this category are, for example, the cases in which the Prosecutor General has made a decision to terminate criminal proceedings against a person who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime that is more serious or dangerous than a criminal offence committed by such person himself / herself. In 2021, Prosecutor General has not terminated any criminal proceedings based on Article 410 of the Criminal Procedure Law. For 2021, in this category there are 285 cases included that were sent on the basis of the jurisdiction (including – abroad).
4 Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref year: The number has increased mainly due to the COVID-19 pandemic (that affected the timely execution of procedural/investigative actions).
3.4. In 2021 there has been a significant decrease of the number of initiated criminal proceedings (-17%), furthermore the number of criminal proceedings completed in the prosecutor's office has increased (+26%).

(2020): Cases brought to court
8088 cases with the total number of criminal offenses - 14158
The vertical consistency cannot be ensured because in 2020, there were 520 cases that were added to other cases and 91 cases were returned to the investigative authorities to continue the investigation. These cases are not included in the subcategories of Q107. 3.1.4 Discontinued for other reasons: the cases included in this category are, for example, the cases in which the prosecutor took a decision to terminate criminal proceedings by conditionally releasing from criminal liability a person who has been accused of committing a serious crime and who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime that is more serious or dangerous than the criminal offence committed by the relevant person himself / herself. The information compiled in the information system of the Prosecution Office shows that in 2020, prosecutors took 2 decisions to terminate criminal proceedings based on Paragraph prim of Section 415 of the Criminal Procedure Law. Besides, for 2020, in this category are included 955 cases in which criminal proceedings were suspended.
3.3. Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: the cases included in this category are, for example, the cases in which the Prosecutor General has made a decision to terminate criminal proceedings against a person who has substantially assisted in the disclosure of a serious or especially serious crime that is more serious or dangerous than a criminal offence committed by such person himself / herself. In 2020, Prosecutor General has not terminated any criminal proceedings based on Article 410 of the Criminal Procedure Law. For 2020, in this category are included 285 cases that were sent in accordance with the relevant jurisdiction (including – abroad). The category “3.1. Discontinued during the reference year” decreased because 365 cases in which the prosecutor took a decision to terminate the criminal proceedings by conditionally releasing a person from criminal liability for the commission of a criminal offense or a less serious crime were included in the category “3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor". This also explains the increase in the latter category.

(2018): Cases brought to court
8887 cases with the total number of criminal offenses - 14569

(2016): Cases brought to court
10022 cases with the total number of criminal offenses - 16892

Lithuania

(2021): The number of registered crimes is gradually decreasing since 2017 in Lithuania, and this also affects other numbers. Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Lithuania: the numbers are correct. Vertical inconsistency is a result of different sources of data and differences in formulas for calculating some statistical indicators. Numbers of „Pending cases“ and „Incoming cases“ are taken from the national register, however number of „Processed cases“ is taken from registers of the Lithuanian Prosecution Service.

(2020): Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons: cases closed under Paragraph 3 Article 68 of the Criminal Procedure Code - when criminal act has been committed in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania by a citizen of a foreign country or other person who have subsequently left the Republic of Lithuania, the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Lithuania may request foreign country to take over the criminal case. When criminal case is taken over by another country, the one in Lithuania is discontinued. The number of registered crimes is gradually decreasing since 2017 in Lithuania, and this affects number of incoming cases, processed cases, discontinued cases and cases brought to court.
The reason for the non-compliance of the result of the formula used ((pending cases on 1 January 2020 + incoming cases) – processed cases = pending cases on 31 December 2020) is a result of different sources of data and their differing formulas for calculating some statistical indicators. Numbers of „Pending cases“ and „Incoming cases“ is taken from the national register, however number of „Processed cases“ is taken from registers of the Lithuanian Prosecution Service.

(2014): In contrast with the 2012 data, the 2014 data includes cases in connected investigations.

(2012): The category “cases charged before the courts” also encompasses cases discontinued by the court on the prosecutor’s request, when the measures of criminal effect can be imposed on the persons concerned.The increase in the number of cases received by the prosecutor stems from the Lithuanian economic situation and the national economic priorities, as well as from the entry into force of the Law on Domestic Violence (2011). Criminal investigation became compulsory regarding every single incident of domestic violence. Over the last few years, the prosecution service had been seeking to complete criminal investigations under economy procedures - imposing penal or reformative measures, deciding the case with a penal order or using the accelerated process.

Luxembourg

(2021): 3.1.4 " Discontinued for other reasons": due to the continuing pandemic in 2021, no “Choice18 +” measures could be initiated, nor processed, during this year. Similarly, driving courses were suspended due to the pandemic and did not resume until October 2021.
3.2 “Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor”: the increase in the number of cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor between 2020 and 2021 cannot be explained by a single event. The increase is mainly due to the growing number of warnings issued by the prosecution service, which is on the one hand the result of punctual measures related to the health crisis and on the other hand depends on the subject matter of the cases dealt with, as warnings are usually issued in less serious cases.

(2020): "The cases referred to under 3.2. shall be considered closed if the party concerned complies with the condition imposed by the warning or fulfills its obligations arising from the mediation. In case of non-compliance, the public action will resume.
3.1.4: These are essentially two specific measures: firstly, in the area of traffic, the obligation to follow a driving course and, only for young offenders of full age, participation in a course in the Choice 18+ program for the prevention of drug addiction (https://www.solina.lu/fr/facilities/impuls/)."

(2018): L'augmentation du nombre d'affaires classées s'explique essentiellement au niveau des affaires de police. Depuis 2017, le nombre d'affaires nouvelles a considérablement augmenté, ce qui explique partiellement le nombre important d'affaires classées en la matière. Cet accroissement des affaires ouvertes est lié à l'introduction du système de contrôle et de sanction automatisés (CSA) au cours de l'année 2016, qui a mené à une augmentation importante des affaires de circulation (vitesse), des infractions constatées via des radars fixes et mobiles. En plus, des changements au niveau de la gestion de ces affaires CSA au parquet a engendré le classement d'un nombre important d'affaires en 2018, ce qui contribue à la variation importante des affaires classées observée entre 2016 et 2018. Les affaires reçues par le procureur au cours de l'année de référence incluent les affaires 'Sans Auteur Identifié' (SAI) qui sont provisoirement classées dans l'attente de l'identification d'un auteur. En 2018, 24 799 affaires étaient qualifiées SAI.

Malta

(2021): The Office of the Attorney General is in the process of setting up a comprehensive case management system that will keep track of all the cases that are processed by the OAG. Until then, the cases quoted above are all cases prosecuted in court at 1st Instance.
The high pending caseload at the beginning of 2021 is a direct result of the inefficiencies experienced during the Covid-19 pandemic. In fact throughout 2020, given that most of the year the courts of justice were closed, the number of incoming cases far exceeding the number of resolved cases. This led to a low CR and a concomitant high pending caseload.

(2016): The criminal cases brought to court at 1st Instance are prosecuted by the Police and not by the attorneys working in the Office of the AG.

Netherlands

(General Comment): The number of pending cases at the end of the year cannot equal pending cases at the start of the year + incoming cases – processed cases, because a specific type of case can only be counted in the stock when the file has been judged, not when they are pending. This is for criminal cases where an order is given, but the case is then returned because the order cannot be executed. This specific case type return to the stock, but cannot be measured in the system the public prosecution uses. Once those cases are assessed again and stream out, they become visible in the numbers in the system. Pending cases are cases that are yet to be judged and for which a hearing has to be planned. Cases for which the hearing has been planned, are not included in this number.

(2021): Pending cases are cases that are yet to be judged and for which a hearing has to be planned. Cases for which the hearing has been planned, are not included in this number.
Discrepancy comment Pending cases January: The way in which pending cases were counted changed in August 2020, before that time a large number of cases were included that had already been dealt with administratively. Those cases are now excluded from the number of pending cases, which explains the difference in numbers between pending cases Jan 2020 and and pending cases Jan 2021.

(2020): The number of pending cases at the end of the year cannot equal pending cases at the start of the year + incoming cases – processed cases because a certain type of case can only be counted in the stock when the file has been judged, not when they are pending. These cases are criminal cases where an order is given, but they are then returned because the order cannot be executed. These criminal cases return to the stock, but cannot be measured in the system the public prosecution uses. Once a case like that it assessed again and streams out, it becomes visible in the numbers of the system.

(2016): In 2014 there were no assistent officers. The lower input results in lower output.

(2012): The category "cases discontinued for reasons of opportunity" concerns minor cases and covers cases solved by the suspects and victims themselves and cases considered too old to be still prosecuted. Since 2012, these kinds of cases are not filtered anymore by the police and are registered at the public prosecution offices. In 2012, the number of cases concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the prosecutor, increased due to the Law on Public Prosecution sanctions. The latter extended the possibility for the public prosecution to impose sanctions itself, independently of the Judicial (sentence disposal).

Poland

**(General Comment): ***The number of cases discontinued for any other reason consists of cases discontinued on the basis of:
- art. 17 par. 1 point 3 to 11 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: the social harm of the act is negligible; the law provides that the perpetrator is not subject to punishment; the defendant has died; the criminal statute of limitations has run; criminal proceedings for the same act of the same person have been validly terminated or previously instituted proceedings are pending; the perpetrator is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Polish criminal courts; lack of complaint from an authorized prosecutor; absence of the required authorization for prosecution or request for prosecution from an authorized person, unless otherwise provided by law; there is another circumstance excluding prosecution.
- the Act on Counteracting Drug Addiction (Article 62a and 62b);
- other discontinuances - in addition to those described in report PK-P1K on activity of common organizational units of the Public Prosecutor's Office in criminal cases.
*The number of cases closed by the prosecutor for other reasons consists of: - cases in which criminal prosecution was transferred (Article 591 para. 6 of the Code of Criminal Procedure), - refusal to start an investigation, - suspended cases, - cases finished with the transfer of the commander, - cases settled in another way (there is no data about the way of completion in the report).

**(2020): ***The number of cases processed in 2018 was 1,076,123. The number of cases discontinued for this period is 397,471. This number is comparable to the 2019 data. (406,770 cases discontinued) and for 2020. (387,521 cases discontinued). *The number of cases - "concluded by a penalty or measure imposed or negotiated by the prosecutor" for each year was as follows: 2018. – 43 348, in 2019. -36 167, in 2020. - 25 635.

(2018): Differences which appear between data mentioned in the form related to functioning of the Polish jurisdiction and data specified in the previous edition of research - connected with the amount of cases incoming and the amount of terminated cases - arise from at least two reasons. First, during the years the image of crime has been changing. The amount of committed crimes is not constant and it is changing dynamically. Second, normative changes affect the differences mentioned at the beginning. This is connected with: the penalization of acts which have been criminally indifferent until now and amendments to the Criminal Procedure Law. In the adversarial reform - currently in force since the 1st of July 2015 - the rule related to cases terminated by decisions of police on refusal to allow investigation or on discontinuance of investigation has been introduced. According to this rule the aforementioned cases do not have to be approved by the prosecutor. Therefore such proceedings have not been registered in the prosecution office. Amendments to the Code of Criminal Procedure, which came into force on the 15h of April 2016, cancelled this rule.

(2016): Cases "Discontinued during the reference year" - only number of staied legal proceedings.

Portugal

(2020): The data indicated for «number of processed cases» corresponds to “the total number of criminal cases at the investigation stage that have been closed”.
The Public Prosecutor's Office, closes the inquiry as soon as it has gathered sufficient evidence that no crime has been committed, that the defendant has not committed it or that the procedure is legally inadmissible.
The Public Prosecutor's Office also closes the inquiry if it has not been possible to obtain sufficient evidence that a crime has been committed or who the perpetrators were.

(2014): For 2014, data concerning 1st instance courts is not available due to technical constraints.

(2012): This category of cases includes inquiry proceedings received by the public prosecutor and inquiry proceedings completed with charges proposed by the public prosecutor.

Romania

(2020): There are no available data on grounds on which a decision to discontinue a case is taken by the public prosecutor.

(2016): As regard the increase from 2014 data related to the number of cases brought to court, most probably the new provisions in terms of guilty plea procedures introduced by the new codes may represent a reason for this increase in using this procedural institution; moreover people/parties become more aware of it/of this procedural instrument and a judicial practice has been created

(2014): The figure provided for 2014 in respect of the total number of 1st instance criminal cases received by the public prosecutor (1 756 001) corresponds to the stocks and newly entered files for this year. In 2012, the number of newly entered files was 679 193 (789 677 for 2013). The variations observed between 2012 and 2014 are due to the entry into force of the new codes.

Slovak Republic

(2021): The General public prosecutors office did not deliver any explanation.

(2020): The data were delivered by General prosecutor office. The number of 1st instance criminal cases are not monitored by General prosecutor office in CEPEJ requested structure.

(2018): The number of Cases received during the reference year represents the count of received cases on the Prosecution Office, not the count of terminated cases.
To the column Cases discontinued during the reference year we included the decisions of the prosecutor as well as of the police officer. If the police officer has decided on the discontinuance of the criminal prosecution, those decisions were examined by a prosecutor. The prosecutor himself/herself has discontinued the criminal prosecution in 263 cases.
Among Cases terminated by the prosecutor by imposing a sanction or negotiating a measure were included criminal prosecutions of persons against whom the criminal prosecution was conditionally suspended (1334) or the criminal prosecution was suspended by approving a conciliation between the accused and aggrieved party (479).
Among Cases brought to court were included indictments submitted by the prosecutor in the year 2018 to the court. The number of accused persons was 29 789 (the count of the accused persons might not equal the count of the indictments).

(2016): The number of cases received represents all entries in the criminal registers of the prosecution offices. The decrease of number of the received cases in comparison with the previous cycle is the objective fact out of the range of prosecution service.
Not all of the received cases are concluded in the same year. The number of cases discontinued during the reference year includes the decisions of the prosecutor as well as of the police officer. The decisions of the police officer to discontinue the criminal prosecution were examined by a prosecutor. Only in 62 cases the decision to discontinue the criminal prosecution was issued by the prosecutor (see Q 108).
Cases terminated by the prosecutor by imposing a sanction or negotiating a measure include criminal prosecutions of persons against whom the criminal prosecution was conditionally suspended (1485) or the criminal prosecution was suspended by approving a conciliation between the accused and aggrieved party (469).
The number of cases brought to court (25023) represents the number of indictments submitted to court by the prosecutor in 2016. The number of accused person was 28 612 (according to Slovak criminal law one indictment can be issued against more defendants).

(2014): For 2012, it was impossible to split the number of cases discontinued by the prosecutor and the number of cases concluded by a penalty. For 2014, both of the categories could be identified. The total is 8547 cases, which is close to the number given in 2012.

Slovenia

(General Comment): General remarks:
- statistical data is kept on charged, accused or convicted persons, and the data is related to the main crime per defendant (methodology as used in the Joint Annual Report on the Work of State Prosecutor's Offices and previous CEPEJ reporting).
- vertical consistency is not ensured due to the fact that the State Prosecutor's Office reports data from a dynamic information system, where subsequent changes and corrections are possible, and each category
(received, solved, unsolved) is "counted" on a certain day or for a period, which may lead to later deviations; and due to the methodology used at reporting (3.) Processed cases (see below).
- data included cases against known and unknown perpetrators. Cases against known perpetrators are counted according to persons (e.g. a denunciation against five individuals is counited as five cases), and cases against unknown perpetrators (Ktn cases) according to the number of files. It should be noted that between 27,000 and 60,000 complaints against unknown perpetrators are received per year. They are included in the statistical data as pending cases until they are closed (for example, the perpetrator is discovered, the expiration of the statute of limitations or that no legal signs of a crime have been provided).
1. Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. Year
The data represent existing unresolved criminal complaints against known perpetrators (adults, minors and legal entities) and newly received complaints against unknown perpetrators.
2. Incoming/received cases
Includes criminal denunciations against known and unknown offenders.
Criminal denunciations against known offenders include cases that were received by the
prosecution office as well as cases with unknown offenders whose identity was discovered during
the reporting period.
3. Processed cases
The reported figure represents all resolved criminal complaints in the reporting year. There is a discrepancy between the sum of following categories: [3.1 known offenders+3.2+3.4] and the number of all resolved criminal complaints reported at (3.) Processed cases, because several criminal complaints can be resolved in one criminal file.
3.1. Discontinued during the reference year The number represents the sum of dismissed criminal complaints against known perpetrators and complaints against unknown perpetrators dismissed due to the statute of limitations.
3.1.1. Discontinued by the public prosecutor because the offender could not be identified
The public prosecutor cannot discontinue a case, because the offender could not be identified, so the answer is NAP.
3.1.2. Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a
specific legal situation Data includes cases in which it was not possible to continue the proceedings due to a lack of procedural or
material preconditions (the act is not a criminal offense, there is no reasonable suspicion that the suspect committed a criminal offence and various procedural obstacles), cases where the motion of the injured party has been withdrawn (only for so-called proposed criminal offences) and cases where the criminal complaint was dismissed due to the expiration of the statute of limitations (procedural obstacle).

(2021): In 2021 the reporting changed to include cases of discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations in the category (3) Processed cases (previously excluded).
Further break-down of data reported:
(1) Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year include transferred criminal complaints: - against known perpetrators: 11.951 and
- against unknown perpetrators: 269.260.
(2) Incoming cases include criminal denunciations: - against known offenders: 24.658 and
- against unknown offenders: 27.199.
(3) Processed cases include processed cases:
- against known offenders: 24.658 and
- discontinued criminal complaints against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations: 29.140
(3.1.) Discontinued during the reference year include dismissed criminal complaints:
- against known perpetrators: 14.260 and
- against unknown perpetrators: 29.140
(3.1.2.) Discontinued due to the lack of an established offence or a specific legal situation include:
- a) discontinued criminal complaints against known perpetrators due to the lack of procedural or material preconditions: 10.022, b) cases discontinued (rejected) due to withdrawal of the motion of the injured party: 2.000 and c) cases discontinued due to expiration of the statue of limitation: 75 (total 12.097 cases) and
- discontinued criminal complaints against unknown perpetrators due to the expiration of statute of limitations: 29.140.
(4) Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year include unresolved criminal complaints:
- against known offenders: 11.709.
- against known offenders: 277.564.
Differences to 2020 data:
2.Incoming/received cases: decrease by 16%
Contributing factors: a) Covid-19 pandemics, especially limit of movement of population and related police control, b) changes in the registration of the number of criminal offences in police registers and c) increase in merging of diferent cases in one case at the Police and state prosecution level, compared to the previous year. 3.1.2 Discontinued by the public prosecutor due to the lack of an established offence or a
specific legal situation: increase by 17%
The increase is mainly due to a higher number of cases against unknown offenders due to the expiration of statute of limitations, which is beyond control of state prosecution. The number of discontinued cases agains known offenders did not change significantly. 3.1.3 Discontinued by the public prosecutor for reasons of opportunity: decrease by 22%
The number of cases remains comparable (despite the decrease in last year) and cannot be considered unusual, due to the structure of processed cases with the majority of offences against property and within it low value cases. 3.2. Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor: increase by 23%
The increase in 2021 is due to partial relief of preventive measures, related to Covid-19 pandemics.

(2020): Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year includes 12.452 cases against known perpetrators and 263.139 cases against unknown perpetrators.
Incoming/received cases includes 27.770 cases against known offenders and 34.019 cases against unknown offenders.
Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year includes 12.072 cases against known offenders and 269.260 cases against unknown offenders.

(2016): The explanation by the state prosecution (data source) concerning the decrease in the number of received cases during the reference year between 2014 and 2016: - since 2013, the number of reported offences to the police is decreasing, hence the decrease in number of cases received (especially cases where the offender is unknown)
- due to several local factors (austerity measures, increased number of immigrants in 2015-2016 and a long strike of police officers in 2016), the number of cases (against identified offenders) processed by the police also decreased
As concerns the decreased number of cases brought to court:
- a decrease in new cases (see above)
- exercising a stricter selection of cases, not appropriate for court procedure (in 2014, almost 30% of resolved cases were brought to court, in 2016 only 25%). The state prosecution also noted some minor differences might be attributed to changes in their methodology for data reporting.

Spain

(General Comment): In Spain the general rule is that the Prosecutor is party in the criminal cases, but the Prosecutor does not process (with exclusive competence) the criminal cases. The investigation Judge (Juez de Instrucción) does that. Data provided in question 107 tries to adapt the information in the Annual Report of the State Attorney General's Office to the criteria of CEPEJ, by offering the data of cases received by the Prosecution Service in 2020, according to the classification of procedures of the Spanish procedural legislation (diligencias previas, diligencias urgentes, procedimiento por delitos leves, sumarios y procedimientos del jurado). In addition to that, there are other two kinds of actions for which the Prosecution have exclusive competence: Investigation of criminal reponsibility of minors, and preliminary diligences of Article 773.2 of the Criminal Procedural Act.

(2020): The provided number of incoming cases is the number of the criminal proceedings received by the Prosecution Service (page 1117 of the Annual Report of the Prosecution Service). It is consistent with the explanatory note as it includes “cases submitted to public prosecutors by the police and other bodies as well as victims (if applicable) within the reference year”. It is an official data, provided by the State Attorney Office.

(2018): Certain number of cases received are re-sent to other porsecutor offices.

Question 107-1

Austria

(General Comment): There is no guilty plea procedure in Austria.

Belgium

(General Comment): The guilty plea procedure was introduced by the law of February 5, 2016 (Article 216 of the Code of Criminal Investigation), which entered into force on February 29, 2016.
According to Article 216 of the CIC, §1, al.1 "For acts that do not appear to be of a nature to be punishable by a main correctional imprisonment of more than five years, the public prosecutor may, either ex officio or at the request of the suspect or defendant or his/her lawyer, propose the application of the "procedure of prior acknowledgement of guilt" defined in this article, if the suspect or defendant admits to being guilty of the acts attributed to him/her".

Bulgaria

(General Comment): "Total number of guilty plea procedures" indicates the total value of the next two indicators;
"Before the main trial": the agreements submitted by a prosecutor to the court are taken into account;
“During the main trial”: a value is indicated, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Article 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code (with a person or for any of the crimes), concluded by the prosecutors in a court phase (after an indictment has been filed), as well as by the number of procedures under the abbreviated court investigation under Article 371, item 2 of the CPC (under Chapter Twenty-eight of the CPC, pursuant to Article 373, para. 3, supra Article 372, para. 4, supra Article 371, item 2 CPC), under which there have been convictions and acquittals.

(2020): Question 107–1:
– the indicator "Total number of guilty plea procedures" indicates the total value of the next two indicators;
– in the indicator "Before the main trial" the agreements submitted by a prosecutor to the court are taken into account (analogous to the previous questionnaires);
– in the indicator “During the main trial” a value is indicated, which is the sum of the number of agreements under Article 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code (with a person or for any of the crimes), concluded by the prosecutors in a court phase (after an indictment has been filed), as well as by the number of procedures under the abbreviated court investigation under Article 371, item 2 of the CPC (under Chapter Twenty-eight of the CPC, pursuant to Article 373, para. 3, supra Article 372, para. 4, supra Article 371, item 2 CPC), under which there have been convictions and acquittals (similar to the previous questionnaires).

(2018): 1) The total amount of the following two indicators is given under indicator “Total number of guilty plea procedures”;
2) The number of the agreements that were brought to court by a public prosecutor is given under indicator “Before the court case” (similar to previous questionnaires;
3) The indicated amount is sum of the number of the agreements under Art. 384 of the Criminal Procedure Code (with a person or for some offence) concluded by the prosecutors in the judicial phase (after an indictment), as well as the number of procedures under an expedited procedure by Art. 371, it. 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code (under Chapter Twenty Eight of the Criminal Procedure Code in accordance with Art. 373, Para. 3, in conjunction with Art. 372, Para. 4 and in conjunction with Art. 371, it. 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code) under which convictions and acquittals have been imposed, is given under indicator “During the court case”.

Croatia

(General Comment): In criminal proceedings, the defendant is granted the right to plead guilty (for all or a number of the counts of the charge) and reach agreement on the sanction. If the defendant pleads guilty and no agreement on the sanction is reached, the panel shall confirm the indictment and a trial must be scheduled. The parties may negotiate on the conditions of pleading guilty and agreeing on a sanction. During these negotiations, the defendant shall have a defence counsel. If the president of the panel is served with a confirmed indictment to which the accused has pleaded guilty, the proposing of evidence for the trial shall be limited only to the evidence which concerns the decision on criminal-law sanctions. Where the accused pleads guilty to all counts of the charge, the president of the panel shall instruct him/her that he/she may immediately state his/her position on all the circumstances that incriminate him/her and present all the facts in his/her favour, after which the accused shall be interrogated. The guilty plea does not exempt the court from its duty to present other evidence as well. If the confession of the accused at the trial is complete and in accordance with the evidence already gathered, the court shall, in the course of evidentiary proceedings, present only those pieces of evidence that relate to the decision on punishment or other sanction. The State Attorney’s Office keeps only a track record on the judgments rendered by the court in the guilty plea procedure and no distinction can be made between the number of guilty plea procedures “before the court case” and their number “during the court case”.

(2021): Source of information: Report of the Chief State Attorney of the Republic of Croatia on the work of State Attorney's offices in 2021
Data under Severe criminal cases refers to cases under the jurisdiction of county state attorney's offices and the Office for the Suppression of corruption and organised crime
Data under Misdemeanour and / or minor criminal cases refers to cases under the jurisdiction of municipal state attorney's offices, noting that certain severe criminal cases are also within their jurisdiction, however, statistical data are presented in total for all criminal offences under the jurisdiction of municipal state attorney's offices, without separating them into “lighter” and “more serious” criminal offences.

(2016): In total, in 2016, 440 judgements were given under the agreement of the parties in which the accused pleaded guilty (total number of guilty plea procedures is 440), but there is no data on how many cases it occurred before the court case or during the court case. Regarding the data from the previous cycle, there has been a decrease in the number of judgements by the agreement of the parties in which the defendant pleaded guilty because during the previous period in only one criminal case that was within the jurisdiction of the Office for the Suppression of Corruption and Organized Crime with over three hundred defendants, an agreement was reached with a large number of defendants, which ultimately affected a significant increase in the number of judgments given by the parties' agreement.

Czech Republic

(2021): There was a legislative change which make several changes regarding the guilty pleas - it easier to plead guilty and achieve guilty plea. The biggest change is that it is possible to get guilty plea for the most serious crimes. As a result the number of guilty pleas is rapidly rising.

(2020): There was a legislative change which make it easier to plead guilty and achieve guilty plea. The biggest change is that it is possible to get guilty plea for the most serious crimes.

Denmark

(General Comment): Denmark does not have a definition of "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". The answer covers the number of counts (measured by charges per person). In 2021, the number of complexes are 2997. There has been a decrease in the number of guilty plea procedures. The Director of Public Prosecutions has no explanation for this. In Denmark, a guilty plea procedure is concluded by a court hearing, not a main trial. Instead of an indictment, the Prosecution Service sends the case to the court with a charge sheet describing the offence. The court must in a court hearing ensure that the conditions for proceeding the case as a guilty plea procedure are present. The answer regarding whether the case was concluded before/during the main trial differs from last year´s answer, as guilty plea procedures are correctly concluded before the main trial, as the confession must subsequently be validated by a judge.

(2021): Denmark does not have a definition of "severe criminal cases" and "minor criminal cases". The answer covers the number of counts (measured by charges per person). In 2021, the number of complexes are 2997. There has been a decrease in the number of guilty plea procedures. The Director of Public Prosecutions has no explanation for this. In Denmark, a guilty plea procedure is concluded by a court hearing, not a main trial. Instead of an indictment, the Prosecution Service sends the case to the court with a charge sheet describing the offence. The court must in a court hearing ensure that the conditions for proceeding the case as a guilty plea procedure are present. The answer regarding whether the case was concluded before/during the main trial differs from last year´s answer, as guilty plea procedures are correctly concluded before the main trial, as the confession must subsequently be validated by a judge. The data is registrered through a case-filing tool, POLSAS. POLSAS is first and foremost a case-filing tool, which may be subject to human entry-error. Furthermore, the number of guilty plea procedures can fluctuate on a yearly basis for a variety of reasons. We cannot conclude anything of substance regarding the decrease without a manual investigation.

(2020): The discrepancy is due to the method of calculation. In 2018 the answer covers the number of complexes of cases, and the answer in 2020 covers the number of counts (measured by charges per person). In 2020 the number om number of complexes are 3.449.

Estonia

(2018): The data for 2018 evaluation cycle are checked and confirmed. The data are not comparable with 2016, because the source of the data changed.

(2012): The total number of guilty plea procedures for 2012 was 4 980.

Finland

(General Comment): The possibility of plea bargaining was introduced to the Finnish legal system in the beginning of year 2015. The aim of the reform was to allocate the resources of the national authorities in a more effective way and to speed up both the pre-trial phase of the criminal process and the court proceedings. A defendant can agree to plead guilty to a particular charge in exchange for a more lenient sentence. The prosecutor may also decide not to prosecute for one or for several of the suspected crimes. Plea bargaining can be used if the injured party has no demands in the matter and if he/she agrees to plea bargaining. Plea bargaining can be used when a person is suspected of a crime carrying a maximum sentence of six years' imprisonment. It cannot be used for crimes like homicide, causing bodily injury and sex offences or when the injured party is a child. Plea bargain is also applicable for white-collar crimes.

(2020): The known number of guilty plea procedures is 80. However, the number could be higher as the use of this procedure is not systematically reported, especially when it takes place during the main trial.

(2018): There were less than 100 plea bargaining cases in 2018. The exact number is not available.

(2016): The possibility of plea bargaining was introduced to the Finnish legal system in the beginning of this year. A defendant can agree to plead guilty to a particular charge in exchange for a more lenient sentence. The prosecutor may also decide not to prosecute for one or for several of the suspected crimes. Plea bargaining can be used if the injured party has no demands in the matter and if he/she agree to plea bargaining. Plea bargaining can be used when a person is suspected of a crime carrying a maximum sentence of six years' incarceration. It cannot be used for crimes like homicide, causing bodily injury and sex offences or when the injured party is a child. Plea bargain is also applicable for white-collar crimes. Legislation regarding plea bargaining was approved in August 2014, and the changes entered into force on 1 January 2015. The aim of the reform was to allocate the resources of the national authorities in a more effective way and to speed up both the pre-trial phase of the criminal process and the court proceedings. The Parliament has required the Ministry of Justice to follow up on and evaluate how the legislation on plea bargaining is being applied and implemented and to provide the Law Committee with a report on how the legislation functions by the end of 2017.

(2014): The possibility of plea bargaining was introduced in 2015. A defendant can agree to plead guilty to a particular charge in exchange for a more lenient sentence. The prosecutor may also decide not to prosecute for one or for several of the suspected crimes. Plea bargaining can be used if the injured party has no demands in the matter and if s/he agrees to plea bargaining. It can be used when a person is suspected of a crime carrying a maximum sentence of six years' incarceration. It cannot be used for crimes like homicide, causing bodily injury and sex offences or when the injured party is a child. Plea bargain is also applicable for white-collar crimes.

France

(2021):
source SDSE
Increase in the number of guilty plea procedures: 2020 was marked by a significant drop in activity (caused by the lawyers' strike movement initiated in the second half of 2019 and which continued at the beginning of 2020, then by the slowdown in court activity under the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic and successive lockdowns of the population) and 2021 by a return to normal activity in the courts. It is also necessary to take into account the impact of the law n° 2019-222 of 23 March 2019 on the nature of cases under the CRPC procedure.

(2016): The procedure of appearance on preliminary admission of guilt is a form of prosecution initiated by the prosecutor. In 2016, this procedure was initiated against 92213 perpetrators. Some of these proceedings failed either because the author failed to appear, or because no agreement could be reached on the sentence, or because the judge refused to approve the agreement between the author of the offence, his/her lawyer and the prosecutor. In 2016, the courts certified 75055 convictions in court on a plea of guilty.

(2014): It was not possible to distinguish between guilty plea agreements before the case is brought to court and guilty plea agreements concluded during judicial proceedings. Only the public prosecutor has competence for initiating such procedure when the facts are admitted. To a lesser extent, the procedure may take place at the end of a judicial investigation, before referring the case to court. The guilty plea procedure is often used for less serious offences.

Greece

(2020): No data available for this query.

Hungary

(2021): The guilty plea procedure as such does not exist in the Hungarian legal system; however, the new Code of Criminal Proceedings has introduced the so-called plea agreement, which is, in essence, a similar instrument.

(2020): This procedure exists only from 1 July 2018, following the entry into force of the Act XC of 2017 on the new criminal procedure law. In the event that the prosecution can prove the guilt of the accused beyond a reasonable doubt and there is no opportunity to explain what happened in an acceptable manner, the accused will do his best to admit the act and avoid a lengthy trial.

(2018): This procedure exists only from 1 July 2018, following the entry into force of the Act XC of 2017 on the nwe criminal procedure law.

Italy

(General Comment): As a matter of fact in Italy there is no "guilty plea procedure" as such. However, if someone pleads guilty there are special procedures to speed up the proceedings.

Latvia

(2016): In 2016, the Prosecution Office sent a total of 699 cases to the court, in which there was concluded an agreement regarding admission of guilt and a punishment. Of all sent cases, in 21 occasions the court did not approve an agreement entered into during the pre-trial criminal proceedings. Thus in total, in 2016, the court approved 678 agreements concluded by the prosecutor at the pre-trial stage. However, data on the number of agreements approved in the court process (court) were not collected separately in 2016. Accordingly, data on the number of agreements approved in the court process (court) and in total are not available for 2016.

(2012): In 2012, 233 cases were brought to court by public prosecutors under a guilty plea procedure.

Lithuania

(2018): On 1st January 2017 driving under the influence of alcohol has been criminalized. The majority of these cases are brought to court through the guilty plea procedure.

(2012): The 2012 data does not include criminal cases that were brought before court with the bill of indictment. It includes cases that were brought before court with the criminal order under a simplified procedure, and also cases that were discontinued by court on non-rehabilitating grounds.

Luxembourg

(2021): In 2020 and 2021, health measures only allowed the physical presence of a reduced number of persons in hearings compared to previous years. To continue to work efficiently and resolve cases, prosecutors' offices have, as far as possible, given preference to the procedure of judgement by agreement (procédure du jugement sur accord), as it requires less physical presence of parties, defence counsel, witnesses, etc. Moreover, since the procedure of judgment by agreement was only introduced in 2015, the habit of resorting to this measure has only become established in recent years among lawyers, who now take the initiative themselves more often to launch this procedure.

(2020): In 2020, the sanitary measures did allow only a reduced number of people in the court hearings compared to previous years. In order to continue to work effectively and to resolve cases, the state prosecutors’ offices decided to resort to the guilty plea procedure, since it does not require the same amount of physical presence of the parties, the defenders, witnesses, etc.

(2018): The "transaction pénale" introduced by a law of February 24th, 2015 under the name of "jugement sur accord" enables the prosecutor and the defendant to "negotiate" a penal judgment that will be rendered executory by the courts.

(2016): The "transaction pénale" introduced by a law of February 24th, 2015 under the name of "jugement sur accord" and enables tht prosecutor and the defendant to "negotiate" a penal judgment that will be rendered executory by the courts.

Netherlands

(2021): In 2021, there were experiments with judgement agreements (vonnisafspraken) and trial agreements (procesafspraken), see eg. https://www.bjutijdschriften.nl/tijdschrift/NTS/2022/2/NTS_2666-6553_2022_003_002_003. These experiments were evaluated, and further specified in directives and instructions in 2022. The numbers are not yet available.

Poland

(General Comment): Article 335 [Sentencing without trial - motion] -Criminal Code Procedure
§ 1. If the accused pleads guilty, and in the light of his explanations the circumstances of the commission of the offence and his guilt raise no doubts, and the attitude of the accused indicates that the objectives of the proceedings will be achieved, further proceedings may be omitted.
The public prosecutor, instead of filing a bill of indictment, shall file a motion with the court for issuing a judgment of conviction at a hearing and for agreeing with the defendant on penalties or other measures envisaged for the offence charged, also taking into account the legally protected interests of the victim. The agreement may also include a specific decision on payment of legal costs.
The public prosecutor may attach to the indictment a motion for a judgment of conviction to be handed down at a hearing and for the penalties or other measures prescribed for the offence charged to be agreed upon with the defendant, also taking into account the legally protected interests of the victim, if the circumstances of the offence and the defendant's guilt are beyond doubt, the evidentiary statements made by the defendant do not contradict the findings made, and the defendant's attitude indicates that the objectives of the proceedings will be achieved.
*Article 156 of the Fiscal Penal Code, The public prosecutor, as well as the financial pre-trial body, may attach to the indictment a motion for issuing, without a hearing, a judgment of conviction and imposing a penalty or penal measure agreed with the accused for the fiscal offence or fiscal misdemeanour charged against him, if the circumstances of the commission of the offence do not raise any doubts and the attitude of the accused indicates that the objectives of the proceedings will be achieved.

(2021): *) 51 198 - Data refers to persons convicted at first instance:
- Convicted as a result of granting an application under Article 335 § 1 or 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: in Regional Courts - 580 persons, in District Courts - 46,148 persons.
- Voluntary surrender to liability for criminal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 4,470 persons.

**(2020): ***during the main trial – 53 072 - *) The data pertains to persons sentenced in the first instance:
- Sentenced as a result of granting an application under Article 335 § 1 or 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure: in Regional Courts - 743 persons, in District Courts - 48,762 persons
- Voluntary submission to liability for penal and fiscal offences (Kks): in District Courts - 3,567 persons.
*57 735 - The data on the basis of which the information was provided are collected under the Law on Public Statistics in the Public Prosecutor office - P1K report on the activity of the common organizational units of the public prosecutor's office in criminal cases (statistical program SprawPro). The data for 2018 included only those cases in which a request under Article 335 par 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure was addressed. On the other hand, the data for 2020 included cases in which the prosecutor addressed a motion for a conviction and motions to join the indictment under Article 335 par 2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and Article 156 of the Fiscal Penal Code

Slovak Republic

(2020): The data were delivered by General prosecutor office. The most of the data are not available, because these are not monitored by General prosecutor office in CEPEJ requested structure.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The defendant may plead guilty in two kinds of situations. He/she can achieve an agreement with a state prosecutor in a plea-bargaining procedure or he/she can make a guilty plea irrespectively of the state prosecutor at the pretrial hearing and until the beginning of a main hearing. Cases brought to court by the public prosecutor through the guilty plea procedure are only first mentioned kind of cases. The agreement on guilty plea between the defendant and state prosecutor may be concluded before the commencement of the criminal proceedings and not later than by the beginning of the main hearing. There is no available data on the stage of the proceeding when the agreement was concluded. There is no guilty plea procedure in misdemeanour criminal cases.

(2021): In the previous year (2020) the number of guilty plea procedures was unusually low due to two reasons: a stricter criminal framework (regarding illegal crossing of the state border or territory under Article 308 of the Criminal Code) and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemics.

(2020): The reason for fewer negotiations and fewer agreements is mainly a stricter criminal framework for crimes that were still regulated in 2018 in such a way that they could be the subject of negotiations between the prosecutor and the defendant (illegal crossing of the state border or territory under Article 308 of Criminal Code). Due to the above, there was no interest on the part of the defendants as well as the state prosecutors to agree on guilt and criminal sanction as parties to criminal proceedings. In addition to this, an epidemiological reason for measures to prevent the spread of the covid-19 epidemic is cited as the reason for the reduction in negotiations and plea agreements concluded, furthermore, the poor staffing situation and the high workload of state prosecutors who are engaged in urgent matters in the on-call service and in attending court hearings and the prompt announcement of pre-trial hearings shortly after the indictment becomes final, which significantly shortened the time for conducting negotiations and concluding a plea deal.

(2016): From the enforcement of the provisions on guilty plea bargaining procedures in Criminal procedure act in 2012 there is a steady rise in the number of concluded agreements between the defendant and the prosecutor. The proportion of these agreements compared to filed indictments also grows (2012: 1,1 %, 2014: 2,0%, 2016: 3,8 %). The most general interpretation of this trend would be that the parties of criminal procedures have recognised these new instrument as beneficial in terms of speeding up the process of reaching the final decision and the reduction of the sanction that would be issued, if the complete trial took place.

Spain

(2021): Explanation of the increased number of guilty plea procedures: Probably, coming back to normal activity after covid restrictions.

Question 109

Austria

(General Comment): The courts only deal with damages to property and negligent bodily injuries caused by traffic accidents in civil and criminal proceedings; offences which do not lead to damages or injuries are punished by administrative bodies (e.g. speeding, having worn-out tires, drunk-driving).

Belgium

(General Comment): The data do not include traffic law cases, cases handled by the labor auditorates, or appeals against police decisions handled by the correctional prosecutor's office.

(2021): The data do not include traffic law cases, cases handled by the labor auditorates, or appeals against police decisions handled by the correctional prosecutor's office.

Bulgaria

(2021): Statistical reporting of the PORB. The data are derived from the statistical reporting of the PORB, according to indicators and order, approved by the Prosecutor General with the Instruction for the organization of the information activity in the PORB.

Estonia

(2020): Only the ones that are classified as criminal offences.

(2016): It includes only a minority of traffic offences that are punisheable according to Penal code, these are more serious offences like causing an accident with injured victims, drunk driving above medium-intoxication level and repeated driving without licence.

(2014): The 2014 data encompasses only severe drunk driving and accidents with serious bodily casualties.

France

(2021): source SDSE

Hungary

(2012): In 2012, the total number of traffic offences cases was 3 084.

Ireland

(General Comment): In the vast majority of cases involving traffic offences, the police service (An Garda Síochána) will prefer charges without reference to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. Only in the more serious of such cases, including causing death by dangerous driving, will the Office of the DPP receive files for a decision whether to prosecute or not. Any such traffic offence cases received by the Office of the DPP and decided upon would normally be included in the figures.

Latvia

(2021): Data from Accountancy system

(2016): In accordance with the Latvian legal system on traffic offenses, a person can also be punished administratively, for example, for driving a vehicle under the influence of alcohol, narcotic drugs or other intoxicating substances. Therefore, in this specific case, we would like to emphasize the fact that the indicated number of cases does not include any road traffic violations that are provided for by the Latvian Administrative Violations Code. At the moment, having evaluated the comment received from you, we consider that it is acceptable to rectify the previously given response in Q-109 by indicating "Yes", as it includes road traffic violations for the commission of which there is provided criminal liability

Lithuania

(General Comment): A traffic offence is qualified as criminal when it causes health impairment to another person, or the offender has been driving under influence of alcohol, narcotic, psychotropic of other psychoactive substances and his/her driving resulted in health impairment to or death of another person. Other traffic offences are qualified under the administrative legislation.

Malta

(2016): Traffic offences are listed with the 1st instance cases filed in front of the Court of Magistrates, Criminal Jurisdiction.

Netherlands

(General Comment): They include traffic offences, but NOT traffic violations. Only serious traffic issues are prosecuted as traffic offence, the less serious as violation or administrative justice (wet Mulder).

(2020): These include traffic offences, but NOT traffic violations. Only serious traffic issues are prosecuted as traffic offence, the less serious as violation of even administrative justice (wet Mulder).

Portugal

(2012): According to 2012 data, the figures include traffic offences which are criminally punished.

Romania

(2020): Only serious offenses that are considered crimes, such as drunk driving or involuntary manslaughter.

(2018): Only serious offenses that are considered crimes, such as drunk driving or involuntary manslaughter.

(2016): Only serious offenses that are considered crimes, such as drunk driving or involuntary manslaughter.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The communicated data include only traffic offences, stipulated as criminal offences (in the Penal Code) and therefore prosecuted by State prosecutors. There are two such criminal offences: causing a traffic accident through negligence whereby another person is seriously injured or died and audacious driving in road traffic which is committed by a serious breach of road safety regulations, while other cases of traffic offences are not criminal offences, but minor offences and are not included in the provided figures.

Indicator 5: Access to justice and all courts

- Legal Aid

- System for compensating users

Legal aid

Table 5.1 Type of legal aid in 2021 (Q16)

States	Legal Aid			
	In Criminal Cases		In Other than criminal cases	
	For Representation in court	For Legal advice	For Representation in court	For Legal advice
Austria				
Belgium				
Bulgaria				
Croatia				
Cyprus				
Czech Republic				
Denmark				
Estonia				
Finland				
France				
Germany				
Greece				
Hungary				
Ireland				
Italy				
Latvia				
Lithuania				
Luxembourg				
Malta				
Netherlands				
Poland				
Portugal				
Romania				
Slovak Republic				
Slovenia				
Spain				
Sweden				
Yes	27	27	27	27
No/NAP	0	0	0	0

Table 5.2 Legal aid coverage of enforcement and other costs in 2021 (Q18 and Q19)

States	Enforcement of judicial decisions covered by legal aid	Other costs covered by legal aid	
		Criminal cases	Other than criminal cases
Austria			
Belgium			
Bulgaria			
Croatia			
Cyprus			
Czech Republic			
Denmark			
Estonia			
Finland			
France			
Germany			
Greece			
Hungary			
Ireland			
Italy			
Latvia			
Lithuania			
Luxembourg			
Malta			
Netherlands			
Poland			
Portugal			
Romania			
Slovak Republic			
Slovenia			
Spain			
Sweden			
Yes	20	19	24
No/NAP	7	8	3

Table 5.3 (EC) Coverage of legal aid (other than criminal cases) in 2021 (Q16, Q18 and Q19)

States	EC Code	Legal aid applies to representation in court	Legal aid applies to legal advice	Legal aid covers the fees that are related to the enforcement of judicial decisions	Legal aid covers other costs	
					Criminal cases	Other than criminal cases
Austria	20					
Belgium	1					
Bulgaria	2					
Croatia	11					
Cyprus	13					
Czech Republic	3					
Denmark	4					
Estonia	6					
Finland	26					
France	10					
Germany	5					
Greece	8					
Hungary	17					
Ireland	7					
Italy	12					
Latvia	14					
Lithuania	15					
Luxembourg	16					
Malta	18					
Netherlands	19					
Poland	21					
Portugal	22					
Romania	23					
Slovak Republic	25					
Slovenia	24					
Spain	9					
Sweden	27					
Yes		27	27	20	19	24
No/NAP		0	0	7	8	3

Table 5.4.1 (2021) Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted in 2021 (Q20)

States	Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted in 2021								
	Total of cases (1 + 2)			Criminal cases (1)			Other than criminal cases (2)		
	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)
Austria	18 649	18 649	NAP	5 049	5 049	NAP	13 600	13 600	NAP
Belgium	217 039	NA	NA	79 662	NA	NA	137 377	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	34 841	NA	NA	31 531	NA	NA	3 310	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	27 896	2 946	24 950
Cyprus	NA	3 329	NA	NA	2 760	NA	NA	569	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	4 098	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	11 992	NA	NA	6 254	NA	NA	5 738	NA	NA
Finland	81 138	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	1 218 689	NA	NA	691 975	NA	NA	526 714	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	402 442	NA
Greece	7 353	6 875	508	2 363	2 115	278	4 990	4 760	230
Hungary	8 746	2 925	5 821	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	303 350	303 350	NA	175 796	175 796	NA	127 554	127 554	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	68 832	28 184	40 648	NA	19 616	NA	NA	8 568	NA
Luxembourg	5 074	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	963	803	160	698	538	160	265	265	NAP
Netherlands	308 269	264 525	43 744	97 580	97 580	NAP	210 689	166 945	43 744
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	34 423	NA
Portugal	123 332	122 085	1 247	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	68 636	68 636	NAP	65 342	65 342	NAP	3 294	3 294	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	11 761	NA	NA
Slovenia	8 241	7 507	734	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Spain	1 923 183	NA	NA	1 338 993	NA	NA	584 190	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	273 343	66 601	13 266	246 371	44 481	219	137 839	64 056	22 975
Median	68 734	18 649	1 247	72 502	19 616	219	20 748	6 664	24 950
Minimum	963	803	160	698	538	160	265	265	230
Maximum	1 923 183	303 350	43 744	1 338 993	175 796	278	584 190	402 442	43 744
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	41%	52%	63%	59%	63%	78%	52%	52%	74%
% of NAP	0%	0%	11%	4%	4%	15%	4%	4%	15%

Table 5.4.2 (2021) Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted per 100 inhabitants in 2021 (Q1, Q20)

States	Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted per 100 inhabitants in 2021								
	Total of cases (1 + 2)			Criminal cases (1)			Other than criminal cases (2)		
	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)
Austria	0,21	0,21	NAP	0,06	0,06	NAP	0,15	0,15	NAP
Belgium	1,88	NA	NA	0,69	NA	NA	1,19	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	0,51	NA	NA	0,46	NA	NA	0,05	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,72	0,08	0,64
Cyprus	NA	0,37	NA	NA	0,31	NA	NA	0,06	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	0,07	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,90	NA	NA	0,47	NA	NA	0,43	NA	NA
Finland	1,46	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	1,80	NA	NA	1,02	NA	NA	0,78	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,48	NA
Greece	0,07	0,06	0,00	0,02	0,02	0,00	0,05	0,04	0,00
Hungary	0,09	0,03	0,06	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	0,51	0,51	NA	0,30	0,30	NA	0,22	0,22	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	2,45	1,00	1,45	NA	0,70	NA	NA	0,31	NA
Luxembourg	0,79	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	0,19	0,16	0,03	0,14	0,10	0,03	0,05	0,05	NAP
Netherlands	1,76	1,51	0,25	0,56	0,56	NAP	1,20	0,95	0,25
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,09	NA
Portugal	1,19	1,18	0,01	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,36	0,36	NAP	0,34	0,34	NAP	0,02	0,02	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,22	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,39	0,36	0,03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Spain	4,05	NA	NA	2,82	NA	NA	1,23	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	1,13	0,49	0,26	0,64	0,32	0,02	0,52	0,21	0,30
Median	0,84	0,36	0,03	0,41	0,31	0,02	0,32	0,08	0,25
Minimum	0,07	0,03	0,00	0,02	0,02	0,00	0,02	0,02	0,00
Maximum	4,05	1,51	1,45	2,82	0,70	0,03	1,23	0,95	0,64
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	41%	52%	63%	59%	63%	78%	52%	52%	74%
% of NAP	0%	0%	11%	4%	4%	15%	4%	4%	15%

Table 5.4.1 (2020) Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted in 2020 (Q20)

States	Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted in 2020								
	Total of cases (1 + 2)			Criminal cases (1)			Other than criminal cases (2)		
	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)
Austria	18 959	18 959	NAP	4 958	4 958	NAP	14 001	14 001	NAP
Belgium	203 305	NA	NA	76 561	NA	NA	126 744	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	31 866	NA	NA	29 002	NA	NA	2 864	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30 622	3 433	27 189
Cyprus	3 386	3 386	NA	2 351	2 351	NA	1 035	1 035	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	3 694	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	12 421	NA	NA	7 067	NA	NA	5 354	NA	NA
Finland	82 628	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	888 343	NA	NA	348 715	NA	NA	539 628	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	433 536	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	5 748	2 006	3 742	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	85 963	NA	NA	73 611	NA	30 874	12 352	18 522
Italy	305 268	305 268	NA	154 234	154 234	NA	151 034	151 034	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	76 914	36 544	40 370	NA	27 442	NA	NA	9 102	NA
Luxembourg	4 660	NA	NA	1 182	NA	NA	3 478	NA	NA
Malta	946	755	191	626	626	NAP	320	129	191
Netherlands	301 304	253 506	47 798	88 075	88 075	NAP	213 229	165 431	47 798
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	31 661	NA
Portugal	115 349	113 642	1 707	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	66 522	66 522	NAP	63 492	63 492	NAP	3 030	3 030	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	11 432	NA	NA
Slovenia	9 876	9 138	738	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Spain	1 599 883	NA	NA	1 103 860	NA	NA	496 023	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	217 600	77 296	15 758	168 284	49 310	-	116 200	68 967	23 425
Median	66 522	34 205	2 725	63 492	29 002	-	22 312	10 727	22 856
Minimum	946	755	191	626	626	-	320	129	191
Maximum	1 599 883	305 268	47 798	1 103 860	154 234	-	539 628	433 536	47 798
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	37%	52%	67%	56%	63%	81%	44%	52%	74%
% of NAP	0%	4%	11%	4%	4%	19%	4%	4%	11%

Table 5.4.2 (2020) Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted per 100 inhabitants in 2020 (Q1, Q20)

States	Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted per 100 inhabitants in 2020								
	Total of cases (1 + 2)			Criminal cases (1)			Other than criminal cases (2)		
	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)
Austria	0,21	0,21	NAP	0,06	0,06	NAP	0,16	0,16	NAP
Belgium	1,76	NA	NA	0,66	NA	NA	1,10	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	0,46	NA	NA	0,42	NA	NA	0,04	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,76	0,09	0,67
Cyprus	0,38	0,38	NA	0,26	0,26	NA	0,12	0,12	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	0,06	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	0,93	NA	NA	0,53	NA	NA	0,40	NA	NA
Finland	1,49	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	1,32	NA	NA	0,52	NA	NA	0,80	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,52	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	0,06	0,02	0,04	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	1,73	NA	NA	1,48	NA	0,62	0,25	0,37
Italy	0,52	0,52	NA	0,26	0,26	NA	0,25	0,25	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	2,75	1,31	1,44	NA	0,98	NA	NA	0,33	NA
Luxembourg	0,73	NA	NA	0,19	NA	NA	0,55	NA	NA
Malta	0,18	0,15	0,04	0,12	0,12	NAP	0,06	0,03	0,04
Netherlands	1,72	1,45	0,27	0,50	0,50	NAP	1,22	0,95	0,27
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,08	NA
Portugal	1,12	1,10	0,02	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	0,35	0,35	NAP	0,33	0,33	NAP	0,02	0,02	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0,21	NA	NA
Slovenia	0,47	0,43	0,03	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Spain	3,38	NA	NA	2,33	NA	NA	1,05	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	1,03	0,68	0,31	0,52	0,49	-	0,52	0,23	0,34
Median	0,73	0,45	0,04	0,33	0,33	-	0,48	0,14	0,32
Minimum	0,06	0,02	0,02	0,06	0,06	-	0,02	0,02	0,04
Maximum	3,38	1,73	1,44	2,33	1,48	-	1,22	0,95	0,67
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	37%	52%	67%	56%	63%	81%	44%	52%	74%
% of NAP	0%	4%	11%	4%	4%	19%	4%	4%	11%

Table 5.4.3 Variation (%) of the number of cases for which legal aid has been granted per 100 inhabitants between 2020 and 2021 (Q1, Q20)

States	Variation (%) of the number of cases for which legal aid has been granted per 100 inhabitants between 2020 and 2021								
	Total of cases (1 + 2)			Criminal cases (1)			Other than criminal cases (2)		
	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)	Total (A + B)	Cases brought to court (A)	Cases not brought to court (B)
Austria	-2,1%	-2,1%	NAP	1,3%	1,3%	NAP	-3,4%	-3,4%	NAP
Belgium	6,3%	NA	NA	3,6%	NA	NA	7,9%	NA	NA
Bulgaria	NA	10,6%	NA	NA	10,0%	NA	NA	16,9%	NA
Croatia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-5,0%	-10,5%	-4,3%
Cyprus	NA	-2,6%	NA	NA	16,3%	NA	NA	-45,6%	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Estonia	-3,5%	NA	NA	-11,5%	NA	NA	7,1%	NA	NA
Finland	-2,1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	36,7%	NA	NA	97,8%	NA	NA	-2,7%	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-7,3%	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	55,3%	48,8%	58,8%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	-0,2%	-0,2%	NA	14,5%	14,5%	NA	-15,2%	-15,2%	NA
Latvia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	-10,8%	-23,2%	0,3%	NA	-28,8%	NA	NA	-6,2%	NA
Luxembourg	7,1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	1,5%	6,0%	-16,5%	11,2%	-14,3%	NAP	-17,4%	104,8%	NAP
Netherlands	2,1%	4,1%	-8,7%	10,6%	10,6%	NAP	-1,4%	0,7%	-8,7%
Poland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	9,2%	NA
Portugal	6,3%	6,8%	-27,3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	4,0%	4,0%	NAP	3,7%	3,7%	NAP	9,6%	9,6%	NAP
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3,4%	NA	NA
Slovenia	-16,5%	-17,8%	-0,5%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Spain	20,0%	NA	NA	21,1%	NA	NA	17,5%	NA	NA
Sweden	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Average	102,6%	67,5%	30,7%	52,4%	49,1%	-	52,2%	23,5%	33,9%
Median	73,4%	44,7%	3,7%	33,1%	33,1%	-	47,5%	13,6%	32,3%
Minimum	5,8%	2,0%	1,7%	5,6%	5,6%	-	1,6%	1,6%	3,7%
Maximum	337,9%	172,7%	144,4%	233,2%	147,9%	-	122,0%	94,7%	67,4%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	44%	56%	67%	63%	67%	81%	56%	56%	78%
% of NAP	0%	4%	11%	4%	4%	19%	4%	4%	15%

Table 5.5 Timeframes of the procedure for granting legal aid in 2021 (Q20-1)
(in relation to the duration (in days) from the initial legal aid request to the final approval of the legal aid request)

States	Maximum duration prescribed in law/regulation (in days)	Actual average duration (in days)
Austria	NA	NA
Belgium	15	NA
Bulgaria	14	5
Croatia	15	NA
Cyprus	NA	NA
Czech Republic	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA
Estonia	NAP	NA
Finland	NAP	NA
France	NAP	50
Germany	NAP	NA
Greece	15	3
Hungary	5	NA
Ireland	NAP	140
Italy	10	NA
Latvia	21	NA
Lithuania	57	NA
Luxembourg	NAP	NA
Malta	NA	19
Netherlands	40	9
Poland	NAP	NA
Portugal	30	139
Romania	NAP	NA
Slovak Republic	30	30
Slovenia	NAP	30
Spain	30	NA
Sweden	NAP	NA
Average	24	47
Median	18	30
Minimum	5	3
Maximum	57	140
Nb of values	27	27
% of NA	19%	67%
% of NAP	37%	0%

System for compensating users

Table 5.7.1 (2021) System for compensating users: number of requests for compensations and condemnations by specific circumstances in 2021 (Q37)

States	Total		Excessive length of proceedings		Non-execution of court decisions		Wrongful arrest		Wrongful conviction		Other	
	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	80	20	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	575	300	NA	NA	NA	257	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	332	131	161	59	NAP	NAP	171	72	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	5 356	2 490	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	3 400	1 499	NA	NA	NA	NA	259	140	80	31	3 061	1 328
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	NA	NA	49	28	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	754	530	NA	NA	NA	575	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	26 964	25 853	18 167	19 257	7 507	6 033	1 282	560	8	3	NAP	NAP
Latvia	39	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Lithuania	73	47	20	16	0	0	14	10	17	11	22	10
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	9	7	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	15 290	2 038	NA	NA	NA	272	NA	12	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	18	21	4	7	NAP	NAP	11	10	3	4	NAP	NAP
Spain	656	113	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	2 085	1 812	5	1	0	0	2 080	1 811	0	0	NAP	NAP
Average	4 325	3 996	3 892	2 471	2 502	2 011	488	339	22	10	1 542	669
Median	656	815	161	59	0	0	126	140	8	8	1 542	669
Minimum	18	21	4	1	0	0	9	7	0	0	22	10
Maximum	26 964	25 853	18 167	19 257	7 507	6 033	2 080	1 811	80	31	3 061	1 328
No of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	63%	63%	63%	59%	63%	63%	67%	52%	78%	70%	59%	56%
% of NAP	4%	7%	4%	7%	26%	26%	4%	7%	4%	7%	33%	37%

Table 5.7.1 (2020) System for compensating users: number of requests for compensations and condemnations by specific circumstances in 2020 (Q37)

States	Total		Excessive length of proceedings		Non-execution of court decisions		Wrongful arrest		Wrongful conviction		Other	
	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations	Number of requests for compensation	Number of condemnations
Austria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	70	13	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	332	180	138	48	NAP	NAP	194	132	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	NA	93	17	NA	NA	125	82	27	25	2 193	1 286
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Finland	NA	NA	56	40	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	908	249	NA	217	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	NAP	NAP	15 855	12 778	6 914	4 966	1 107	408	12	8	NAP	NAP
Latvia	45	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA	NAP
Lithuania	78	35	22	6	0	2	25	15	12	8	19	4
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8	7	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	NA	15 852	1 706	NA	NA	NA	229	NA	19	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	32	11	15	3	NAP	NAP	15	4	2	4	NAP	NAP
Spain	605	29	NA	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	28
Sweden	2 125	1 880	3	1	0	0	2 122	1 879	0	0	NAP	NAP
Average	589	397	4 004	1 482	2 305	1 656	458	308	11	11	1 106	439
Median	332	108	75	29	0	2	98	82	12	8	1 106	28
Minimum	32	11	3	1	0	0	8	4	0	0	19	4
Maximum	2 125	1 880	15 855	12 778	6 914	4 966	2 122	1 879	27	25	2 193	1 286
No of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	67%	67%	67%	56%	63%	63%	63%	56%	78%	70%	56%	48%
% of NAP	7%	11%	4%	7%	26%	26%	7%	11%	4%	7%	37%	41%

Table 5.7.2 (2021) System for compensating users: amounts by specific circumstances in 2021 (Q37)

States	Total amount	Excessive length of proceedings		Non-execution of court decisions		Wrongful arrest		Wrongful conviction		Other	
		Absolute value	As % of the Total amount	Absolute value	As % pf the Total amount	Absolute value	As % pf the Total amount	Absolute value	As % pf the Total amount	Absolute value	As % pf the Total amount
Austria	1 288 715 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	181 720 €	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	416 526 €	NA	NA	NA	1 041 345 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	1 106 447 €	20 160 €	1,8%	NAP	NAP	1 086 287 €	98,2%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	9 617 860 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	2 742 529 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	81 005 €	3,0%	47 969 €	1,7%	2 613 555 €	95,3%
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	NA	212 218 €	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	NA	2 514 646 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Latvia	97 212 €	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	133 818 €	13 106 €	9,8%	0 €	0,0%	42 000 €	31,4%	22 499 €	16,8%	56 213 €	42,0%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	133 961 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	1 290 111 €	NA	NA	NA	3 770 285 €	NA	2 927 715 €	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	994 446 €	107 129 €	10,8%	NAP	NAP	836 738 €	84,1%	50 579 €	5,1%	NAP	NAP
Spain	2 289 703 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	7 036 964 €	964 €	0,0%	0 €	0,0%	7 036 000 €	100,0%	0 €	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Average	2 811 966 €	571 858 €	6%	0 €	0%	1 578 816 €	63%	609 752 €	6%	1 334 884 €	69%
Median	1 288 715 €	159 674 €	6%	0 €	0%	836 738 €	84%	47 969 €	3%	1 334 884 €	69%
Minimum	97 212 €	964 €	0%	0 €	0%	42 000 €	3%	0 €	0%	56 213 €	42%
Maximum	9 617 860 €	2 514 646 €	11%	0 €	0%	7 036 000 €	100%	2 927 715 €	17%	2 613 555 €	95%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	63%	67%	81%	67%	67%	63%	78%	78%	81%	59%	59%
% of NAP	4%	4%	4%	26%	26%	4%	4%	4%	4%	33%	33%

Table 5.7.2 (2020) System for compensating users by specific circumstances in 2020 (Q37)

States	Total amount	Excessive length of proceedings		Non-execution of court decisions		Wrongful arrest		Wrongful conviction		Other	
		Absolute value	As % of the Total amount	Absolute value	As % pf the Total amount	Absolute value	As % pf the Total amount	Absolute value	As % pf the Total amount	Absolute value	As % pf the Total amount
Austria	1 310 376 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	150 905 €	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	1 290 594 €	15 973 €	1,2%	NAP	NAP	1 274 621 €	98,8%	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	NA	25 673 €	NA	NA	NA	89 833 €	NA	28 317 €	NA	2 600 362 €	NA
Estonia	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Finland	NA	154 264 €	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
France	1 975 018 €	1 388 393 €	70,3%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Latvia	103 420 €	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	26 705 €	6 000 €	22,5%	0 €	0,0%	5 690 €	21,3%	14 050 €	52,6%	966 €	3,6%
Luxembourg	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	125 599 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	NA	1 007 710 €	NA	NA	NA	3 217 799 €	NA	629 105 €	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovenia	389 871 €	61 615 €	15,8%	NAP	NAP	242 108 €	62,1%	86 147 €	22,1%	NAP	NAP
Spain	569 858 €	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	7 170 985 €	985 €	0,0%	0 €	0,0%	7 170 000 €	100,0%	0 €	0,0%	NAP	NAP
Average	1 604 603 €	332 577 €	22%	0 €	0%	1 534 569 €	71%	151 524 €	25%	1 300 664 €	4%
Median	930 226 €	43 644 €	16%	0 €	0%	196 507 €	80%	28 317 €	22%	1 300 664 €	4%
Minimum	26 705 €	985 €	0%	0 €	0%	5 690 €	21%	0 €	0%	966 €	4%
Maximum	7 170 985 €	1 388 393 €	70%	0 €	0%	7 170 000 €	100%	629 105 €	53%	2 600 362 €	4%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	63%	67%	78%	67%	67%	63%	78%	78%	85%	56%	59%
% of NAP	7%	4%	4%	26%	26%	7%	7%	4%	4%	37%	37%

Indicator 5: Legal aid

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 016. Does legal aid apply to:

Question 018. Can legal aid be granted for the fees that are related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (e.g. fees of an enforcement agent)?

Question 019. Can legal aid be granted for other costs (different from those mentioned in questions 16 to 18, e.g. fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries), travel costs etc.)?

Question 020. Please indicate the number of cases for which legal aid has been granted:

Question 020-1. Please indicate the timeframes of the procedure for granting legal aid, in relation to the duration from the initial legal aid request to the final approval of the legal aid request:

Austria

Q016 (General Comment): In principle every person who retains a defence lawyer or another representative has to bear the costs him or herself even if the lawyer was appointed ex officio. By virtue of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the court has to decide on total or partial legal aid on the request of the defendant if the defendant cannot bear the total costs for the defence lawyer without impairment of his/her own or his/her family's maintenance which enables him/her to a simple lifestyle and if it is necessary in the interest of justice in particular in the interest of an adequate defence. Where in any case the defendant needs a defence lawyer, the court has to decide on legal aid ex officio even if the defendant does not request for it but further requirements to provide legal aid are given.

Civil Cases:

A party with insufficient financial means may apply for legal aid when entering into litigation or at any time later as long as the civil proceeding is still pending. As far as required the court can give legal aid by (wholly or partially) freeing the indigent party from court fees and other fees (fees for experts, interpreters, witnesses and guardians appointed by the court - as representatives for absent parties or parties in need of guardianship -, the parties' travelling expenses, and costs of announcements) and by providing legal representation (by a lawyer) free of charge. Where legal representation is provided, legal aid also covers the pre-trial advice given by the lawyer. Legal aid is granted only as the applicant - according to his income, assets and maintenance obligations - is unable to bear (any or part of) the costs mentioned above without endangering the minimum subsistence level necessary to allow a simple standard of living. Legal aid is denied if the claim or defence of the applicant is manifestly unfounded or if the claim has no prospect of success. Legal aid is granted in all civil and commercial court proceedings regardless of the applicant's nationality or place of residence. If legal aid is granted in the main proceeding, the same also applies to the enforcement proceedings. A party which was granted legal aid for a particular legal dispute in another EU Member State is also entitled to legal aid in Austria for a proceeding concerning the recognition and enforcement of the decision given in that dispute. If an application for legal aid is submitted concerning an urgent case (e.g. legal representation in the case of interim measures) the court has to decide speedily. If the court decides that the legal aid includes the assistance of a lawyer, the regional Bar Association selects a lawyer from among its members, by alphabetical order.

However, the applicant may propose a lawyer himself. Although this proposal is not binding on the regional Bar Association, it will in general accept a well-founded proposal (e.g. if the lawyer is willing and already familiar with the case). The regional Bar Association usually appoints a lawyer to represent the applicant within a few days. The application form (ZPForm 1) contains a summary of assets (income, property such as real estate, money in bank accounts, insurance policies, etc.) and liabilities (maintenance, etc.), personal data and information on the applicant's living conditions. Supporting documents are to be submitted as far as possible. False or maliciously incomplete information can lead to considerable fines and can also result in civil liability or criminal prosecution for fraud. At its discretion the courts may grant full legal aid or – depending on the applicant's circumstances and taking into account expected costs – partial legal aid, covering only certain fees. But if the applicant looses the case, he has to reimburse the successful party's procedural costs.

Legal aid covers all stages of the proceedings. As long as it has not been withdrawn because of a change in the applicant's circumstances or annulled by the court if it is established that the conditions under which the aid was granted were not borne out, legal aid covers any appeal (or appeal procedure).

Q016 (2017): As far as civil cases are concerned, according to § 64 of the Austrian Civil Procedure Order (Zivilprozessordnung, ZPO) legal aid may cover a provisional exemption from court fees, fees for witnesses, experts, interpreters and guardians, costs of the necessary announcements and the cash expenditure of guardians or lawyers, representation by a court official or – if necessary – a lawyer.
In criminal cases:
According to sec 391 par 1 CCP the enforcement of the court's decision on costs has to take into account the ability of the convicted person to bear the costs for the daily life for him/herself and the family as well as the obligation of compensation in regard of the offence. The court may, if the costs cannot be enforced because of an impecunious defendant, declare the costs unrecoverable. If the court assumes that in the future the costs will be recoverable but for the time being they are not, the economic capacity of the person concerned has to be re-examined after a certain period. The statute for limitation to recover the costs is five years after the final decision in the proceeding. If the court decides that the convicted person has to bear the costs of the proceeding and further on he or she is not able to pay the costs the authorities, responsible to recover costs, may prolong the payment deadline, allow to pay instalments, or to abate the costs.
In principle every person who retains a defence lawyer or another representative has to bear the costs him or herself even if the lawyer was appointed ex officio (sec 393 par 1 of CCP). According to sec 61 para 2 CCP the court has to decide on total or partial legal aid on the request of the defendant if the defendant cannot bear the total costs for the defence lawyer without impairment of his/her own or his/her family's maintenance which enables him/her to a simple lifestyle and if it is necessary in the interest of justice in particular in the interest of an adequate defence. In any case legal aid has to be granted
during the whole procedure if and as long as the defendant is held in pre trail detention; • during the entire procedure on the confinement in an institution for mentally abnormal offenders; • during the trail on the confinement in an institution for addicted offenders in need of curing and on the confinement in an institution for dangerous subsequent offender; •during the trail in front of a jury or of a court of lay assessors; •during the trail in front of a single judge if the sentence which may be imposed is more than three years of deprivation of liberty; •during the appeal procedure against a verdict of a court of jury or a court of lay assessors, in case the European Court for Human Rights has determined a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights or an additional Protocol to it for conducting the request for the reopening of the procedure and for the trail in public;
•if the defendant is blind, deaf, mute or otherwise handicapped or is not able to conduct the defense by him/herself because he/she can do not understand the language at court,
•for the appeal procedure,
•if the factual and legal position is difficult.
Where in any case the defendant needs a defense lawyer, the court has to decide on legal aid ex officio even if the defendant does not request for it but further requirements to provide legal aid are given.
With regard to the decision on legal aid the court has to examine the defendant's economic capacity to bear the costs for a defense lawyer. The economic capacity is determined by the maintenance which enables the defendant and his/her family to a simple lifestyle, and can be identified at the bases of the minimum living wage which may not be garnished given by sec 5 of the act on garnishment of wages and the appropriate maintenance which is higher than the minimum living wage. In particular the income and other assets on the one hand and the number of persons who are entitled to maintenance on the other hand

Q018 (General Comment): If legal aid is granted in the main proceeding, the same also applies to the enforcement proceeding. According to the Austrian Civil Procedure Order, the requirements for granting legal aid have only to be re-examined, if the enforcement proceeding will be opened one year after the main proceeding has been closed.

Q018 (2019): According to § 64 of the Austrian Civil Procedure Order (Zivilprozessordnung, ZPO) legal aid extends to enforcement proceedings.
Q018 (2018): Legal aid according to § 64 of the Austrian Civil Procedure Order (Zivilprozessordnung, ZPO) extends to enforcement proceedings.
Q019 (General Comment): In civil matters, the Austrian Civil Procedure Order provides for that legal aid may cover not only the (provisional) exemption from court fees but also the exemption from fees for witnesses, experts, interpreters and guardians, costs of the necessary announcements and the cash expenditure of guardians or lawyers, representation by a court official or – if necessary – a lawyer. If the personal presence of the parties at a hearing is ordered by the court, their necessary travel expenses are also replaced. Where legal representation is provided, legal aid also covers the pre-trial advice given by the lawyer. If legal aid is granted in the main proceeding, the same also applies to the enforcement proceedings. A party which was granted legal aid for a particular legal dispute in another EU Member State is also entitled to legal aid in Austria for a proceeding concerning the recognition and enforcement of the decision given in that dispute. In criminal matters, there are no costs to bear for the parties, until the court has taken a final decision, which also encompasses a decision on the costs. In case of an acquittal, the State has to bear all the costs. The Public Prosecutor does not have to bear any costs in any case. The Code of Criminal Procedure pinpoints only one exception to this rule, if a person, different from the Public Prosecutor, i.e. "Privatankläger" holds the accusation and loses the case because of an acquittal. In this case, the so called Privatankläger (private prosecutor) has to bear the costs. In case of a false accusation, the person who knowingly accused the (acquitted) perpetrator would have to bear the costs of the trial.

Q019 (2019): see general comments

Q019 (2018): See above Point 016-1.

Q020 (2016): Legal aid can not be granted for cases that have not been brought to court. Analysis of the non-litigious cases for which legal aid has been granted is not avaiable.

Q020-1 (General Comment): Where legal representation is provided, legal aid also covers the pre-trial advice given by the lawyer. Legal aid is granted only as the applicant - according to his income, assets and maintenance obligations - is unable to bear (any or part of) the costs mentioned above without endangering the minimum subsistence level necessary to allow a simple standard of living. Legal aid is denied if the claim or defence of the applicant is manifestly unfounded or manifestly not brought in good faith. Legal aid is granted in all civil and commercial court proceedings regardless of the applicant's nationality or place of residence.
If legal aid is granted in the main proceeding, the same also applies to the enforcement proceedings. A party which was granted legal aid for a particular legal dispute in another EU Member State is also entitled to legal aid in Austria for a proceeding concerning the recognition and enforcement of the decision given in that dispute. If an application for legal aid is submitted concerning an urgent case (e.g. legal representation in the case of interim measures) the court has to decide speedily. If the court decides that the legal aid includes the assistance of a lawyer, the regional Bar Association selects a lawyer from among its members, by alphabetical order.
Legal aid covers all stages of the proceedings. As long as it has not been withdrawn because of a change in the applicant's circumstances or annulled by the court if it is established that the conditions under which the aid was granted were not borne out, legal aid covers any appeal (or appeal procedure).

Q020-1 (2021): criminal cases: 3,64 days; other than criminal cases: 32,35 days; total: 23,9 days regional administrative courts: maximum duration prescribed in law/regulation: 6 months
supreme administrative court: 29 days

Q020-1 (2020): Actual average duration:
criminal law: 3,67 days; civil law 34,48 days; total: 24,87 days
supreme administrative court: 23 days
regional administrative courts: maximum duration prescribed in law/regulation: 6 months
Actual average duration: 40 days

Q037 (General Comment): The Public Authority's Liability Act (Amtshaftungsgesetz) provides for liability of the state (and other legal entities) for misconduct of their employees in the exercise of public authority, including court proceedings and court decisions, causing damage to persons or property by excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and/or wrongful condemnation. The liability presupposes both wrongfulness and fault. In the case of wrongful arrest or wrongful criminal condemnation, compensation can also be obtained according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act (Strafrechtliches Entschädigungsgesetz) without proving fault of the Authorities. The compensation procedure is laid down in para. 8 ff. Amtshaftungsgesetz and para. 9 ff. Strafrechtliches Entschädigungsgesetz. The injured person may demand – free of costs - of the legal entity against which the claim for damages is to be raised to forward her/him within a three months' term a written statement indicating as to whether it accepts or partially or totally rejects the claim for damages. If the claim is partially or totally rejected, the complaint can still be filed at court. The exclusive jurisidiction over the claim of the injured person against the legal entity rests in the first instance with the regional court (Landesgericht) in charge of civil matters in whose range of jurisdiction the infringement of law occurred. Compensation is funded by the Public Authority's general budget. The liability is unlimited, indemnity is to be paid in terms of money only. To make sure that compensation is paid following the concrete circumstances of each individual case, there is no such thing as a daily tariff or a flat compensation sum. The amount of compensation depends solely on the magnitude of damage suffered by the victim and the degree of fault attributable to the Public Authority.
According to sec 67 CCP victims have the right to claim reimbursement for the damage caused by the criminal act or compensation for the impairment of their legally protected interests. The extent of the damage or the impairment has to be established ex officio as far as this can be done on the basis of the results of the criminal proceeding or with the help of additional simple investigations. If for the assessment of a bodily injury or damage to the health of a person an expert is appointed, he/she also has to be requested to establish the periods of pain.

Q037 (2021): The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act and the Penal Law's Compensation Act cannot be quantified regarding the different circumstances. Only the total amount of the payments can be provided. On this basis the payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act were 714.676,17 Euro and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were 574.038,47 Euro.

Q037 (2020): The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act and the Penal Law's Compensation Act cannot be quantified regarding the different circumstances. Only the total amount of the payments can be provided. On this basis the payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act were 444.740,27 Euro and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were 865.635,22 Euro.

Q037 (2016): The Public Authority's Liability Act (Amtshaftungsgesetz) provides for liability of the state (and other legal entities) for misconduct of their employees in the exercise of public authority, including court proceedings and court decisions, causing damage to persons or property by excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and/or wrongful condemnation. The liability presupposes both wrongfulness and fault. In the case of wrongful arrest or wrongful criminal condemnation, compensation can also be obtained according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act (Strafrechtliches Entschädigungsgesetz) without proving fault of the Authorities. The compensation procedure is laid down in para. 8 ff. Amtshaftungsgesetz and para. 9 ff. Strafrechtliches Entschädigungsgesetz. The injured person may demand – free of costs - of the legal entity against which the claim for damages is to be raised to forward her/him within a three months' term a written statement indicating as to whether it accepts or partially or totally rejects the claim for damages. If the claim is partially or totally rejected, the complaint can still be filed at court.
The exclusive jurisidiction over the claim of the injured person against the legal entity rests in the first instance with the regional court (Landesgericht) in charge of civil matters in whose range of jurisdiction the infringement of law occurred. Compensation is funded by the Public Authority's general budget. The liability is unlimited, indemnity is to be paid in terms of money only. To make sure that compensation is paid following the concrete circumstances of each individual case, there is no such thing as a daily tariff or a flat compensation sum. The amount of compensation depends solely on the magnitude of damage suffered by the victim and the degree of fault attributable to the Public Authority.

Belgium

Q016 (2017): In Belgium there are three types of "legal aid": first-line legal aid, second-line legal aid and legal assistance.
First-line legal aid consists of practical information, legal information, a first legal opinion or referral to a specialised body (Article 508/1 of the Judicial Code).
Second-line legal aid: legal aid granted to a natural person in the form of a detailed legal opinion or legal assistance in or out of court proceedings or assistance in a trial, including legal representation.
Legal assistance consists in exempting, in whole or in part, those who do not have the necessary income to afford the costs of a procedure, from paying the related costs, which will therefore be covered by the State budget (Article 664 of the Judicial Code). Legal assistance may be obtained in civil or criminal matters and in any proceedings (judicial, administrative or arbitral).

Q016 (2016): In Belgium there are three types of "legal aid": front-line legal aid, second-line legal aid and legal assistance.
Front-line legal aid consists of practical information, legal information, a first legal opinion or referral to a specialized body (section 508/1 of the Judicial Code).
Second-line legal aid: legal aid granted to a natural person in the form of a detailed legal opinion or legal assistance in the context or not of a procedure or assistance in the context of a trial including representation. Legal assistance consists in providing, in whole or in part, those who do not have the necessary income to meet the costs of a procedure, to pay the related costs which will therefore be borne by the budget of the State (Article 664 of the Judicial Code). Legal aid may be obtained in civil or criminal matters and in any proceeding (judicial, administrative or arbitral).

Q018 (General Comment): Judicial assistance (one of the components of the legal aid in the sense of the questionnaire) consists in exempting, in whole or in part, those who do not have the necessary means of subsistence to meet the costs of proceedings, even extrajudicial proceedings, from paying the various fees - registration, registry and shipping, as well as other costs related to the proceedings. The beneficiaries are also entitled to free of charge services of public and ministerial officials. They can also have free assistance of a technical adviser during judicial expertise. According to Article 665, 2° of the Judicial Code, judicial assistance covers acts relating to enforcement of judgments and decisions of justice.

Q018 (2020): Legal aid consists in exempting, in whole or in part, those who do not have the necessary means of existence to meet the costs of a procedure, even an extrajudicial one, from paying the various fees, registration, clerk's office and dispatch fees and other costs that it entails. It also assures the interested parties that the ministry of public and ministerial officers is free of charge. It also allows the interested parties to benefit from the free assistance of a technical advisor during judicial expertises. According to article 665, 2° of the Belgian Judicial Code, legal aid is applicable to acts relating to the execution of judgments and decisions.

Q019 (General Comment): Judicial assistance is applicable:
1) to all acts related to applications to be brought or pending before a judge in all legal matters (civil, criminal, administrative) or before arbitrators;
2) to acts related to the enforcement of judgments;
3) to proceedings on request;
4) to procedural acts that fall within the jurisdiction of a civil or criminal judge or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer;
5) to mediation procedures, extrajudicial or judicial, conducted by an accredited mediator;
6) to all extrajudicial proceedings imposed by law or by the judge;
7) for the enforcement of authentic acts in another member State of the European Union in the frame of Article 11 of the Council Directive 2002/8/EC of 27 January 2003 to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes, under the conditions defined by that Directive;
8) to the assistance of a technical adviser when a legal expert is required.

Q019 (2020): "Legal aid is applicable:
1° to all acts relating to claims to be brought or pending before a judge of the judicial or administrative order or before arbitrators;
2° to acts relating to the execution of judgments and decisions;
3° proceedings on request;
4° to procedural acts that fall within the competence of a member of the judicial order or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer
5° to mediation procedures, extrajudicial or judicial, conducted by a certified mediator
6° to all extrajudicial procedures imposed by law or the judge
7° for the enforcement of authentic instruments in another Member State of the European Union within the framework of Article 11 of Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes, under the conditions defined by this Directive
8° to the assistance of a technical adviser in the case of judicial expertise.
"

Q019 (2018): Legal aid is applicable: 1° to all acts relating to claims to be brought or pending before a judge of the judicial or administrative order or before arbitrators;
2° to the acts relating to the execution of judgments and decisions;
3° to the proceedings on request;
4° to the procedural acts that fall within the jurisdiction of a member of the judiciary or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer;
5° to the mediation procedures, extrajudicial or judicial, conducted by an approved mediator;
6° to all extrajudicial proceedings imposed by law or by the judge;
7° for the enforcement of authentic instruments in another Member State of the European Union under Article 11 of Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 aimed at improving access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes, under the conditions defined by that Directive;
8° to the assistance of a technical adviser during judicial expert appraisals.

Q019 (2017): Legal assistance is applicable:
(1) to all acts relating to claims to be brought or pending before a judge (civil, penal or administartive) or before arbitrators;
(2) to acts relating to the enforcement of judgments and court decisions;
(3) to proceedings on request;
(4) to procedural acts that fall within the jurisdiction of a member of the civil and penal order or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer;
(5) voluntary or judicial mediation procedures conducted by a mediator approved by the commission referred to in section 1727;
(6) to all extrajudicial proceedings imposed by law or by the judge;
(7) to the enforcement of authentic acts in another Member State of the European Union under Article 11 of the Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 aimed at improving access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes, under the conditions defined by that Directive.
(8) to the assistance of a technical adviser during judicial expert appraisals.
Articles 691 to 692bis of the Judicial Code set out a series of costs advanced by the State (transport and subsistence costs of judges and public or ministerial officials, witness taxes, interpreters' costs, disbursements of bailiffs, notaries, etc.) for the benefit of the person receiving legal assistance.

Q019 (2016): Legal assistance is applicable to:
1 ° all acts relating to applications to be made or pending before a judge of the judicial or administrative order or before arbitrators;
2 ° acts relating to the execution of judgments and decisions;
3 ° proceedings on request;
4° proceedings that fall within the jurisdiction of a member of the Judicial Order or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer;
5° mediation procedures, whether voluntary or judicial, conducted by a mediator approved by the commission referred to in article 1727;
6 ° [to all extrajudicial procedures imposed by law or by the judge;
7 ° for the enforcement of authentic instruments in another Member State of the European Union within the framework of Article 11 of Council Directive 2003/8 / EC of 27 January 2003 on improving access to justice in cross-border cases by establishing common minimum rules on legal aid granted in such cases, under the conditions laid down in that directive.]
8 ° to the assistance of a technical advisor during judicial appraisals.
Articles 691 to 692bis of the Judicial Code set forth a series of costs advanced by the State (transportation and subsistence expenses of magistrates and public or ministerial officers, taxes of witnesses, interpreters' fees, disbursements of bailiffs, notaries etc ...); to the discharge of the person benefiting from legal aid.

Q020 (2021): For second line legal aid, the number of cases closed for the year 2020-2021 amounts to 217 039 for Belgium.
For the year 2020-2021, the number of cases closed in criminal matters amounts to 79 662 and 137 377 for other matters.
As regards judicial assistance (one of the components of the legal aid in the sense of the questionnaire), the figure is 17 995: these are cases brought before the following courts: first instance courts (civil and family section), company courts and labour tribunals, courts of appeal, criminal section (in criminal matters) and courts of appeal, civil section, and labour court (in other matters). The number of closed cases for which legal aid was granted in full or in part is included in the figures in each category.

Q020 (2020): For second-line legal aid, the number of cases closed for the year 2019-2020 amounts to 203,305 for Belgium.
The figures for the 2018-2019 year were 196,840.
For the year 2019-2020, the number of cases closed in criminal matters is 76,561 and 126,744 for other matters.
Regarding legal aid, it can be noted that the figure of 16,266 corresponds to cases brought before the following courts: court of first instance (civil and family sections), enterprise court and labor court, court of appeal, criminal section (in criminal matters), and court of appeal, civil section, and labor court (in matters other than criminal).The number of closed cases for which legal aid was granted is included in the figures each time.

Q020 (2016): With regard to cases brought to courts, the only figure in our possession is the number of lawyers' appointments. This does not necessarily mean that the case will be closed or even brought to court (even if it is often the case). For the year 2015-2016, there has been 272,313 lawyers' designations (knowing that there may be several designations for a procedure). There is no distinction by subject.
With regard to second-line legal aid, however, the number of cases closed in criminal cases (excluding court work) for the 2015-2016 judicial year is available: 78172. For other subjects (year 2015- 2016): 155,769.
Regarding the number of cases (cases not brought to courts) that benefited from second-line legal aid, we have partial figures from the OVB (order of the Flemish Bars) for the year 2015- 2016: Cases that ended with an amicable settlement or transaction: 4097.

Q020 (2014): As for secondary legal assistance, for the judicial year 2013-2014 the number of cases solved which benefited from legal aid was 212 495. Regarding legal assistance, data are incomplete. Concerning 1st instance courts (civil cases), there were 20 033 orders granting or refusing legal assistance. In respect of commercial courts, 1 023 orders of the Legal Assistance Office granted legal assistance.
For the period 2013-2014 (September to September), secondary legal assistance has been allocated in favour of 212 495 resolved cases. As regards legal assistance, data are incomplete. And regarding first instance courts ruling on civil matter, 20 033 orders have been made, granting or refusing legal assistance. For commercial courts, 1 023 orders of the Judicial Assistance Office have approved the legal assistance.

Q020 (2012): For 2012, the number of non-litigious cases for which legal aid has been granted was 16 432 as regards the Order of the French and German Speaking Bars (Ordre des barreaux francophones et germanophones (OBFG)) and 41 618 as regards the Order of the Dutch Speaking Bars (Ordre des Barreaux néerlandophones (OVB)).

Q020-1 (General Comment): For second-line legal aid, Article 508/15, paragraph 1, of the Judicial Code states that "Except in urgent cases, the applicant and, where appropriate, his or her lawyer, shall be informed of the decision of the office within fifteen days of the application".
Q020-1 (2021): For second-line legal aid, Article 508/15, paragraph 1, of the Judicial Code states that "Except in urgent cases, the applicant and, where appropriate, his or her lawyer, shall be informed of the decision of the office within fifteen days of the application".As regards judicial assistance, the average duration varied between 11 and 4 days (for criminal cases 9 days, civil cases 11 days, before the labour court 7 days and before the labour tribunal 4 days).

Q020-1 (2020): No data available.

Q037 (General Comment): In Belgian law, the terminology is "inoperative preventive detention" and not "wrongful arrest".
Compensation via the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the liability of the state for damages resulting from faults committed by the public prosecutor's office or judges, falls under Article 1382 of the Civil Code (action in tort). According to article 1382 of the Civil Code: "Any act of man whatsoever which causes damage to another person obliges the person by whose fault it occurred to make reparation". The fault may consist of negligence according to the terms of article 1383 which provides that "everyone is responsible for the damage he causes not only by his own act but also by his negligence or imprudence". In order to obtain compensation, the plaintiff must demonstrate the existence of a fault, damage and a causal link between the fault and the damage. According to the Constitutional Court (see Constitutional Court ruling of June 30, 2014 (No. 99/2014)), a constitutionally correct interpretation of Article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that the state can be held liable for a fault of a judge/body deciding at the last instance, even if the decision is not repealed, amended, annulled or revoked. It is necessary that the fault consists of a sufficiently serious violation of the applicable rule of law and that, given the limited remedies available against the erroneous decision, it is not possible to obtain an annulment of the decision. Such claims are brought before the civil courts.
Reference should also be made to the Act of 13 March 1973 on compensation for inoperative preventive detention. Article 28 of this law provides that "Any person who has been held in preventive detention for more than eight days without this detention or its continuation having been caused by his own conduct may claim compensation:
a) if he or she has been directly or indirectly excluded from liability by a judicial decision that has become res judicata;
b) if he/she has benefited from an order or a ruling of dismissal;
c) if he/she has been arrested or kept in detention after the public action has been extinguished by prescription;
The amount of such compensation shall be determined in equity, taking into account all the circumstances of public and private interest.
If the person concerned is unable to bring an action for compensation before the ordinary courts, the compensation must be requested in writing to the Minister of Justice, who shall decide within six months.
The compensation shall be awarded by the Minister of Justice at the expense of the Treasury, if the conditions provided for in § 1 are met.
If the compensation or the allocation is refused, if the amount of the compensation or the number of days allocated is deemed insufficient, or if the Minister of Justice has not taken a decision within six months of the request, the person concerned may apply to the Commission for Inoperative Preventive Detention.
With regard to the "number of convictions" for "wrongful arrests": it should be noted that the figure in the table does not correspond to "convictions" but represents the number of cases for which there has been a definitive grant of compensation. In "inoperative preventive detention" cases there is no conviction. It is either a grant of compensation or a refusal of compensation. Therefore, the title of the third column of the table does not correspond to the content (in any case for the ""inoperative preventive detention"")

Q037 (2021): For the item "wrongful arrest" (corresponding in Belgium to "inoperative preventive detention"): concerning the number of decisions taken, there were 20 decisions granting and 21 decisions refusing compensation (+ 39 pending cases), in total 80 applications. Only the 20 decisions granting compensation and the total number of applications are included in the table.

Q037 (2019): 1. Reference should also be made to the Law of 13 March 1973 relating to compensation in the event of inoperative preventive detention. Article 28 stipulates the following:
Any person who has been held in preventive detention for more than eight days without this detention or its extension having been caused by his/her own conduct is entitled to compensation:
a) if s/he has been exonerated directly or indirectly by a court decision that has the force of res judicata;
(b) if s/he has benefited from an order or judgment of dismissal;
(c) if s/he has been arrested or detained after the termination of the prosecution by prescription;
The amount of such compensation shall be fixed in equity and taking into account all circumstances of public and private interest.
If the person concerned is unable to bring an action for compensation before the ordinary courts, the compensation must be requested by written request addressed to the Minister of Justice, who shall decide within six months. If compensation or imputation is refused, if the amount of compensation or the number of days imputed is deemed insufficient, or if the Minister of Justice has not made a decision within six months of the request, the interested party may apply to the "Inoperative Preventive Detention" Commission.
2. Compensation through the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the State liability for damage resulting from faults made by the public prosecutor office or judges, falls under the article 1382 of the Civil Code (claims on the basis of tort). According to article 1382 Civil Code: “Any act whatever of man which cause damage to another obliges him by whose fault it occurred to make reparation”. To obtain compensation, the plaintiff must demonstrate the existence of a fault, of damage and of a causal link between the fault and damage. According to the Constitutional Court a constitutionally correct interpretation of article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that the State may be held liable for a fault of a judicial body deciding in last instance, even if the decision is not repealed, amended, annulled or revoked. It is required that the fault consists in a sufficiently serious breach of the applicable legal rule and that, given the limited legal remedies available against the wrongful decision, it is not possible to obtain an annulment of the decision. These claims are brought before the civil courts.
Exceeding a reasonable time is also to be considered as a fault. However, article 21ter of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that as a consequence of a violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time, the courts can either impose a penalty below the statutory minimum or simply pronounce a guilty verdict without imposing a sentence. In addition, the Court of Cassation has ruled that the Chambre du conseil (which is the investigative court that intervenes in case of a judicial inquiry) can declare the criminal claim inadmissible if the rights of the defence have been seriously and irretrievably damaged due to the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time. In other less serious cases, the Chambre du conseil may establish the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time and commit the case for trial, after which the trial court is bound to give a proper response to this violation, in accordance with Article 21ter of the Preliminary Title of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Q037 (2016): Compensation is only awarded for wrongful arrest. Excessive length may have consequences to the extent that a reduction of the sentence granted is possible: If the length of criminal proceedings exceeds a reasonable time, the judge may convict the offender simply by conviction or impose a sentence that is less than the minimum sentence prescribed by law.

Bulgaria

Q016 (General Comment): Legal aid is granted only to natural persons, in criminal, civil and administrative matters before courts of all instances. Legal aid authorities are the Ministry of Justice which conducts the State policy in the sphere of legal aid; the National Legal Aid Bureau /NLAB/ which provides general and methodological guidance of the activity concerning the granting of legal aid by issuing mandatory instructions on the application of the Act and the statutory instruments of secondary legislation; the Bar Councils which organize and administer legal aid within the respective geographical jurisdiction (network of Regional Counseling Centers / RCCs /, established at thirteen bar councils in the country); the authority directing the procedural steps, the court or the relevant police or customs authority which decide whether to grant legal aid or not in civil or administrative cases. Consultations are provided as well as through the National Telephone for Legal Aid at the NLAB. The NLAB grants or refuses granting legal aid for a consultation with a view to reaching a settlement prior to bringing legal proceedings or to bringing a case before a court and/or preparation of documents for a trial. The types of legal aid are: pre-litigation advice with a view to reaching a settlement prior to bringing legal proceedings or to bringing a case before a court; preparation of documents for bringing a case before a court; representation in court by legal counsel; representation upon detention under Article 72 of the Ministry of Interior Act and under Article 16a of the Customs Act and under Art. 124b, para. 1 of the Law on the State Agency for National Security. The legal aid system covers cases in which the assistance of a lawyer, a stand-by defence counsel or representation is mandatory as provided for by the Criminal Procedure Code, the Civil Procedure Code and the Administrative Procedure Code. Legal aid system covers also cases in which the applicant is unable to pay for a lawyer, wishes to benefit of a legal assistance, and the interests of the justice require such legal assistance. Legal aid for alternative dispute resolution (ADR) does not apply.

Q016 (2014): In 2014, changes were made in the Regulations of the organization and activities of the National Legal Aid Bureau. Since May 2015, within the NLAB are permanently operating the National Primary Legal Aid Hotline and the Regional Consultation Centers for vulnerable social groups.
Q016 (2012): Legislative changes in the Legal Aid Act have been carried out in several directions: increasing the powers of the legal aid system authorities and exercising control over granting legal aid; introduction of the stand-by defence counsel with the purpose of expediting court proceedings in criminal matters; changes in the order and circumstances for entering and striking from the National Legal Aid Register; introducing legislative requirements for reporting legal aid; the scope of the legal aid has been expanded.
Q019 (General Comment): The travel expenses of an official defence counsel are covered by the budget for legal aid administering.
Legal Aid Act: Art. 38 (5) The appointed lawyer shall furthermore be reimbursed for the necessary expenses on the defence, incurred for visit to the places of deprivation of liberty or to detention facilities and on defence in another nucleated settlement according to the procedure established by the Ordinance on Domestic Business Trips.

Q019 (2019): Art 38 ал.5 LAA The travel expenses of an official defence counsel are covered by the budget for legal aid administering.
Q019 (2017): The travel expenses of an official defense counsel are covered by the budget for legal aid administering.

Q020 (General Comment): According to the Bulgarian Law on Legal Aid / LPA / there are four types of legal aid: 1. preliminary legal aid for consultation with a view to reaching an agreement before the commencement of court proceedings or for filing a case; 2. preparation of documents for filing a case; 3. legal aid for procedural representation in an already initiated case in the court or in the pre-trial bodies; 4. legal assistance in case of detention under the Law on the Ministry of Interior and under the Law on Customs, which is a representation by a lawyer before pre-trial criminal proceedings are instituted. The provided data is only in respect of the legal aid for procedural representation in an already initiated case in the court or in the pre-trial bodies (3.)
Q020 (2020): The provided data is only in respect of the legal aid for procedural representation in an already initiated case in the court or in the pre-trial bodies.
Q020 (2018): The number of other than criminal cases brought to court for which legal aid has been granted increased due to the broadening of the net of Regional Centres for consultation functioning in some Bar Councils. The consultations in the centres are predominantly of civil matters and in most of the cases there are grounds for bringing legal proceedings.

Q020 (2016): The increasing of the number of cases other than criminal for which legal aid was provided is due to the amendments (in force from 19 March 2013) in the Legal Aid Act according to which the circle of persons entitled to legal aid was broadened. Foremost there was an increase of the number of cases for which legal aid was provided for seekers of international protection under the Asylum and Refugees Act; under the Law on Child Protection; for persons entitled to maintenance under Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations; for victims of domestic or sexual violence or of trafficking in human beings. Furthermore, there are two new forms for providing legal aid for consultation – the National Telephone Line for Legal Aid as well as Regional Centres for consultation functioning in some the the Bar Councils. Thanks to those two forms for providing legal aid the number of other than criminal cases increased. In respect to criminal cases not brought to court, they remain 0 as in 2014. The increase in the number of criminal cases brought to court for which legal aid has been granted stems also from the amendment to the Legal Aid Act and the extension of the legal aid scope.

Q020-1 (2021): According to the Law on Legal Aid, 14 days is the deadline for providing legal aid for consultation and preparation of documents for the initiation of a case, which within the meaning of the law is a primary legal aid, which is provided by decision of the Chair of the National Legal Aid Bureau. The 14 days period shall run from the moment when all the documents required by law are presented or available and the legal problem is specified. The average time for processing the application for legal aid and preparing the decision is up to 5 working days, provided that the application is accompanied by all documents certifying that the person is eligible for legal aid.

Q020-1 (2020): The term of 14 days is provided in the Law on Legal Aid, in force from January 1, 2006 / SG no. 79 of 2005 Actual average duration- up to 7 days

Q037 (General Comment): The Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities sets out the procedure for liability for the activity of the Administration, law enforcement authorities, Commission for Forfeiture of Unlawfully Acquired Assets, and Liability for actions of the judiciary bodies, for violation of the right to a hearing and pronouncement of judgment within a reasonable time.
Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions, or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion, the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions, or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of an administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, list the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities, or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions, or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Q037 (2021): Statistics on excessive length of proceedings use data by the Procedural Representation before the ECHR Directorate of the Ministry of Justice on the review of applications for the domestic compensatory remedy for an excessive length of proceedings under the Judicial System Act. Sums paid may include payments under applications from December of the previous year. Statistics on wrongful arrest include prosecution data (on detention in custody and house arrest, but also on wrongful charges, because the numbers on the provision for seeking compensation for those are aggregate) and on 24-hour police detention.

Q037 (2019): Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

Q037 (2016): The Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities sets out the procedure for laibility for activity of the Administration, law-enforcement authorities, Commission for Forfeiture of Unlawfully Acquired Assets and Liability for actions of the judiciary bodies, for violation of the right to a hearing and pronouncement of judgment within a reasonable time.
Chapter Three A of the Judiciary System Act regulates the rules for reviewing applications against the right to be heard within a reasonable time, payment of compensation in case of violations and the relevant measures to remedy the breaches.

Croatia

Q016 (2014): The new Free Legal Aid Act entered into force in 2014. The procedure of exercising the right to primary legal aid (legal information, legal advice, drawing up submissions in procedures before public and international bodies, representation in proceedings in public bodies, legal aid in amicable, out-of-court dispute resolution) is substantially simplified. Involvement of civil society groups, legal clinics and government bodies in the system of primary legal aid and legal counseling increased the territorial availability of expert legal aid. As to the approval of secondary legal aid in court proceedings and exoneration from paying court costs and fees, the focus of the reform has been placed on increasing the property and income threshold for approving legal aid.

Q018 (General Comment): Exemption from court fees in other than criminal cases is one of the forms of secondary legal aid proscribed by the Law on Legal Aid and it may be granted in proceedings related to the enforcement of judicial decisions. The situation changed few times in the last years. While till 2014, the exemption from payment of court fees could be granted in all judicial proceedings, including enforcement procedures and security procedures, due to changes in the Legal Aid Act in 2014, there was no more this possibility to finally again reinstall it again in 2016 Free Legal Aid Act (Official Gazette 143/13) and allow to grant legal aid for the fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions.

Q018 (2021): e.g. in enforcement proceedings following child maintenance proceedings; labour disputes

Q018 (2019): Legal aid may be granted for exemption of payment of fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions.

Q018 (2018): Legal aid may be granted for exemption of payment of fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions.

Q018 (2017): In enforcement proceedings legal aid is granted when it comes to enforcing a claim arising from a civil or administrative court procedure for which legal aid may be granted under the provisions of Free Legal Aid Act (Official Gazette 143/13).

Q018 (2016): In enforcement proceedings legal aid is granted when it comes to enforcing a claim arising from a civil or administrative court procedure for which legal aid may be granted under the provisions of Free Legal Aid Act (Official Gazette 143/13).

Q019 (General Comment): Exemption from court-proceeding-expenses in other than criminal cases is one of the forms of secondary legal aid prescribed by the Law on Legal Aid. It includes exemption from payment costs of witnesses, expert witnesses, court-sworn translators, costs of site visits and court advertisements. The exemption from payment of litigation costs depends on the material conditions and the type of procedure.

Q019 (2018): Legal aid may be granted in the form of exemption from payment of court proceeding costs (costs of witnesses, expert witnesses, court-sworn translators, costs of site visits and court advertisements).

Q019 (2017): The legal aid can be granted in civil and administrative court proceedings (other than criminal cases) for exemption form payment of court proceedings. The exemption from payment of court proceedings includes the exemption from payment of an advance for the costs of witnesses, expert witnesses, investigation and judicial announcements.

Q019 (2016): The legal aid can be granted in civil and administrative court proceedings (other than criminal cases) for exemption from payment of court proceedings. The exemption from payment of court proceedings includes the exemption from payment of an advance for the costs of witnesses, expert witnesses, investigation, judicial announcements.

Q020 (2021): Information not available on cases brought/not brought to court following granting legal aid

Q020 (2018): In 2018. the annual approved and implemented public budget for provision of legal aid in other than criminal cases for cases not brought to court has been increased. This is the result of the increased number of financed projects (NGO's and Legal Clinics) for providing primary legal aid and, subsequently, number of cases in which primary legal aid has been provided increased in this period.

Q020 (2016): The difference between data for 2014 and 2016 occur because data for 2014 only covered the period from 1 September to 31 December 2014, since keeping the record started on 1 September, while data for 2016 include the period of 1 January to 31 December 2016.

Q020 (2014): In 2014, the most of the cases for which free legal aid was granted were family law cases. In total of 374 cases, an exemption from paying costs of court proceedings was granted. In 1167 cases, an exemption from payment of court fees was approved.
In the frame of the 2014 exercise, the attention was drawn on the entry into force of a new Free Legal Aid Act in January 2014. Accordingly, the range of legal issues in which primary free legal aid (cases not brought to court) can be granted has been expanded (with certain exceptions, in proprietary rights, labour relations, enforcement and insurance proceedings, amicable dispute resolution, administrative and civil proceedings). On the contrary, in 2012, primary free legal aid could have been granted only with regard to the citizen status rights, retirement and/or health insurance, exceptionally, in all the other administrative proceedings and the protection of employees' rights with regard to the employer. Due to this expansion and the fact that primary free legal aid is available to a wider range of users, there is a significant increase of the number of cases for which legal aid has been granted (1018 in 2014 in comparison to 465 in 2012).

Q020 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been specified that from 1st February 2009 until 7 November 2013, legal aid has been granted in 18,905 other than criminal cases (both brought to the court and not brought to the court). In 2012, it has been granted in 5,872 other than criminal cases (both brought to the court and not brought to the court).
In the frame of the 2012 evaluation cycle, it has been specified that from 1st February 2009 until 7 November 2013, legal aid was granted in 2,900 cases that were not conducted before a court. In 2012, legal aid was granted in 465 such cases.

Q020-1 (2021): According to the provisions of the Criminal procedure Act (OG 152/08, 76/09, 80/11, 121/11, 91/12, 143/12, 56/13, 145/13, 152/14, 70/17, 126/19, 126/19), the defendant submits a reasoned request to be granted legal aid on budget charges to the State Attorney processing the indictment or to the court upon submission the indictment. The decision to grant legal aid against budgetary resources shall be decided by a reasoned decision of the State Attorney or the President of the Council or an individual judge. An appeal against the decision of the State Attorney shall be decided by the investigating judge, while an appeal against the decision of the President of the Council or the individual judge shall be decided by the Council. Where the defendant has made a request for legal aid against budgetary resources, the administering authority shall not be authorised to take action in which the defendant has the right to participate or decide on the legal remedy or remedy submitted, before deciding on the validity of the request of the defendant for the appointment of the defence counsel against budgetary resources or before the appointment of the defence counsel against budgetary resources, unless those actions are not subject to delay. The administering authority shall provide the appointed defence with adequate time to prepare the defence.

Q020-1 (2020): Eviseaged timeframe for granting legal aid in other then criminal cases is set out in Law on Legal Aid. However, the proceeding for obtaining legal aid for cases not brought to court in other than criminal cases (primary legal aid) is initiated by directly contacting the primary-legal-aid-provider and there is no proscribed timeframe, that is to say the primary-legal-aid-provider shall provide legal aid imeddiately upon contact with free-legal-aid-recipient. To obtain legal aid for cases brought to court in other than criminal cases (secondary legal aid) an application must be submitted to one of the county-administrative-bodies or Administrative Body of the City of Zagreb and they shall render decision in 15 days of the subbmision of the application.
According to the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Act (OG 152/08, 76/09, 80/11, 121/11, 91/12, 143/12, 56/13, 145/13, 152/14, 70/17, 126 / 19, 126/19) the defendant shall submit a reasoned request for the appointment of a defense counsel at the expense of budgetary funds to the State Attorney until the indictment is filed, or to the court after the indictment is filed. The State Attorney or the President of the Council or a judge shall decide on the merits of the request for the appointment of a defense counsel at the expense of the budget. An appeal against the decision of the State Attorney shall be decided by the investigating judge, while an appeal against the decision of the president of the panel or an individual judge shall be decided by the panel.

Q037 (2020): The data in the table refer to the compensation for unjustified arrest and unjustified conviction
An application for compensation for unjustified arrest and unjustified conviction shall be submitted to the Ministry of Justice and Public Administration. If the applicant does not accept the offer of the Ministry of Justice and Public Administration, he has a right to sue at the competent court.
The Ministry of Justice of the Administration issued a Decision on 19 November 2019, which established that the financial compensation in the mediation procedure amounts to HRK 280.00 for each day of imprisonment for unfounded arrest or unjustified conviction. Therefore, there was an increase in the amount of compensation and a greater number of acceptance of bids, and for that reason there was a greater number of resolved cases.
The amount paid for 2020 refers to payments based on decisions rendered in amicable procedure and court judgments, cases and from previous years in which the payment was made in 2020.
For excessive length of proceedings, the compensation can not exceed 35.000 Croatian kunas (cca 4.600 EUR) per case.

Q037 (2018): * The information in the table also refers to compensation for wrongful arrest and unjustified conviction.
An application for compensation for unjustified arrest and unjustified conviction shall be submitted to the Ministry of Justice. If the applicant does not accept the offer of the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Justice has the right to bring an action before the competent court. The amount of compensation offered by the Ministry to the parties as just financial compensation on that basis is unique in all cases and ranges from the following amounts - up to 30 days in custody in the amount of HRK 200.00 per day of deprivation of liberty, for custody of 30 to 90 days in the amount of HRK 160.00 per day of imprisonment, for detention of more than 90 days in the amount of HRK 120.00 per day of imprisonment. The amount paid for 2018 relates to payments made under the amicable settlement and court rulings.

Q037 (2016): Number of requests for compensation and number of condemnation is 167 and refers both to compensation for wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction.
The amount of compensation that the Ministry offers to the injured parties as a fair monetary compensation for claim for damages for wrongful and unjustified conviction is unique in all cases and ranges in the following amounts - for a custody of up to 30 days in the amount of 200,00 HRK per day of deprivation of liberty , for a custody from 30 to 90 days in the amount of HRK 160,00 HRK per day of deprivation of liberty, for a custody of more than 90 days in the amount of HRK 120,00 HRK per day of deprivation of liberty. The amount paid in 2016 (3 155 925 EUR) refers to payments based on decisions issued in a friendly settlement and on court judgements.
• Excessive length of proceedings
According to the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia, everyone shall be entitled have his/her rights and obligations, or suspicion or accusation of a criminal offence decided upon fairly before a legally established, independent and impartial court within a reasonable period.
According to the Courts Act, a party considering that the competent court has not reached a decision within a reasonable time on the party's right or obligation or criminal suspicion or charge, can file an application to the Court President where the proceedings is conducted, for the right to trial within reasonable time. The Court President shall demand from the judge conducting the case the report on the file and determine the term by which the case has to be resolved. Conduct term shall not be longer than 6 months. If the case is not resolved within set time, the judge conducting the case is obliged to deliver a written report to the Court President, President of the immediately superior court and to the Ministry of Justice on the reasons for not resolving the case.
If the court does not decide within the set time, the party can address the request for right to trial within reasonable time to the immediately superior court. If the court decides positively on the merits of the application filed by the applicant, it shall determine a time framework for the court before which the case is heard to decide on the right or obligation or suspicion or criminal charge against the applicant, and shall determine a just compensation to the applicant for violation of the right to trial within reasonable time.
The compensation shall be paid out from the State budget within 4 months from the day the party submits the request for payment of the compensation. The amount of the compensation for the proceeding concerned cannot exceed the amount of 35.000,00 Croatian kunas.
The number of requests for compensation provided in the table above is the total number of the requests received in the 2016 for the compensation for violation of the right to trial within reasonable time (in county courts, High Commercial Court of RoC, Supreme Court of RoC); the number of condemnation is the number of requests that were considered founded by the courts and the total amount is the amount of the just compensation awarded in the judgments.
• Non-execution of court decisions The Republic of Croatia provides the compensation in cases related to the non-execution of final decisions of the European court of Human Rights, according to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental freedoms. If this question refers to non-execution of court decisions only of domestic courts, then we can confirm that there is no compensation system for non-execution of court decision.

Q037 (2014): According to 2014 data and in respect of the excessive length of proceedings, the right to a fair trial within a reasonable time is enshrined in the Constitution. Besides, according to the Courts Act (2013), a party considering that the competent court has not reached a decision within a reasonable time, can file an application to the Court President (according to the previous Courts Act, a party could file an application with the immediately superior court). The latter shall demand from the judge conducting the case the report on the file and determine the term by which the case has to be resolved (not longer than 6 months). If the case is not resolved within the set time, the judge conducting the case has to deliver a written report to the Court President, the President of the immediately superior court and the Ministry of Justice on the reasons for not resolving the case. If the court does not decide within the set time, the party can apply to the immediately superior court. If the latter decides positively on the merits of the application, it shall determine a time framework for the court before which the case is heard, and shall determine a just compensation to the applicant for violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time. The compensation shall be paid out from the State budget within 4 months from the day the party submits the request and the amount cannot exceed 35000 Croatian kunas.
As for the non-execution of court judgments, compensation can be granted in case of non-execution of final decisions of the European Court of Human Rights, according to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental freedoms. Conversely, there is no compensation system for non-execution of domestic courts' judgments.
With regard to wrongful arrest, detention or condemnation, the Constitution provides for the right to an indemnification and a public apology, in compliance with the law. According to the Criminal Procedure Act (2008), a person unjustifiably convicted of a criminal offence or unfoundedly arrested shall be entitled to full rehabilitation, compensation of damage from the State budget and other rights established by law. No compensation is possible if the proceedings were discontinued or the charge rejected because in the new proceedings the subsidiary prosecutor or private prosecutor desisted from prosecution on the basis of an agreement with the defendant. Moreover, a person who caused his arrest by illicit acts is not entitled to compensation of damages.
The compensation can be requested within three years from the day the first instance judgment of acquittal or judgment rejecting the charge became final or from the day the first instance ruling discontinuing the proceedings became final, and if a higher court decided on an appeal, from the day of receipt of the decision of the higher court.

Before bringing a civil action for the compensation of damages, the injured person is bound to submit his request to the Ministry of Justice in order to reach a settlement on the existence of damage and the type and amount of compensation. The Ministry of Justice annually receives an average of between 200 and 250 requests for compensation, while the settlement is reached in approximately 50%.

A person who was unjustifiably detained is entitled to all types of monetary and non-monetary damages according to the provisions of the Obligations Act (OG 35/05, 41/08 and 125/11), for the full amount of damages suffered. An injured person may be awarded compensation for non-monetary damages in case of harm inflicted on his/her individual rights, namely the right to freedom, honor, reputation and respect. Monetary compensation is usually awarded as a result of the loss of earnings or income. The amount of monetary compensation offered to injured persons on the basis of non-monetary damages depends

Cyprus

Q016 (2017): x

Q018 (2017): x

Q019 (2021): These costs can only be given following a court order.

Q019 (2019): in 2019 the legal aid law was amended and European arrest warrant procedure was included. These costs include interpreter fees, translation costs, travel expenses of witnesses.

Q019 (2017): x

Q020 (2020): Other cases include civil cases for serious violations of human rights and family court cases. In the last cycle we did not have available statistics on the family court cases, and in this cycle we have included these cases.

Q037 (2019): The law providing effective remedies for exceeding reasonable time in identifying civil rights and obligations provides for the filing of an action against the government for undue delay in the hearing of a case. The cases are still pending.

Czech Republic

Q018 (General Comment): Legal aid could be granted at every stage of the proceedings – it could be granted even only for enforcement of judicial decision.

Q018 (2017): Legal aid can be granted in any stage of the proceeding.

Q018 (2016): Legal aid can be granted in any stage of the proceeding.

Q019 (General Comment): If legal aid is granted, it covers all costs, including lawyer's fees, fees of judicial experts, etc.

Q037 (2021): There were 5 356 requests for compensation in 2021, from this number 3 045 requests filed to the Ministry of Justice and 2 311 reguests filed to the courts. In 2 490 cases in total was the applicant successful, either fully or partially. 9 617 860 Euro in total was paid.

Denmark

Q016 (General Comment): Criminal cases:
Defendants are in all cases appointed a defence attorney. Victims of certain criminal offences (e.g. sexual offences, homicide and acts of violence) have access to representation in court by a support attorney. Basic legal advice is available to all persons in criminal cases. Further legal advice is only available subject to certain economic criteria. If the prosecuted person is acquitted, the costs of the defence attorney remain free of charge. Contrarily, it is normally the court who decides if the prosecuted person must pay for the defence attorney and other expenses of the case, if the person is convicted. Finally, if the prosecuted person picks his or her own defence attorney, he or she will as a starting point have to pay the attorney's fee.
Other cases:
In civil cases it is normally the losing part who has to pay both one's own and the opposite party's expenses in relation to the court case. The court can decide that both parties must pay their own costs, if the case doesn't have an actual winner.

Q018 (General Comment): The bailiff's court can grant legal aid if the person appearing before the court is deemed to need a lawyer's assistance, and the person fulfils certain economic criteria. (Danish Administration of Justice Act, article 500(2)).

Q019 (General Comment): With regard to other than criminal cases, legal aid can be granted for all necessary costs associated with the proceedings. The court decides which expenses are covered by legal aid, e.g. expenses that have been held in connection with a trial with good reason. Fees for technical advisors or experts are covered in criminal cases under special circumstances.
Q020 (2021): In Denmark, there are four different authorities that can grant legal aid: 1) The courts can grant legal aid to the cases listed in section 327 of the Administrative Procedure Act. 2) In other cases legal aid is granted by the Civil Affairs Agency. 3) The Ministry of Justice processes legal aid cases where the Civil Affairs Agency declares itself incompetent.
4) Complaints over decisions made by the Civil Affairs Agency and the Ministry of Justice can be brought before the Appeals Permission Board. The total number of cases listed above (4098 cases) stems from information given by the the National Board of Justice. It includes all cases brought before the courts where legal aid was granted by either the courts, the Civil Affairs Agency, the Ministry of Justice or the Appeals Permission Board. We are unable to obtain the number of cases not brought before the courts, but where legal aid was granted.

Q020 (2016): The 2.071 cases mentioned above is the number of civil cases in district courts where it is noted on the case that one or all parties have been granted legal aid.
Q020 (2014): In 2014, the overall number of finalized civil cases has decreased about 15% and the number of cases granted with legal aid follows the same trend. The number of petty cases where parties are not supposed to have a lawyer – and therefore do not need legal aid - did not overall fall that much. Accordingly, cases where legal aid does not apply constitute a bigger part of the total, while the number of cases granted with legal aid decreased.
According to 2014 data, there are several voluntary organizations as well as law students etc., offering free assistance in legal matters. It is also possible to pay an insurance to safeguard oneself if a situation arises where help is needed. It is not a part of the "system" as such but it is definitely a part of the overall picture.

Q020-1 (2021): There is no binding legislation on the maximum duration in cases of granting legal aid. At mentioned under the comments to Q20 legal aid can be granted by four different authorities. The average processing time in cases of legal aid request processed by the Civil Affair Agency was 93 days in 2021. It has not been possible to obtain information regarding the average processing time in regards to requests that have been processed by the courts, the Ministry og Justice and the Appeals Permission Board, since this would entail reviewing all the cases manually, which we do not have the resources for.

Q020-1 (2020): The Ministry of Justice Civil Affairs Department has provided information that there is no binding legislation on the maximum duration in cases of granting legal aid. The average processing time in cases of legal aid requests was 60 days in 2020.
Q037 (2021): We can only supply data for the two sub-groups that can be filtered correct. The figures that do not fit under the other categories now appear under "other". It should be noted that the data comes from a case filing tool, and therefore is not a statistics tool. Data may be subject to entry-errors of all sorts such as compensation amount, categorization etc.

Q037 (2020): Data in the table (Q37) has been created outside the standard model. Specifically developed data models are tested, but there is a greater risk of unidentified errors than when using the standard model. Data in the table are thus associated with considrable uncertainty. All figures indicating condemnations of requests and total amount are the sum of cases and amounts fully or partially granted. In regards to the "Other" category, the figures given are total numbers minus the numbers in the three categories for which separate figures are given (excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction).

Q037 (2019): The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains rules concerning the possibility to obtain compensation for criminal prosecution. These rules allow for compensation under certain circumstances for example due to the excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction. The Prosecution Service decide on requests for compensation for criminal prosecution and these decisions can be brought before the courts. The Prosecution Service annually decides on approximately 2000 requests for compensation of which approximately 100 are brought before the courts. The budget for the total amount of compensation due criminal prosecution paid in accordance with the rules of the Danish Administration of Justice Act was approximately DKK 31.400.000. This amount is however revised at the end of the year.

Q037 (2018): The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains rules concerning the possibility to obtain compensation for criminal prosecution. These rules allow for compensation under certain circumstances for example due to the excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and
wrongful conviction. The Prosecution Service decide on requests for compensation for criminal prosecution and these decisions can be brought before the courts. The Prosecution Service annually decides on approximately 2000 requests for compensation of which approximately 100 are brought before the courts. In 2018 the total amount of compensation due criminal prosecution paid in accordance with the rules of the Danish Administration of Justice Act was approximately DKK 23.000.000.

Estonia

Q018 (General Comment): Legal aid cannot be granted for fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (except for representing a person in enforcement proceedings), but procedural assistance can be granted to release a person from all or a part of the expenses related to enforcement proceedings.

Q018 (2019): Partial or full coverage of the costs related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (incl. fees of an enforcement agent) depending on the financial situation of the claimant. The advance payment of enforcement costs shall not be demanded by the bailiff from the claimant who is a natural person and who has received legal aid for the payment of procedural costs (incl court fees) as well as in case of collection of compensation for damage caused by a criminal offence as well as in case of collection of maintenance support.

Q018 (2018): Partial or full coverage of the costs related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (incl. fees of an enforcement agent) depending on the financial situation of the claimant. The advance payment of enforcement costs shall not be demanded by the bailiff from the claimant who is a natural person and who has received legal aid for the payment of procedural costs (incl court fees) as well as in case of collection of compensation for damage caused by a criminal offence as well as in case of collection of maintenance support.

Q018 (2017): Partial or full coverage of the costs related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (incl. fees of an enforcement agent) depending on the financial situation of the claimant. The advance payment of enforcement costs shall not be demanded by the bailiff from the claimant who is a natural person and who has received legal aid for the payment of procedural costs (incl court fees) as well as in case of collection of compensation for damage caused by a criminal offence as well as in case of collection of maintenance support.

Q018 (2016): Partial or full coverage of the costs related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (incl. fees of an enforcement agent) depending on the financial situation of the claimant. The advance payment of enforcement costs shall not be demanded by the bailiff from the claimant who is a natural person and who has received legal aid for the payment of procedural costs (incl court fees) as well as in case of collection of compensation for damage caused by a criminal offence as well as in case of collection of maintenance support.

Q019 (General Comment): At the request of a lawyer who has provided state legal aid, the court, investigative body or prosecutor's office shall determine the reimbursable travel and accommodation expenses incurred by the lawyer or the manager of the law firm in connection with the provision of state legal aid. Travel and accommodation expenses shall be reimbursed only if the State legal aid has been provided in a place other than the town or municipality where the law firm or the structural unit through which the lawyer provides legal services is located.

Q020 (General Comment): The number of cases referred to court for which legal aid has been granted and the number of cases for which legal aid has been granted only for legal advice cannot be separated.

Q020 (2014): The total number of cases for which legal aid has been granted in 2014 is 16 110.

Q020 (2012): The total number of cases for which legal aid has been granted in 2012 is 17 031.

Q020-1 (2020): The data of legal aid is in two seperate information systems and it is not possible to collect data on actual average duration.

Q037 (2016): There is now a system for excessive length of proceedings or non-execution of court decision, but we do not have the numbers.

Finland

Q018 (General Comment): The granting of legal aid exempts the recipient from liability for the enforcement fees pertaining to the judgment or the court order and any expenses payable in advance. All necessary costs of enforcement are covered from state funds, if they cannot be collected from the opposing party. (Legal Aid Act, Section 4(4)).

Q018 (2020): The granting of legal aid exempts the recipient from liability for the enforcement fees pertaining to the judgment or the court order and any expenses payable in advance. All necessary costs of enforcement are covered from state funds, if they cannot be collected from the opposing party. (Legal Aid Act, Section 4(4)).

Q018 (2019): The granting of legal aid exempts the recipient from liability for the enforcement fees pertaining to the judgment or the court order and any expenses payable in advance. All necessary costs of enforcement are covered from state funds, if they cannot be collected from the opposing party. (Legal Aid Act, Section 4(4)).

Q018 (2017): Legal aid covers exemption from execution fees resulting from court's decision.

Q019 (General Comment): The fees and compensations arising from the interpretation and translation services required in the consideration of the matter are waived for a recipient of legal aid. Compensation for a witness called by a party receiving legal aid is paid from the state funds. Other costs arising from presenting evidence by a party receiving legal aid are paid from the state funds if the evidence was necessary for deciding the case. If a party receiving legal aid, other than the defendant in a criminal case, has been summoned to the court in person, the compensation for the costs of appearing before the court are paid from the state funds. Legal aid can be granted for travel and lodging costs for the lawyer, as well as for the expenses of witnesses, expert witnesses included. A state-covered support person may be appointed to a victim of violent or sexual crimes, in addition to his/her legal representation.

Q019 (2020): Legal aid can be granted for travel and lodging costs for the lawyer, as well as for the expenses of witnesses, expert witnesses included. A state-covered support person may be appointed to a victim of violent or sexual crimes, in addition to his/her legal representation.

Q019 (2019): Legal aid can be granted for travel and lodging costs for the lawyer, as well as for the expenses of witnesses, expert witnesses included. A state-covered support person may be appointed to a victim of violent or sexual crimes, in addition to his/her legal representation.

Q019 (2017): Legal aid can include, for example, fees from interpretation services and costs from adducing evidence.

Q020 (General Comment): Legal aid decisions are taken by the State Legal Aid Offices. Legal aid can be provided in respect of almost any sort of legal matter. In court cases the applicant has a choice of lawyers: (1) a public legal aid lawyer (working at the State Legal Aid Office) or (2) a private lawyer, who can be an advocate (member of the Finnish Bar Association) or a licensed lawyer (lawyer who has been granted a permit by the Licensed Lawyers Board to act as an licensed lawyer). In certain matters legal aid is only given by public legal aid lawyers.

Q020 (2021): At the moment, the requested data cannot be provided because the reporting system of the legal aid is currently being renewed.

Q020 (2020): At the moment, the requested data cannot be provided because the reporting system of the legal aid is currently being renewed.

Q020 (2018): The public legal aid offices received a total of 48 045 cases of which 6 751 were criminal cases and 41 294 other than criminal cases. 20 % of cases dealt with by the legal aid offices were closed with court proceedings. Private lawyers received 32 683 legal aid cases of which 22 040 were criminal cases and 10 643 other than criminal cases.

Q020 (2016): The public legal aid offices received a total of 50,369 cases (2014: 46734), of which 6,762 were criminal cases and 43,607 other than criminal cases. Of the 50,369 cases dealt with by the legal aid offices 20 per cent were closed with court proceedings.
Private lawyers handled 41,315 legal aid cases, of which 54 per cent were criminal cases and 46 per cent other than criminal cases.

Q037 (2021): In criminal cases the primary means to compensate excessive length of proceedings for a convicted person is to reduce the sentence. Therefore the number of compensation paid does not does not reflect the whole picture of the cases where the proceeding has taken too long. For excessive length the compensation is 1500 euro/unduly delayed year, maximum 10.000 euro, which may be exceeded if
there are special circumstances.
The information on wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction are compiled together. There were 415 requests. A total of 1 530 000 euros has been paid as compensation. For wrongful arrest the compensation is in practice approximately 120 euro/day but it can be higher due to the circumstances. For wrongful conviction the compensation covers fair legal costs.

Q037 (2020): In criminal cases the primary means to compensate excessive length of proceedings for a convicted person is to reduce the sentence. Therefore the number of compensation paid does not does not reflect the whole picture of the cases where the proceeding has taken too long. For excessive length the compensation is 1500 euro/unduly delayed year, maximum 10.000 euro, which may be exceeded if
there are special circumstances.
The information on wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction are compiled together. There were 437 requests. A total of 2 916 000 euros has been paid as compensation. For wrongful arrest the compensation is in practice approximately 120 euro/day but it can be higher due to the circumstances. For wrongful conviction the compensation covers fair legal costs.

Q037 (2019): Correction: Excessive length of proceedings number of Number of condemnations in year 2018 should have been 41, not reported 28. The number reported was the number of rejected.

France

Q018 (General Comment): Enforcement agents can be appointed to enforce any court decision for a beneficiary of legal aid, either as a continuation of the proceedings or separately. Article 11 of the Law of 10 July 1991 provides for that legal aid "shall apply as of right to procedures, acts or measures for the enforcement of justice decisions obtained with its benefit, unless enforcement is suspended for more than one year for a reason other than the exercise of an appeal or a decision to suspend enforcement". In addition, Article 10 of the Law of 10 July 1991 provides for that legal aid may be granted "in connection with the enforcement on French territory of a court decision or any other enforceable title, including if they emanate from another Member State of the European Union" (except Denmark). Source SADJAV

Q018 (2020): Article 11 of the aforementioned law provides that legal aid "shall apply as of right to proceedings, acts or measures for the enforcement of legal decisions obtained with its benefit, unless enforcement is suspended for more than one year for a reason other than the exercise of an appeal or a decision to suspend enforcement."

Q018 (2019): Article 11 of the aforementioned law provides for that legal aid "applies automatically to procedures, acts or measures for the enforcement of court decisions obtained with its benefit, unless enforcement is suspended for more than one year for a reason other than the exercise of a remedy or a decision to suspend enforcement".

Q018 (2018): Article 11 of the aforementioned Act provides that legal aid "shall automatically apply to proceedings, acts or measures for the enforcement of court decisions obtained with its benefit, unless enforcement is suspended for more than a year for a cause other than the exercise of a remedy or a stay order. "
Q019 (General Comment): Articles 40 and 40-1 of the law of 10 July 1991 on legal aid provide for that the beneficiary of legal aid is entitled to the assistance of a lawyer and all public or ministerial officers (enforcement agents, solicitors and notaries in particular). He/she is also exempt from paying, advancing or depositing all costs relating to the instances, procedures or acts for which it has been granted (expert reports, social surveys, family mediation, etc.), with the exception of a pleading fee of €13.
Source SADJAV
Q019 (2020): Legal aid covers all legal costs related to a case (in case of total legal aid); notaries, bailiffs, experts can be paid.

Q019 (2019): Legal aid covers all the legal costs related to an instance (in case of total legal aid); can thus be covered notaries', bailiffs' and experts' fees.
Q019 (2018): Legal aid covers all legal costs related to a case (in the case of a total AJ); notaries, bailiffs, experts may thus be paid.
Q019 (2016): Legal aid may be granted for notary, bailiff and expert fees in the frame of legal proceedings. It may also be granted for the assistance of a lawyer during mediation or settlement.

Q020 (General Comment): The data provided correspond to the number of admissions to legal aid per year.

Q020 (2021): The discrepancies are due to the effects of the health crisis. Source SADJAV

Q020 (2020): We do not have the information to distinguish between the number of cases brought and not brought to court. The decrease in the number of cases that received legal aid is explained by the particular context of the health crisis in 2020.

Q020 (2014): In 2012, 52 transactional negotiations were the subject of a mission of assistance under legal aid. In addition, for information or legal advice but also for measures of settlement of disputes, 741,459 people were received in a House of Justice and Law, including by associations in the field of access to the law or lawyers, notaries and bailiffs for legal consultations or by justice conciliators.
Q020 (2012): In 2012, 68 transactional negotiations were the subject of a mission of assistance under legal aid. In addition, for information or legal advice but also for measures of settlement of disputes, 713,319 people were received in a House of Justice and Law, including by associations in the field of access to the law or lawyers, notaries and bailiffs for legal consultations or by justice conciliators.
Q020-1 (2021): Concerning the average reel duration, the precise figure is 49.8 days.
source SADJAV

Q020-1 (2020):
"The processing time for legal aid applications has been set at less than 45 days in the 2020 Annual Performance Project indicators. The actual average time is the time between the filing of the application and the date of the admission or rejection decision, calculated from the time limits maintained by each legal aid office
There is no distinction provided for criminal and non-criminal cases.
"

Q037 (2021): The sub-directorate for legal affairs of the Ministry of Justice, in conjunction with the State judicial agent, monitors liability actions relating to the defective functioning of the public service of Justice (essentially based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation, with regard to users of this service). The State judicial agent directly follows up actions for compensation for pre-trial detention undergone in the context of criminal proceedings that have ended with a decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit (Articles 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure).
1. Regarding liability actions relating to the defective functioning of the public service of Justice: The vast majority of them are based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation. According to this article, the State is obliged to allow a compensation for damage caused by the defective functioning of the Justice service. Except in the case of special provisions, this liability is incurred only in the event of serious fault or a denial of justice. This regime of liability concerns only the user of the public service of Justice, the third party to the legal proceedings being able to engage only the liability without fault of the State for breach of equality before public charges.
During 2021, the number of new liability actions brought against the State in connection with the functioning of the civil and criminal justice is 1 016 (compared with 908 in 2020, and 510 in 2019). Of these 1 016 new cases, 754 relate to the excessive length of proceedings before labour courts. In 2021, 580 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the public Justice service, out of a total of 717 decisions on the merits of the case (compared with 249 convictions out of 398 decisions in 2020, and 352 convictions out of 485 decisions in 2019).
Out of the 717 decisions, 530 decisions involve the State's responsibility for the excessive length of proceedings, of which 31 decisions concern the length of proceedings in criminal matters and 499 in civil matters (compared with 17 convictions for excessive length in criminal matters and 200 in civil matters in 2020).
The amount of the condemnations is of 2 514 646,05 euro for excessive length of proceedings out of a total amount of 5 225 167,81 euros (compared with 1 388 393 euros out of a total of 1 975 018 euros in 2020).
2) With regard to actions based on Article 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure: article 149 of the Code of Criminal Procedure gives the right, under certain conditions, to full compensation for the damage suffered as a result of detention in proceedings that have been dismissed, acquitted or discharged. Any person who has been held in pre-trial detention during proceedings which have ended in a decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit that has become final, shall be entitled, subject to the exceptions precisely defined by Article 149 of the CCP, at his or her request, to full compensation for the moral and material damage caused by this detention. The compensation awarded is payable by the State.
It is the First president of the court of appeal within whose jurisdiction the decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit, resulting in the detainee's innocence, has been taken, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a reasoned decision that can be appealed to the national commission for compensation for detention placed at the Court of Cassation (CNRD).
According to data from the State Judicial Agent (SJA) (Sillage application and dashboards), the key data for 2021 are as follows: 571 new cases registered; 575 decisions handed down by the First presidents of the courts of appeal; 19 settlements concluded; 53 decisions rendered by the CNRD with an average detention period of almost 140 days; 28 appeals to the CNRD in 2021 (12 at the initiative of the SJA and 16 at the initiative of the applicants). Source - Sub-Directorate for Legal Affairs, SEM, General Secretariat

Q037 (2020): "The sub-directorate for legal affairs of the Ministry of Justice, in conjunction with the State judicial agent, monitors liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public justice service (essentially based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organization, with regard to users of this service).
The State's judicial agent directly follows up actions for compensation for pre-trial detention undergone in the context of criminal proceedings that have ended with a decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit (Articles 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure).
1. With regard to liability actions relating to the defective functioning of the public service of justice:
The vast majority of them are based on article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organization.
Under the terms of this article, the State is obliged to repair the damage caused by the defective functioning of the judicial service. Except in the case of specific provisions, this liability is only incurred by gross negligence or by a denial of justice. This system of liability concerns only the user of the public service of justice, the third party to the legal proceedings being able to engage only the liability without fault of the State for breach of equality before public charges.
During the year 2020, the number of new liability actions brought against the State for gross negligence or denial of justice is 908 compared to 510 in 2019. During the same year 2020, 249 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the public service of justice against 352 in 2019, out of a total of 398 decisions on the merits rendered in this matter.
Of the 249 condemnation decisions, 217 decisions implicated the responsibility of the State due to the excessive length of the proceedings, of which 17 decisions concerned proceedings in criminal matters and 200 in civil matters.
The amount of the sentences pronounced is 1,388,393 euros for excessive length of proceedings out of a total amount of 1,975,018 euros. 2. Article 149 of the Code of Criminal Procedure gives the right, under certain conditions, to full compensation for the damage suffered as a result of detention in the context of proceedings that have been dismissed, acquitted or discharged.
Any person who has been remanded in custody in the course of proceedings that have ended in a decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit that has become final, is entitled, with the exceptions specifically defined by Article 149 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, at his or her request, to full compensation for the moral and material damage caused by this detention. The compensation awarded is to be paid by the State.
It is the first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision to dismiss the case, acquit or acquit the detainee was handed down, which results in the detainee's innocence, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a reasoned decision that can be appealed to the national commission for compensation for detentions placed at the Court of Cassation (CNRD).
According to data from the State Judicial Agent (Sillage application and follow-up tables), the key data for the year 2020 are as follows
- 423 new cases registered.
- 436 decisions rendered by the first presidents of the courts of appeal.
- 8 settlements reached.
- 83 decisions rendered by the CNRD with an average length of compensated detention of less than 400 days.
- 37 appeals to the CNRD in 2020 (4 at the initiative of the AJE and 33 at the initiative of the claimants).

Q037 (2019): 1) The Legal Affairs Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Justice monitors, in conjunction with the State's judicial agent, liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public service of justice. The vast majority of them are based on Art. L. 141-1 of the Judicial Organization Code. The State is required to repair the damage caused by the defective functioning of the justice system. Except in the case of special provisions, this liability is engaged in respect of court users in case of gross negligence or denial of justice. The third party in the proceedings can engage only the no-fault liability of the State for breach of equality.
In 2019, the number of new liability actions brought against the State for gross negligence or denial of justice is 510, compared with 482 in 2018. 352 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the justice against 393 in 2018 (out of a total of 513). Of the 352 convictions, 302 decisions involved State responsibility due to the excessive length of proceedings (20 in criminal matters and 283 in civil matters) and the amount of 1,599,340 euros was paid out of a total amount of 5 292 676, 47 euros.
2)Article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code entitles the accused to full compensation from the State, under certain conditions, for damages suffered as a result of detention in connection with proceedings that have been dismissed, discharged or acquitted. It is the first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision of dismissal/ acquittal was pronounced, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a motivated decision that can be appealed to the national commission for reparation of detentions before the Court of Cassation (CNRD). The State's judicial officer directly follows such actions for compensation. The key data for the year 2019 are as follows: 519 new cases registered; 408 decisions handed down by the first presidents of courts of appeal; 4 transactions concluded. 83 decisions handed down by CNRD with an average compensated detention period of less than 400 days. 55 appeals to the CNRD in 2019 (7 at the initiative of the AJE and 48 at the initiative of the claimants).

Q037 (2016): The category “other” refers to compensation for pre-trial detention. Indeed, article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code provides for the right, under certain conditions, to full compensation for the damage suffered as a result of detention in the context of proceedings which have been the subject of a decision of dismissal, release or acquittal. Any person who has been detained in custody in the frame of proceedings terminated by a decision of dismissal, release or acquittal that has become final is entitled, subject to exceptions specifically pinpointed by article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code, at his/her request, to full compensation for the moral and material damage caused by such detention. The compensation awarded shall be borne by the State. It is the first president of the Court of Appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision of dismissal, release or acquittal resulting in the innocence of the detainee has been pronounced, who rules, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a reasoned decision subject to appeal before the National Commission for Compensation of Detentions placed within the Court of Cassation (CNRD).
According to the computer application of the State judicial officer, the latter would have recorded 468 requests in 2012, 480 in 2013, 553 in 2014, 521 in 2015 and 491 in 2016. In 2015, 528 decisions were rendered by the First Presidents of Courts of Appeal. Of these 528 decisions, 84 resulted in rejection and 444 in compensation. 499 decisions were rendered in 2016 (the rejection/compensation ratio is not available). The number of appeals brought before the National Commission for Reparation of Detentions is stable in 2015 and 2016 since the NCRD registered 62 and 61 appeals respectively for these two years. CNRD rendered 84 decisions for the year 2015 and 64 decisions for the year 2016.

Germany

Q016 (General Comment): Criminal Cases:
The concept of “necessary defense” provides that in all criminal cases in which accusations of considerable weight are involved, which are not merely simple in nature or in which the accused is particularly in need of protection, the accused shall be provided with a defense counsel representing him or her upon request or ex officio, irrespective of his or her financial circumstances (Section 140 of the Criminal Procedure Code). In a case of necessary defense the court or - in urgent cases - the public procecutor will assign a defense counsel to the defendant upon his or her request prior to his or her interrogation. A defense counsel has to be appointed ex officio in cases of necessary defense, if (1) the defendant is to be brought before a court for a decision on detention or provisional placement, (2) it becomes known that the accused, to whom the accusation of the crime has been opened, is in an institution on the basis of a judicial order or with judicial authorization, (3) it becomes apparent in the preliminary proceedings that the accused will not be able to defend himself or herself, in particular if the accused is questioned or confronted or if (4) he or she has been summoned to make a statement on the indictment (Section 141 of the Criminal Procedure Code). The appointment of the defense counsel ends with the discontinuation or final conclusion of the criminal pro-ceedings [Section 143 (1) of the Criminal Code]. The defense counsel settles his fees with the state treasury. However, since his or her costs are part of the costs of the proceedings, the defendant must pay them as far as he or she is convicted and insofar as the defendant is ac-quitted, the state treasury must bear the costs and expenses of the proceedings.
Rules for witnesses and victims in criminal cases:
Especially vulnerable witnesses, e.g. children or handicapped persons, can - without proof of being financially needy - be assigned a lawyer free of charge by the court to assist them during an interview (“Zeugenbeistand”, section 68b (2) Code of Criminal Procedure).
Victims of certain crimes, especially violent or sexual crimes, and also close relatives, spou-ses and partners of killed persons, who are entitled to be joint plaintiffs, can be assigned a lawyer without having to cover the expenses and without having to prove their financial need (see sections 397a and 406h (3) Code of Criminal Procedure). Victims of other crimes, who can also be joint plaintiffs, have the possibility to apply for legal aid as financial assistance if their income is too low to cover the costs fully or only in part and if they are unable to assert their own interests sufficiently or cannot be expected to do so (see section 397a (2), 406h (3) Code of Criminal Procedure).
Legal aid can also be granted to persons who claim compensation for damages or pain and suffering in the criminal proceedings in a so-called adhesion claim (“Adhäsionsklage”, see sections 403, 404 (5) Code of Criminal Procedure), if they are not able to cover the expenses (fully or in part) and their legal action offers sufficient expectation of success and is not wanton. The same applies to persons who act as private prosecutors to achieve a punishment of the perpetrator in cases where the prosecution has declined to pursue the offence due to a lack of public interest in the prosecution (“Privatklage”, see sections 374, 379 (3) Code of Criminal Procedure).

Q016 (2017): In Germany there is no legal aid for legal representation in criminal cases because the law provides for the so called “necessary defense” implying mandatory legal representation.
Q018 (General Comment): In civil matters, legal aid in compulsory enforcement is granted for the entire enforcement proceeding and not for individual enforcement measures.
Q018 (2018): -

Q018 (2016): Legal aid in compulsory enforcement is granted for the entire enforcement proceedings and not for individual enforcement measures.

Q019 (General Comment): The approval of legal aid includes the costs for the taking of evidence (e.g. witnesses, experts), as well as travel expenses of the recipient to attend a court hearing if personal attendance at the hearing is necessary. Expenditure for the preparation of the proceedings (e.g. expert witnesses, interpreters) may be refundable as necessary expenditure of the appointed solicitor.
With regard to criminal cases: Other costs are considered costs of the proceedings. These are settled after the discontinuation or final conclusion of the criminal proceedings and not paid in advance. The only exception being travel costs of a defendant who does not have sufficient financial means. However, since these costs are also considered costs of the proceedings, the defendant must pay them as far as he or she is convicted. Insofar as the defendant is acquitted, the state treasury must bear the costs and expenses of the proceedings.

Q019 (2017): If granted, legal aid covers all of the costs of the legal dispute. In particular, this includes the cost of a court-ordered taking of evidence, as well as the costs for compensating witnesses or obtaining expert reports.

Q019 (2016): If granted, legal aid covers all of the costs of the legal dispute. In particular, this includes the cost of a court-ordered taking of evidence, as well as the costs for compensating witnesses or obtaining expert reports.

Q020 (General Comment): In criminal cases, legal aid is granted. However, this is not separately statistically recorded. Therefore: "NA".
Q020 (2012): The information provided for 2012 included approvals of legal aid with installment payments.
The 2012 data referred to the number of cases where legal advice and assistance was granted by the local courts, including the certificates issued by the local courts entitling the applicant to legal advice and assistance, upon application filed directly by the person seeking redress and/or with the support of a lawyer. Data from Bremen and Hamburg are not included since these Länder have public legal advice offices.
Q020-1 (General Comment): Regarding the statement of the opposing party:
According to the Code if Civil Procedure (Section 118 Approval Procedure), the opponent is to be given the opportunity to state his position as to whether or not he believes the prerequisites for the approval of legal aid have been met, unless this is deemed inappropriate for special reasons (e.g. in the case of a claim for an injunction). The Act on Proceedings in Family Matters and in Matters of Non-contentious Jurisdiction includes a similar provision (Section 77).

Q020-1 (2021): The duration of the proceedings depends, among other things, on when the evidence for the means test is submitted in full, whether a statement by the opposing party has to be considered and whether the court has to issue legal notices if necessary.
Q020-1 (2020): The duration of the proceedings depends, among other things, on when the evidence for the means test is submitted in full, whether a statement by the opposing party has to be considered and whether the court has to issue legal notices if necessary.

Q037 (General Comment): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation.
The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non- pecuniary disadvantages.
In criminal proceedings, the passage of time between the offence and the conviction, as well as the length of the proceedings, must also be taken into account and compensated ex officio by the court and the public prosecutor's office in favour of the accused. Depending on the extent of the delay and the disadvantages suffered by the accused as a result, compensation may be provided by a ruling that a quantified part of the sentence imposed is already deemed to have been enforced (this will be stated in the operative part of the judgment). In individual cases, it may suffice – even at the investigation stage by the public prosecutor's office – to discontinue proceedings (e.g. pursuant to Sections 153, 153a or 154 of the German Code of Criminal Procedure [Strafprozessordnung – StPO]), to dispense with imposing a penalty (Section 60 of the German Criminal Code [Strafgesetzbuch – StGB]) or, in the event of minor delays, to establish in the grounds of the judgment that the proceedings have been delayed in breach of the rule of law. In extreme cases, undue delay may constitute a procedural impediment that requires the court to terminate proceedings. If compensation has been provided in the criminal proceeding, except for compensation for material damage, the accused has received sufficient redress and is not further entitled to compensation in accordance with the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings.
If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.

Q037 (2020): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation. The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non-pecuniary disadvantages.
In criminal proceedings, the passage of time between the offence and the conviction, as well as the length of the proceedings, must also be taken into account and compensated ex officio by the court and the public prosecutor's office in favour of the accused. Depending on the extent of the delay and the disadvantages suffered by the accused as a result, compensation may be provided by a ruling that a quantified part of the sentence imposed is already deemed to have been enforced (this will be stated in the operative part of the judgment). In individual cases, it may suffice – even at the investigation stage by the public prosecutor's office – to discontinue proceedings (e.g. pursuant to Sections 153, 153a or 154 of the German Code of Criminal Procedure [Strafprozessordnung – StPO]), to dispense with imposing a penalty (Section 60 of the German Criminal Code [Strafgesetzbuch – StGB]) or, in the event of minor delays, to establish in the grounds of the judgment that the proceedings have been delayed in breach of the rule of law. In extreme cases, undue delay may constitute a procedural impediment that requires the court to terminate proceedings. If compensation has been provided in the criminal proceeding, except for compensation for material damage, the accused has received sufficient redress and is not further entitled to compensation in accordance with the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings.
If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.
Anyone who has suffered damage from a criminal conviction is compensated by the Treasury if the conviction is quashed or

Q037 (2019): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation. The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non-pecuniary disadvantages.
If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.
Anyone who has suffered damage from a criminal conviction is compensated by the Treasury if the conviction is quashed or reduced in reopened proceedings or otherwise in criminal proceedings after having become final and binding (Section 1(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures [Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen – StrEG]). The same applies if a measure of correction and prevention or an ancillary measure has been ordered without a conviction (Section 1(2) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, Section 2(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures provides for compensation for the damage suffered due to the execution of remand detention or temporary arrest. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation may be granted ex bono (Section 3 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures).
The subject of the compensation is the property damage caused by the criminal prosecution measure. In cases of deprivation of liberty on the basis of a court ruling, this can also be immaterial damage (section 7(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). The current immaterial compensation is €25 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced. Currently, legislative proceedings are ongoing to raise this amount of compensation up to €75 per day (BT-Drs. 19/17035).

Q037 (2018): As a general rule, in the case of excessively long court proceedings, the person concerned has to file a complaint about undue delay (Verzögerungsrüge) with the court at which the proceedings seem excessively long. If necessary, he or she can then file an application for compensation even if the original proceedings have not yet been concluded. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary disadvantages. To the extent that an alternative form of redress would appear insufficient, a fixed amount of €1,200 per year is granted as a general rule for non-pecuniary disadvantages.
The law of state liability is only partly regulated by national law (see below). In addition, there are provisions of Land law, as well as customary and judge-made law.
Provisions of federal law
If the parties to a legal dispute suffer damage because of the excessive length of proceedings, a compensation claim may ensue from section 839 of the Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch, BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law (Grundgesetz, GG) if there is a case of an official being culpable of refusal or delay in exercising a public function in breach of duty (section 839 (2), second sentence, of the Civil Code). However, the manner in which a judge conducts the proceedings within the scope of section 839 (2), second sentence, of the Civil Code may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
A creditor's first port of call in procedural terms against the non-execution of a court decision by a bailiff is to lodge a reminder in accordance with section 766 (2) of the Code of Civil Procedure. The court responsible for execution rules on the reminder. If a senior judicial officer of the court responsible for execution wholly or partially rejects a creditor's motion to issue a compulsory enforcement measure, the creditor may lodge an immediate complaint (section 567 (1) no. 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure). If the organ responsible for execution has delayed compulsory enforcement culpably and in breach of duty, there may be a compensation claim under section 839 (1) of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law in the case of wrongful arrest if the acting official can be accused of a culpable breach of official duty. As regards rulings by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in the investigation proceedings, the decision may only be examined for its justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful judgment, there is an official liability claim under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law if the breach of duty consists of a criminal offence (section 839 (2), first sentence, of the Civil Code).
The claim under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law is to be asserted in the courts of ordinary jurisdiction.
Distinct from these claims are compensation claims under provisions of special statutes, which as a rule are not intended to compensate for the entire damage, but provide lump sums instead.
In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, section 2 (1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures (Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen, StrEG) provides for compensation for the damage suffered due to the execution of
remand detention or temporary arrest. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation may be granted ex bono (section 2 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). The

Q037 (2016): As a general rule, in the case of excessively long court proceedings, the person concerned has to file a complaint about undue delay (Verzögerungsrüge) with the court at which the proceedings seem excessively long. If necessary, he can then file a complaint for compensation even if the original proceedings have not yet been concluded. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary disadvantages. To the extent that an alternative form of redress would appear insufficient, a fixed amount of € 1,200 per year is granted as a general rule for non-pecuniary disadvantages.
The law of state liability is only partly regulated by national law (see below). There are in addition pro-visions of Land law, as well as common and judges' law.
Provisions of federal law
If the parties to a legal dispute suffer damage because of excessive length of proceedings, a damage claim may ensue from section 839 of the Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch, BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law (Grundgesetz, GG) if a case of culpable refusal or delay of execution of the office in breach of duty applies, section 839 (2), second sentence, of the Civil Code. However, the manner in which a judge pursues the proceedings within the scope of section 839 (2), second sentence, of the Civil Code may only be examined for justifiability because of the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
A creditor's first port of call in procedural terms against the non-execution of court decisions by a bailiff is to lodge a reminder in accordance with section 766 (2) of the Code of Civil Procedure. The execution court rules on the reminder. If a senior judicial officer of the execution court rejects a creditor's motion completely or in part to issue a compulsory enforcement measure, the creditor may lodge an immediate complaint (section 567 (1) no. 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure). If the execution organ has delayed compulsory enforcement culpably and in breach of duty, there may be a compensation claim under section 839 (1) of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law in the case of wrongful arrest if the acting official can be accused of a culpable breach of official duty. With rulings of the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as with discretionary decisions of the public prosecution office in the investigation pro-ceedings, the decision may only be examined for its justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful judgment, there is an official liability claim under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law if the breach of duty consists of a criminal offence, section 839 (2), first sentence, of the Civil Code. The claim under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law is to be asserted in the courts of ordinary jurisdiction.
Distinct from these claims are compensation claims under provisions of special statutes, which as a rule are not intended to compensate for the entire damage, but provide lump sums.
Section 2 (1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures (Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen, StrEG) provides in cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings for compensation for the damage suffered by
remand detention or temporary arrest that have been carried out. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation can be granted ex bono, section 3 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures. The subject of the compensation is the property damage caused by the criminal prosecution measure, in the case

Greece

Q018 (General Comment): Low-income citizens are entitled to the provision of free legal assistance, that is, the granting of a lawyer, bailiff or notary, in cases of criminal, civil and commercial law of any degree. These include divorce, alimony, custody and communication, insult, paternity recognition, etc.
Greek citizens, EU citizens, as well as third-country citizens or stateless persons are entitled to legal aid if they have a legal residence or habitual residence in Greece. Low-income citizens, beneficiaries of Legal Aid, are those whose annual family income does not exceed two-thirds of the minimum annual individual earnings provided for by the National General Collective Labor Agreement.
Legal Aid is provided at the request of the beneficiary and is provided by law 3226/2004 as in force after its Amendment and completion by law 4274/20

Q018 (2019): article 9 par. 2 and 3 of law 3226/2004: Exemption of court fees in civil and commercial cases, of payment of a bailiff as well as the costs of the enforcement procedure

Q018 (2018): Exoneration from paying court fees in civil and commercial cases covers court bailiffs' fees.

Q018 (2017): Legal aid also includes the bailiff's remuneration.

Q019 (General Comment): Furthermore, if an expert's opinion is considered by the court to be necessary then the relevant costs are covered by the State.
With regard to administrative courts, there is not any such legislative provision, while in civil and commercial cases legal aid is granted for expert fees.

Q019 (2019): appointment of a lawyer, notary, bailiff
payment of a lawyer, notary, bailiff, witness

Q019 (2017): Regarding "criminal cases", the ex officio appointment of a lawyer is provided. Furthermore, if an expert's opinion is considered by the court to be necessary then the relevant costs are covered by the State. As far as "civil and commercial cases" are concerned, legal aid also includes notaries, bailiff's and services of judicial documents cost.
With regard to Administrative courts, there is no specific legislative provision, except Articles 199 and 200 of the code of civil procedure.

Q020 (2020): Evidence has been provided by different courts, but not by their totality, so there is not enough data to give a full answer.
Q020 (2018): From the 657 cases, 637 correspond to cases from administrative disputes in general, while 20 cases correspond to the Council of State (the same 20 cases that were brought to court). More specifically, for the Council of State and for 2018, 52 applications were submitted, 20 of which were accepted.
Q020 (2016): Statistical data may be available next year.

Q020-1 (2020): Law 3226/2004 (as amended and in force with articles 41-47 Law 4689/2020).

Q037 (General Comment): The majority of courts have responded unavailable, there is data for a small percentage of them.

Q037 (2018): Chapter C L.4055/2012 and Articles 1-7 L.4239/2014 provide for the compensation system for the cases brought before administrative, Civil and Criminal courts.
Furthermore, according to Criminal Procedure Court there is a provisional compensation between 8,804 euro and 29,347 euro per day, for the wrongly convicted, which is granted by a relevant judicial decision.
Q037 (2016): Chapter C L.4055/2012 and Articles 1-7 L.4239/2014 provide for the compensation system for the cases brought before administrative, Civil and Criminal courts.
Furthermore, according to Criminal Procedure Court there is a provisional compensation between 8,804 euro and 29,347 euro per day, for the wrongly convicted, which is granted by a relevant judicial decision.

Hungary

Q016 (General Comment): According to the Legal Aid Act LXXX of 2003, the Legal Aid Service may grant legal aid in judicial and extrajudicial cases. The county justice services, as offices of first instance and in charge of receiving the applications for legal aid, do not merely assess the eligibility for aid but, in simple cases, provide legal assistance directly as well – without prior screening of the clients' financial capabilities. However, legal aid (legal advice, drafting a document) is primarily provided by legal aid providers (attorneys, notaries public, non-governmental organizations etc.) who are recorded into the Register of legal aid providers who have contractual relation with the Legal Aid Service. The latter provides professional legal assistance for socially disadvantaged people. The law defines the situations in which legal aid can be granted and those in which no legal aid may be provided.

Q018 (General Comment): If legal aid is authorized, it extends to all stages of the proceedings, including the enforcement phase. However, it concerns only the fee of the legal aid provider. Besides, legal representation cannot be granted in such cases, but only extrajudicial assistance (legal advice, drafting of documents).
Q018 (2021): Legal aid cannot be granted for the fees that are related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (e.g. fees of an enforcement agent), because in Hungary the state-financed legal aid basically covers only the lawyer's fee and, as of 2022, a 25% flat-rate for the lawyer. Previously we marked "Yes" due to a different interpretation, because legal aid extends to all stages of the proceedings, including the enforcement actions, but the state does not pay the fees that are related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (e.g. fees of an enforcement agent).

Q019 (2021): In both cases ("Criminal cases" and "Other than criminal cases") the state-financed legal aid basically covers only the lawyer's fee and, as of 2022, a 25% flat-rate for the lawyer; however, the reimbursement of a few other costs (for example: travel, parking costs and phone, postal expenses) may also be requested. We must note that we don't have accurate data regarding this question since in criminal cases the appointment of the officially appointed defence counsels and determining the fee of an officially appointed defence counsel are the competence of the Bar Association, and legal aid belongs to the government offices.
Q020 (2021): The provided total data is based on data directly from the specialised filing system. The total number is an aggregate only of the numbers of the 19 counties and the capital city, and is not available as requested (distinguished to "In criminal cases" and "In other than criminal cases".)
As it is well known, in 2020 due COVID-19 pandemic the personal appearance of the clients strongly decreased, therefore the applications for legal aid and the number of cases where legal aid was granted decreased also heavily in comparison to 2018. In 2021, the case numbers began to increase again. Only the total numbers are available, so we marked "NA", beacause there is no specific data available for "criminal cases" and "other than criminal cases".

Q020 (2016): Official statistics of the Ministry of Justice

Q020-1 (General Comment): 5 days (if the application form was handed in in person)
15 days (if the application form was not handed in in person)
The timeframes are set by Section 23, Subsection (1) of Act LXXX of 2003 on Legal Aid .

Q037 (General Comment): Excessive length: If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. Non-execution of court decisions: Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day. Wrongful arrest: The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated. Wrongful condemnation: If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included. Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

Q037 (2020): There is no national level database containing the data for the question.

Q037 (2019): Excessive length:
If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. The governement given before the Paliament in october 2018 a bill proposal on the financial compensation related to the prolongation of certain court proceedings.
Non-execution of court decisions:
Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day.
Wrongful arrest:
The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated.
Wrongful condemnation:
If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included.
Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

Q037 (2018): Excessive length:
If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. The governement given before the Paliament in october 2018 a bill proposal on the financial compensation related to the prolongation of certain court proceedings.
Non-execution of court decisions:
Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day.
Wrongful arrest:
The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated.
Wrongful condemnation:
If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included.
Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

Ireland

Q016 (2017): Under Irish law, there is a distinguishment between “legal aid” which refers specifically to “representation in court” and “legal advice”. This question is being answered on the basis that the words “legal aid” refers to “legal aid and legal advice” and “Representation in Court” means “Legal Aid”.
Q018 (General Comment): Civil legal aid does not generally include fees in respect of enforcement by an enforcement agent (this is distinct from enforcement of proceedings in a court which may be covered).
Q019 (General Comment): In criminal cases, legal aid can cover the cost of expert witnesses (medical and technical), interpreters, translation service providers, travel costs, disbursements i.e. photocopying costs, prison visits.
In civil cases, fees of other professionals may be covered where it is necessary having regard to the circumstances of the case.

Q019 (2017): In criminal cases, legal aid can cover the cost of expert witnesses (medical and technical), interpreters, translation service providers, travel costs, disbursements i.e. photocopying costs, prison visits.
In other than criminal cases, a legally aided person may apply through their solicitor for the fees of expert witnesses and other experts to be covered.
Q020 (General Comment): In Criminal Cases - this represents the number of criminal legal aid certificates which originated from the criminal prosecutions in the District Court.
In "other than criminal cases" the 'number of cases brought before the court' is the number of legal aid certificates granted. The number of 'cases not brought to court/non-litigious cases' is the number of applications for civil legal aid and advice. However please note that any advice case may progress to being an aid case and the Legal Aid Board does not keep a record of what specific cases never progressed beyond advice stage (i.e. this figure includes all of the cases which eventually became aid cases).

Q020 (2020): We have data for the total criminal legal aid certificates issue, but the necessary breakdown is not available.

Q020 (2018): In Criminal Cases - this represents the number of criminal legal aid certificates, which originated from the criminal prosecutions in the District Court.
In "other than criminal cases" the 'number of cases brought before the court' is the number of legal aid certificates granted. The number of 'cases not brought to court/non-litigious cases' is the number of applications for civil legal aid and advice. However please note that any advice case may progress to being an aid case and the Legal Aid Board does not keep a record of what specific cases never progressed beyond advice stage (i.e. this figure includes all of the cases which eventually became aid cases).

Q020 (2012): The 2012 data does not include asylum cases where legal aid was granted.

Q020-1 (2021): The average actual duration in 2021 was 20 weeks

Q020-1 (2020): Legal Aid Certificates for Emergency / Priority applications (including Child Abduction applications and applications under Sex Offenders Acts) are addressed within 24 hours. Legal Aid Certificates for Standard applications (including foreign applications and non urgent Central Authority cases) are addressed within 2 weeks i.e. granted, refused or further information requested

Italy

Q016 (General Comment): Legal advice does not exist as such in Italy, but lawyers play a role in ADR procedures.

Q018 (General Comment): Legal aid also covers expenses related to the enforcement of judicial decisions.

Q019 (General Comment): Legal aid can also be granted for costs related to private detectives, interpreters and expert witnesses.

Q020 (General Comment): On the occasion of the 2012 evaluation cycle, it has been explained that the higher number of cases for which legal aid had been granted compared to 2010 was due to the fact that the threshold concerning the income and assets evaluation had been slightly increased. Owing to that, since 2012, Italy is experiencing a positive trend in this respect. Additionally, more and more people are living under the threshold under which legal aid can be granted. These numbers must also be seen in the light of the trend of the incoming cases. In recent years the number of incoming cases has decreased, especially in 2019-2020 due to the pandemic.

Q020 (2020): The number of cases not brought to court is not available because this figure is not registered anywhere. Since these cases are not brought to court, these events are outside the sphere of competence/vision of the Ministry of Justice.
However, the vast majority of legal aid cases is ascribed to cases brought to court. For this reason, even though the total is composed of both components, when calculating the total we can omit cases not brought to court.
Covid19 has deeply affected the flow of the incoming cases. Not only the courts were temporary closed but other than that we went through a long period of lockdown and therefore most existing proceedings were delayed and incoming cases drastically fell. The fall of LA cases is the obvious consequence of the above-described scenario.

Q020 (2018): The above figure included number of legal aid granted to administrative proceedings.

Q037 (2021): The number of condemnations is higher than the number of requests because the former refers to condemnations in year 2021 and some of them were initiated in previous years.
Q037 (2019): Unfortunately, the total amount in € is not available at this stage. This is a figure whose source is external to our administration (Ministry of Economy and Finance), hence we cannot guarantee its reliability.

Q037 (2018): Please note that the last two columns at Q.37 (number of condemnations and total amount in euros) refer to those compensating procedures cleared (actually paid) in 2018. Therefore, not necessary they refer to compensation procedures initiated in 2018 (first column).
PS: Given the wide diversity of such procedures we believe that the total doesn't make much sense, hence NA.

Latvia

Q018 (General Comment): In the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from payment of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of the law (Section 567 of the Civil Procedure Law). Moreover, in accordance with Section 11 of the Cabinet of Ministers Regulations No 454 of 26 June 2012 "Regulations on the Remuneration Rates of Sworn Bailiffs", a sworn bailiff has the right to reduce the remuneration fees.
It is also possible to submit a complaint to the court about the actions of sworn bailiffs, incl. regarding of the fees. Legal aid in such cases is granted. This also applies to previous years' questionnaire periods

Q018 (2020): Answer for Q18 is "No", but in the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism how persons receive support at the enforcement of judicial decisions stage – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from the payment of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of law and in addition sworn bailiffs right to reduce the remuneration fees in another cases.
Q018 (2019): Answer for Q18 is "No", but in the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism how persons receive support at the enforcement of judicial decisions stage – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from the payment of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of law and in addition sworn bailiffs right to reduce the remuneration fees in another cases.
Q018 (2017): Answer for Q18 is "No", but in the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism how persons receive support at the enforcement of judicial decisions stage – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from the payment of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of law and in addition sworn bailiffs right to reduce the remuneration fees in another cases.
Q018 (2016): Answer for Q18 is "No", but In the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism how persons receive support at the enforcement of judicial decisions stage – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from the payment to sworn bailiffs of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of law and in addition sworn bailiffs right to reduce the remuneration fees in another cases.
Q019 (General Comment): In the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism - a legal framework that provides for exemptions from payment of court costs granted on the basis of the law by the judge in civil proceedings (Section 43 of the Civil Procedure Law). Besides, the Criminal Procedure Law stipulates which costs, for example, conducting of inspections, shall be assumed by the State. The mentioned regulation is applying to court proceedings and exemptions rules in their respect (for example concerning the expertise costs etc).
In addition, according to the State Ensured Legal Aid Law, in cross-borders cases a person has the right to receive the following: 1) services of an interpreter; 2) translation of documents requested by the court or the competent authority and submitted by the recipient of legal aid, which are necessary for adjudication of the matter; 3) payment of expenses related to the attendance at court sittings, if the presence of the person in court is provided for by the law or if the court requests so, deciding that the relevant person cannot be heard in another way (the Legal Aid Administration makes a decision).
In accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1493 of 22 December 2009 "Regulations Regarding the Amount of State-ensured Legal Aid, the Amount of Payment, Reimbursable Expenses and the Procedures for Payment Thereof", if legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses shall be covered from the State budget. It is relevant for all cases – civil, administrative and criminal. In asylum cases and cases related to foreigners who are obligated to be returned, the responsible institution – the Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs or the Legal Aid Administration – shall ensure the communication of the applicant for legal aid with the provider of legal aid, which covers costs of the interpretation services.
In questions 16-18 it is indicated that the state provides representation in court and legal advice, but in Latvia it is provided and paid also for preparation of procedural documents in all types of cases and in criminal cases for representation in the pre-trial criminal proceedings.

Q019 (2020): We can indicate that additional persons are exempted, for example, from expertise, interpreters and travel expenses (in cross border disputes). If the legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses also shall be covered from the State budget. In questions 16-18 it is indicated that the state provides representation in court and legal advice, but in Latvia it is provided and paid also for preparation of procedural documents in all types of cases and in criminal cases for representation in the pre-trial criminal proceedings.

Q019 (2019): We can indicate that additional persons are exempted, for example, from expertise, interpreters and travel expenses (in cross border disputes). If the legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses also shall be covered from the State budget. In questions 16-18 it is indicated that the state provides representation in court and legal advice, but in Latvia it is provided and paid also for preparation of procedural documents in all types of cases and in criminal cases for representation in the pre-trial criminal proceedings.

Q019 (2017): We can indicate that additional persons are exempted, for example, from expertise, interpreters and travel expenses (in cross border disputes). If the legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses also shall be covered from the State budget. In questions 16-18 it is indicated that the state provides representation in court and legal advice, but in Latvia it is provided and paid also for preparation of procedural documents in all types of cases and in criminal cases for representation in the pre-trial proceedings.

Q019 (2016): indicates that additional persons are exempted, for example, from expertise, interpreters and travel expenses. In accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1493 of 22 December 2009 “Regulations Regarding the Amount of State-ensured Legal Aid, the Amount of Payment, Reimbursable Expenses and the Procedures for Payment Thereof” the State shall pay to the provider of legal aid also for drawing up procedural documents in all kind of legal aid cases and for representation in pre-trial criminal proceedings.

Q020 (General Comment): The Legal Aid Administration is the competent authority for providing State ensured legal aid in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases and in a Constitutional Court process. It cannot identify data on legal aid granted specifically to cases referred to court. It is noteworthy that one case can last for several years. Consequently, in a given year the Legal Aid Administration shall provide legal aid both in cases undertaken in the previous years and new cases. In criminal proceedings, the advocate shall provide the State ensured legal aid upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the elder of the sworn advocates or if urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates. In these cases, the Legal Aid Administration shall perform payments to an advocate regarding the legal assistance provided. The Legal Aid Administration cannot identify data on legal aid granted specifically to cases referred to court.

Q020 (2021): Legal Aid Administration is the competent authority of providing the State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases. In 2021 the Legal Aid Administration received 1212 applications for request of State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases, decisions on ensuring legal aid were adopted in 864 cases, legal aid was ensured in 62 asylum and return cases. It must be noted that one case can last for several years, depending on the duration of proceedings, consequently, in a given year the Legal Aid Administration shall provide the legal aid both in cases undertaken in the previous years and new cases. The advocate shall provide the State ensured legal aid in criminal proceedings upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the senior of the sworn advocates or in urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates. In these cases, the Legal Aid Administration shall perform payments to an advocate regarding the legal assistance provided. According to the data available to the Legal Aid Administration legal aid was provided in approximately 6224 criminal proceedings. Legal Aid Administration alone cannot select data on legal aid in cases existing directly in proceedings.

Q020 (2020): Legal Aid Administration is the competent authority of providing the State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases. In 2020 the Legal Aid Administration received 1146 applications for request of State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases, decisions on ensuring legal aid were adopted in 847 cases, legal aid was ensured in 54 asylum and return cases. It must be noted that one case can last for several years, depending on the duration of proceedings, consequently, in a given year the Legal Aid Administration shall provide the legal aid both in cases undertaken in the previous years and new cases. The advocate shall provide the State ensured legal aid in criminal proceedings upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the senior of the sworn advocates or in urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates. In these cases, the Legal Aid Administration shall perform payments to an advocate regarding the legal assistance provided. According to the data available to the Legal Aid Administration legal aid was provided in approximately 7286 criminal proceedings. Legal Aid Administration alone cannot select data on legal aid in cases existing directly in proceedings.

Q020 (2018): Legal Aid Administration is the competent authority of providing the State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases. The Legal Aid Administration alone cannot select data on legal aid in existing cases directly in proceedings. In 2018 the Legal Aid Administration received 1665 applications for request of State ensured legal aid, decisions on ensuring legal aid in civil cases were adopted in 1253 cases, legal aid was ensured in 31 asylum cases. It must be noted that one case can last for several years, depending on the duration of proceedings, consequently, in a given year the Legal Aid Administration shall provide the legal aid both in cases undertaken in the previous years and new cases. The advocate shall provide the State ensured legal aid in criminal proceedings upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the senior of the sworn advocates or in urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates. In these cases, the Legal Aid Administration shall perform payments to an advocate regarding the legal assistance provided. According to the data available to the Legal Aid Administration legal aid was provided in approximately 8 347 criminal proceedings. Legal Aid Administration alone cannot select data on legal aid in cases existing directly in proceedings.

Q020 (2016): In the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism - the Civil Procedure Law and the Criminal Procedure Law stipulates which costs, for example, conducting of inspections, costs of the services of an interpreter shall be assumed by the State.
According the State Ensured Legal Aid Law in cross border cases in addition a person has the right to receive the following:
1) services of an interpreter;
2) a translation of such document requested by the court or the competent authority and submitted by the recipient of legal aid, which is necessary for adjudication of the matter; and
3) the payment of such expenses which are related to attendance at court sittings, if the presence of the person in court is provided for in law or if the court requests it, deciding that the relevant person cannot be heard in another way.
In accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1493 of 22 December 2009 “Regulations Regarding the Amount of State-ensured Legal Aid, the Amount of Payment, Reimbursable Expenses and the Procedures for Payment Thereof”, if the legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses shall be covered from the State budget.
In accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1493 of 22 December 2009 “Regulations Regarding the Amount of State-ensured Legal Aid, the Amount of Payment, Reimbursable Expenses and the Procedures for Payment Thereof” the State shall pay to the provider of legal aid also for drawing up procedural documents in all kind of legal aid cases and for representation in pre-trial criminal proceedings.

Q020 (2014): For 2014, the Legal Aid Administration received 2 318 applications requesting State ensured legal aid which was granted to 1 850 civil cases and 9 administrative cases. In criminal matters, legal aid was provided in approximately 10 300 cases.
Q020-1 (General Comment): Application on legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases shall be reviewed and decision on granting or refusal to grant legal aid shall be adopted by the Administration within 21 days, but in matters affecting children's rights - within 14 days from the date of receipt of an application for legal aid, as well as in partial legal aid cases, the Legal Aid Administration takes a decision within one month. The advocate shall provide the state ensured legal aid in criminal proceedings upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the senior of the sworn advocates (process takes maximum 3 days, the estimated term in criminal cases is fixed in the Criminal Procedure Law) or in urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates.

Q037 (2021): The Ministry of Justice informs that it does not have a separate statistic about circumstances mentioned in Article 037.
The Ministry of Justice informs that the total amount of compensation in 2021 consists of non-pecuniary damages 75350 euros, damages 18708,39 euros, state social insurance contributions 2053,21 euros and personal income tax compensation 1100,40 euros.
The Ministry of Justice also informs that the compensation procedure and the calculation method for the compensation is regulated in a Law on compensation for damage caused in criminal proceedings and administrative violations. According to Article 15 the compensation calculation method of non-pecuniary damages for one unjustified detention day is minimum wage for month divided by 30, then the result without decimal places is multiply by 2. For example compensation for one unjustified detention day in 2021 was 32 euros ((500 euros : 30 = 16,66 euros); 16 euro x 2 x 1 day = 32 euros).

Q037 (2020): The Ministry of Justice informs that it does not have a separate statistic about circumstances mentioned in Article 037.
The Ministry of Justice informs that the total amount of compensation in 2020 consists of non-pecuniary damages 69 889,70 euros, damages 31 471,31 euros, state social insurance contributions 1867,12 euros and personal income tax compensation 820,09 euros.
The Ministry of Justice also informs that the compensation procedure and the calculation method for the compensation is regulated in a Law on compensation for damage caused in criminal proceedings and administrative violations. According to Article 15 the compensation calculation method of non-pecuniary damages for one unjustified detention day is minimum wage for month divided by 30, then the result without decimal places is multiply by 2. For example compensation for one unjustified detention day in 2020 was 28 euros ((430 euros : 30 = 14,33 euros); 14 euro x 2 x 1 day = 28 euros).
In Latvia, there is no compensation in the categories “Non-execution of court decisions” and “Number of condemnations”.

Q037 (2019): For 2019 the number of requests is almost the same than for 2018, while the amount decreased considerably. In 2018, in respect of separate legal proceedings and damages decisions, significant amounts of compensation have been determined compared to other cases. In 5 cases the amount of compensations was bigger than 10 000 euro, representing together 118,687.31 euro. Among those 5 cases, one compensation amount was 50 000 euro. Important compensations are an exception, not a routine, but sometimes they are and have a significant impact on the amount of reimbursement paid.

Q037 (2018): Cost increase exist because in 2016 there was less disbursement than in previous five years as well as the lowest expense rate since 2010. It is alleged that there was simply a coincidence in the cost of the claims, where no serious infringement of the rights of the individual could be established to determine a high level of non-pecuniary damage, or the amount of the loss was not high.
Q037 (2016): The Law on Compensation for Damages Caused by Unlawful or Unfounded Actions of Investigators, Prosecutors or Judges (Par izziņas izdarītāja, prokurora vai tiesneša nelikumīgas vai nepamatotas rīcības rezultātā nodarīto zaudējumu atlīdzināšanu; hereafter – “the Law on Compensation”) determines the extent and the procedure of recovering losses, which as a result of the unlawful or groundless action of an investigator, prosecutor or judge in the course of fulfilling their official duties, are caused to natural
persons, as well as establishes the procedure in which the offended social and employment guarantees of such persons are ensured.
Article 2 of the Law on Compensation determines that legal basis for compensation for losses is: 1) a judgment of acquittal, regardless of the reason for acquittal; 2) termination of a criminal case due to person's exonerating circumstances; 3) recognition of an administrative apprehension as unlawful, and termination of the administrative proceedings.
Paragraph 1 of Article 7 of the Law on Compensation determines that the requests for damages must be submitted to the Ministry of Justice or the Office of the Prosecutor General, depending on the stage in which the proceedings have been terminated.
Parapgraph 3 of Article 5 of the Law on Compensation determines that the in relation to non-pecuniary damages, a person is entitled to submit a civil claim to a court of general jurisdiction. The court of general jurisdiction determines the amount of the compensation in civil cases considering the severity of the non-pecuniary damage and other circumstances, for example, excessive length of proceedings.
The Ministry of Justice collects information only about the total number of requests for compensation and the total paid amount.

Lithuania

Q018 (General Comment): The costs of secondary legal aid cover the costs of the execution process (Article 2(1) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid). However, the costs incurred by the debtor in the execution process are not covered.

Q019 (General Comment): The costs of secondary legal aid from which the applicant is exempted are: litigation costs incurred in civil proceedings, the costs incurred in administrative proceedings, the costs related to the hearing of a civil action brought in a criminal matter, the costs related to defence and representation in court (including the appeal and cassation proceedings, irrespective of the initiator) as well as the costs of the execution process, the costs related to the drafting of procedural documents and collection of evidence, interpretation, representation in the event of preliminary extrajudicial consideration of a dispute, where such a procedure has been laid down by laws or by a court decision (Article 14(2) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid). The costs of state-guaranteed legal aid cover also the costs of interpretation of communication between the lawyer and the applicant where, in the cases provided for in treaties of the Republic of Lithuania, it is impossible to ensure that a person providing state-guaranteed legal aid communicates with the applicant in the language which the latter understands (Article 14(10) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid).
Where the physical presence of an applicant is required by the law or by the court, the travel costs to be borne by an applicant are borne by the State-guaranteed legal aid service (Article 20(2) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid). Where the physical presence of an applicant is required by the law or by the court, the travel costs to be borne by an applicant are borne by the State-guaranteed legal aid service (Article 20(2) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid).

Q020 (General Comment): The number provided for non-litigious cases or cases not brought to court indicates the number of matters when primary legal aid (legal information, legal advice, drafting of the documents to be submitted to State and municipal institutions, with the exception of procedural documents, advice on the out-of-court settlement of a dispute, actions for the amicable settlement of a dispute and drafting of a settlement agreement) was granted.

Q020 (2021): The number provided for cases not brought to court indicates the number of matters when primary legal aid was granted. The number for cases brought to court indicates the number of matters when secondary legal aid was granted. In total 28184 cases: 19616 criminal cases (18421 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a lawyer is mandatory and 1195 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service where the presence of a lawyer is not mandatory) and 8568 other cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service.

Q020 (2020): The number provided for cases not brought to court indicates the number of matters when primary legal aid was granted. The number for cases brought to court indicates the number of matters when secondary legal aid was granted. In total 36544 cases: 27442 criminal cases (26102 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a lawyer is mandatory and 1340 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service where the presence of a lawyer is not mandatory) and 9102 in other than criminal cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service.
The number of decisions to grant secondary legal aid decreased due to the Covid-19 related extreme situation and quarantine. The number of applications decreased despite the fact that it was possible to submit an application by electronic means or mail.

Q020 (2018): Primary legal aid (cases not brought to court) was granted for 41791 legal enquires.
Secondary legal aid (cases brought to court) was granted in total in 42248 cases: - 26833 criminal cases (24944 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a lawyer is mandatory and 1889 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service where the presence of a lawyer is not mandatory);
- 15415 civil and administrative matters by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service.

Q020 (2016): It is not possible to calculate and separate the cases where persons who were granted secondary legal aid have eventually brought their cases to courts. Only the total number of secondary legal aid provided is available. In total secondary legal aid was granted in 41063 cases: 24609 criminal cases (22777 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a defence lawyer is mandatory and 1832 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service where defence is not mandatory or the person is an aggrieved party).
Secondary legal aid was granted for 16454 civil and administrative matters by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service.

Q020 (2014): In criminal cases, litigants have the right to legal aid in pre-trial investigation procedures. However, the latter may be terminated due to various reasons. Accordingly, it is impossible to identify the number of cases granted with legal aid and referred to court. Only the total number of secondary legal aid provided is available: 32 699 criminal cases (30879 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a defence lawyer is mandatory and 1820 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid services where defence is not mandatory or the person is an aggrieved party); 14 206 civil and 722 administrative matters by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid services.
In 2014, primary legal aid (legal information, legal advice and drafting of the documents to be submitted to state and municipal institutions, with the exception of procedural documents) was granted for 45443 legal enquires.

The Law on State-guaranteed Legal Aid has been amended from 1st of January 2014, enabling easier access to secondary legal aid (e.g. applicants are no longer obligated to address local tax administrator for a stamp on their annual declaration of income and assets; they may choose any practising lawyer for the provision of secondary legal aid).

Q020 (2012): For 2012, the number of criminal cases subsumes: cases for which the presence of a defence lawyer is mandatory and for which legal aid was granted by a decision of a pre-trial investigation officer (17 853), prosecutor or the court (15 312); cases for which defence is not mandatory or the person is an aggrieved party and for which legal aid was granted by a decision of State-guaranteed legal aid services (2 146). The number of other than criminal cases includes cases where legal aid was granted in civil (13 595) or administrative (786) matters by a decision of State-guaranteed legal aid services.

Q020-1 (General Comment): According to the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid, primary legal aid must be provided as soon as the person applies to the municipality. If it is not possible to provide primary legal aid immediately, the applicant will be notified of the time available, which must be no later than 5 working days from the date of application.
Decisions on the provision of secondary legal aid shall be adopted by the SGLAS not later than within 7 working days from the date of receipt of the required documents and information. In cases when in the interests of the applicant the decision to grant secondary legal aid must be taken urgently, the decision shall be taken immediately, but not later than the date of the procedural step which requires lawyers assistance.
There is no timeframe for the decisions of pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or court on state guaranteed legal aid (when presence of lawyer is mandatory in criminal cases).

Q020-1 (2020): According to the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid, primary legal aid must be provided as soon as the person applies to the municipality. If it is not possible to provide primary legal aid immediately, the applicant will be notified of the time available, which must be no later than 5 working days from the date of application.
Decisions on the provision of secondary legal aid shall be adopted by the SGLAS not later than within 7 working days from the date of receipt of the required documents and information. In cases when in the interests of the applicant the decision to grant secondary legal aid must be taken urgently, the decision shall be taken immediately, but not later than the date of the procedural step which requires lawyers assistance.
There is no timeframe for the decisions of pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or court on state guaranteed legal aid (when presence of lawyer is mandatory in criminal cases).

Q037 (2020): Total - compensation for damage caused by public authorities + compensation for damage caused by public prosecutors and courts;
Other - compensation for damage caused by public authorities;

Q037 (2019): In category “other” the data on the number of requests for compensation is from the Ministry of Justice only, and the number of condemnations data is related to the judgements of all the State institutions, thus the number of condemnations is that much higher. The major part of applicants apply against the State to the court directly, thus the Ministry of Justice has information about the claims against the State in cases where it is the representative of the State only. Also the Ministry of Justice has data on satisfied claims in courts as it is responsible for the enforcement of these judgements.
Category “other” includes damage awarded because of the illegal actions of state institutions or officers and damage awarded because of improper imprisonment conditions.

Q037 (2018): Under the Civil Code and the Law on the Compensation of the Harm Caused by Illegal Actions of Public Authorities and Representation of the State of the Republic of Lithuania the damage resulting from the unlawful condemnation, unlawful arrest, unlawful detention, unlawful application of procedural coercive measures, illegal application of administrative penalty – arrest has to be reimbursed by the state in full, regardless of pre-trial investigation officers, prosecutors and court officials' fault. Compensations for unlawful arrest and unlawful condemnation are paid from separate budgetary program on compensation of damages operated by the Ministry of Justice. These compensations may be paid according to court decisions on damages as well as through out-of-court procedure.
Damages can be compensated after court trial and without court trial (the property damage cannot exceed 1500 EUR, the moral damage cannot exceed 2900 EUR). Information above has been given on both cases.
N.B. In 2016 there was provided information about out-of-court procedure only. In 2018 in order to disclose the complete situation the data is provided also including situations when applicants take an application to the court directly. This can cause some differencies in two periods (2016 and 2018).

Q037 (2016): Under the Civil Code and the Law on the Compensation of the Harm Caused by Illegal Actions of Public Authorities and Representation of the State the damage resulting from the unlawful condemnation, unlawful arrest, unlawful detention, unlawful application of procedural coercive measures, illegal application of administrative penalty – arrest has to be reimbursed by the state in full, regardless of pre-trial investigation officers, prosecutors and court officials' fault. Compensations for unlawful arrest and unlawful condemnation are paid from separate budgetary program on compensation of damages operated by the Ministry of Justice. These compensations may be paid according to court decisions on damages as well as through out-of-court procedure. Damages can be compensated after court trial and without court trial (the property damage can not exceed 1500 EUR, the moral damage can not exceed 2900 EUR).

Luxembourg

Q016 (2017): /

Q018 (General Comment): The amended Law of 10 August 1991 on the profession of lawyer (Art. 37 and 37-1) and, more specifically, the amended Regulation of the Grand-Duché of 18 September 1995 on legal aid (Art. 8) include "fees and costs of bailiffs" among the amounts that may be covered by legal aid.

Q018 (2021): The amended Law of 10 August 1991 on the profession of lawyer (Art. 37 and 37-1) and, more specifically, the amended Regulation of the Grand-Duché of 18 September 1995 on legal aid (Art. 8) include "fees and costs of bailiffs" among the amounts that may be covered by legal aid.

Q018 (2018): An enforcement agent may be required to have a judicial decision executed.

Q018 (2017): An enforcement agent can be mandatory to get a judicial decision executed.

Q019 (2017): /

Q020 (2021): The Diekirch Bar did not provide details on the legal matter of the cases that were granted with legal aid. Among the cases that received legal aid at the Luxembourg Bar, which corresponds to 85% of the total number of cases granted with legal aid, 27% were criminal cases and 73% were other than criminal cases.

Q020-1 (General Comment): The Luxembourg Bar Association has informed us that the average response time to an application for legal aid (LA) is impossible to determine. According to the Bar association, the majority of the applications for legal aid received are incomplete and will have to be returned before a final decision can be taken. The date of this decision depends on how quickly the applicant responds. The Bar association does not have statistics on this point. The processing time of an application for legal aid by the Legal Aid Department of the Luxembourg Bar is on average +/- 1 month, i.e. after receipt of an application for legal aid until a decision is taken, which can be either an approval or a refusal or a return in case of an incomplete application. However, it should be noted that urgent requests are treated as a priority by the service.

Q037 (General Comment): The law of 1 September 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a person considers that he or she has been victim of a defective functioning of the judicial bodies. Excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such malfunctioning could be grounds for such an action. These complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints about excessive length of proceedings can also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these last procedural steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes it difficult to identify the claims and decisions on compensation for the different categories and does not allow us to provide figures that reflect reality. However, it was possible to complete the table concerning compensation for wrongful arrest, provided for by the law of 30 December 1981, concerning compensation for inoperative preventive detention. The figures available for compensation for wrongful arrest represent the requests and decisions granting compensation for inoperative preventive detention (IPD) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detentionpreventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. We would like to point out, however, that in the context of the aforementioned law of 30 December 1981, it is not appropriate to speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions that can be appealed before the administrative courts.

Q037 (2021): The law of 1 September 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a person considers that he or she has been victim of a defective functioning of the judicial bodies. Excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such malfunctioning could be grounds for such an action. These complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints about excessive length of proceedings can also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these last procedural steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes it difficult to identify the claims and decisions on compensation for the different categories and does not allow us to provide figures that reflect reality. However, it was possible to complete the table concerning compensation for wrongful arrest, provided for by the law of 30 December 1981, concerning compensation for inoperative preventive detention. The figures available for compensation for wrongful arrest represent the requests and decisions granting compensation for inoperative preventive detention (IPD) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detentionpreventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. We would like to point out, however, that in the context of the aforementioned law of 30 December 1981, it is not appropriate to speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions that can be appealed before the administrative courts.

Q037 (2020): The law of September 1, 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a person believes that he or she has been the victim of a defective operation of the judicial bodies. Excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such malfunctioning could be grounds for such an action. These complaints are brought before the courts of first instance. However, complaints about excessive length of proceedings can also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of Article 6 of the Convention on Human Rights) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these last approaches do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes it difficult to identify the claims and decisions on compensation for the different categories and does not allow us to provide figures that reflect reality. However, it was possible to complete the table concerning compensation for unjustified arrest, provided for by the law of December 30, 1981, concerning compensation for inoperative preventive detention. The figures available for compensation for wrongful arrest represent the requests and decisions granting compensation for inoperative preventive detention (IPD) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detentionpreventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. We would like to point out, however, that in the context of the aforementioned law of December 30, 1981, it is not appropriate to speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions.

Q037 (2019): The law of September 1, 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a litigant considers that s/he has been the victim of a malfunctioning of the judicial bodies. An excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such a malfunction could motivate such an action. Such complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings may also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of article 6 of the ECHR) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these latter steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes the identification of claims and compensation decisions for the different categories difficult and does not allow for the provision of figures reflecting reality. However, it was possible for us to complete the table concerning compensation for unjustified arrest, provided for by the law of December 30, 1981 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. The figures available for compensation for unjustified arrest represent the claims and decisions granting compensation in the context of inoperative preventive detention (IPR) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detention-preventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. However, we would like to point out that, in the framework of the above-mentioned law of December 30, 1981, we should not speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions.

Q037 (2016): In all cases compensation, in particular on the basis of the civil liability of the State, is possible, but there is no data.

Malta

Q016 (2017): Despite the fact that our current legal aid system does not provide for clients to use the service specifically for legal advice without the requirement of representation in court, in actual practice clients using the services of the Agency are still voluntarily provided with legal advice when solicited.

Q016 (2014): In 2014, Malta implemented a major reform in the provision of legal aid, by establishing it as an independent Agency with its own budget and management structure. Prior to this, legal aid was a function falling within the remit of the office of the Attorney General.

Q018 (General Comment): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through legal aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

Q018 (2021): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through legal aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

Q018 (2018): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through legal aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

Q018 (2017): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through Legal Aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

Q018 (2016): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through legal aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

Q020 (General Comment): The figures quoted for civil and criminal cases do not refer to the actual number of cases but to the number of nominations (requests) for legal aid. For example, if a case is brought to court having 5 accused people requiring legal aid, then this would count as 5 requests but just 1 case.

Q020 (2021): Towards the end of April 2020, Legal Aid Malta started offering legal advice (not representation in courts) to clients experiencing domestic violence. In addition to the 265 cases brought to court, Legal Aid Malta offered legal advice to 160 clients experiencing DV. The nature of the advice given to the victims of domestic violence is both 'criminal' and 'other than criminal' in nature. Each client referred to or requiring assistance from Legal Aid Malta Agency in relation to domestic violence is being assigned a legal aid lawyer for the necessary legal advice required. Such clients do not always want to pursue assistance at Court. This service has fulfilled the obligation set in the Istanbul Convention and has been incorporated in domestic law under Article 57 of the schedule attached to Chapter 581 of the Laws of Malta. In other than criminal cases, legal aid is granted to any party whose annual income does not exceed the national minimum wage for persons over 18 years of age. For 2021 the national minimum wage stood at €181.08 weekly
(€9,416.19 yearly). In 2021, the net asset value should not exceed €6,988 for means test eligibility for legal aid.

Q020 (2020): In Other than Criminal Cases, the low figure quoted as compared to previous evaluations relates to the disruptive effect that the COVID-19 pandemic had on court operations. During 2020, most services at the Legal Aid Agency were limited to the provision of services and the Courts of Law were closed for non-urgent court applications.
It is important to note that towards the end of April 2020, Legal Aid Malta started offering legal advice (not representation in courts) to clients experiencing domestic violence. In addition to the 129 cases brought to court, Legal Aid Malta offered legal advice to 191 clients experiencing DV. Each client referred to or requiring assistance from Legal Aid Malta Agency in relation to domestic violence is being assigned a legal aid lawyer for the necessary legal advice required. Such clients do not always want to pursue assistance at Court. This service has fulfilled the obligation set in the Istanbul Convention and has been incorporated in domestic law under Article 57 of the schedule attached to Chapter 581 of the Laws of Malta.

Q020 (2018): The figures quoted for civil and criminal cases do not refer to the actual number of cases but to the number of nominations (requests) for legal aid. For example, if a case is brought to court having 5 accused people requiring legal aid, then this would count as 5 requests/ nominations. Legal Aid in Malta is mainly granted for court representation but it also provides legal advice in the circumstances outlined in Q16.

Q020 (2016): The above data reflects the number of requests (nominations) made for legal aid in both the civil and criminal fields. These figures do not necessarily reflect the number of cases in which legal aid was granted.

Q020 (2014): Regard being had to the peculiarity of the methodology of presentation of data, the number 607 provided in 2014 in respect of the category “criminal cases brought to court” is a more representative figure of the number of individuals requesting for legal aid.

Q020 (2012): In criminal matters, statistics started being collected with effect from August 2012. Accordingly, the 2012 data refers to the period August - December 2013. Between January and October 2013, the number of criminal cases granted legal aid amounted to 463.

Q020-1 (2020): The average number of days indicated above (19 days) refers to Other than Criminal cases and is computed as follows:
> 5 days: from the time a person asks for legal aid information up to the presentation of the actual means test documents.
> between 7 to 14 days (avg: 10.5 days): from the presentation of the documents by the client to the day set for an appointment with the Advocate for Legal Aid.
> 3 days: from date a Court application is presented at the Court's registry up to the day the Judge gives a decree.
In criminal cases:
No means test is required. When a person is referred to Legal Aid for a criminal case assistance and court representation, the Agency only requires the summons issued by the Police to draft the necessary Court applications, or a copy of the judgment in case of appeals. The average duration of the procedure for the granting of Legal Aid in Criminal Cases, from the point of referral to the day when a Court application is filed, is 4 days.

Q037 (2021): Under article 3 of the 7th protocol of the European Convention for Human Rights there is the right to compensation for wrongful conviction whilst under article 5(5) of the European Convention of Human Rights (transposed as Chapter 319 of the Laws of Malta), there is the right to compensation for unlawful detention. For the purpose of the evaluation, 'unlawful detention' falls under the category 'Wrongful arrest' even if the difference between the two is being acknowledged. For both categories, no data is available.

Q037 (2020): Under article 3 of the 7th protocol of the European Convention for Human Rights there is the right to compensation for wrongful conviction whilst under article 5(5) of the European Convention of Human Rights (transposed as Chapter 319 of the Laws of Malta), there is the right to compensation for unlawful detention.
However no data is available.
Q037 (2018): The items listed at Q37 form the basis of constitutional remedies on the basis of breaches of fundamental human rights. In this respect, such grievances are not covered by our compensation procedure and legislation.

Q037 (2016): The above requested data is not available, as in accordance with our system, an individual has to institute constitutional redress proceedings in order for the court to declare that the individual suffered a violation of his fundamental human rights resulting from length of proceedings or arbitrariness through detention. The compensation awarded by the domestic courts depends on the length of proceedings and the gravity of the case, and whilst such cases are instituted in accordance to Maltese law, this data is not available.

Netherlands

Q018 (General Comment): It is noteworthy that the court fees are lower in respect of litigants with lower incomes.

Q018 (2021): Article 12, Criminal law on prosecution (Wetboek van Strafvordering)

Q018 (2020): Article 12, criminal law on prosecution (wetboek van strafvordering)

Q018 (2019): Article 12, Law on Legal Aid (Wet op de Rechtsbijstand)

Q018 (2018): Article 12, criminal law on prosecution (wetboek van strafvordering)

Q018 (2017): Article 12, criminal law on prosecution (wetboek van strafvordering)

Q019 (General Comment): Legal aid can also be granted for the following costs: travel costs, interpreter and translation costs, administrative costs, medical expert costs in injury cases for which a special regulation exists.
Q019 (2018): Legal aid can also be granted for the following costs: travel costs, interpreter and translation costs, administrative costs, special regulation for medical expert costs in injury cases.
Q020 (General Comment): In criminal matters, legal aid cannot be granted for cases not brought to court.
Policy in the Netherlands makes a distinction between primary and secondary legal aid. Primary legal aid aims at solving judicial problems of citizen without necessarily going to court. There are, for example, Legal Service Counters, where people receive free legal advice on simple judicial problems. The provided figures relate to legal aid certificates. It is worth mentioning that besides legal aid certificates, the Legal Aid Board also provides stand-by duty lawyers. A subsidized lawyer visits each criminal suspect, alien or psychiatric patient who has been lawfully deprived of his liberty against his will. The bulk of such cases are criminal cases. These stand-by lawyers are part of the secondary legal aid system (and not of the primary system). However, the legal aid certificates and the assignment of stand-by duty lawyers are two different operating systems, with different payment methods. Cases (not brought to court) for which stand-by duty lawyers have been assigned are excluded, as these are not payed for with a legal aid certificate. The numbers on stand-by duty lawyers assigned over the years are included in the comment under the question. Once a criminal case for which a stand-by duty lawyer was assigned is brought before the court, a legal aid certificate IS given subsequently. Those certificates ARE included in Q20. Cases dealt with by Legal Service Counters are not counted.

Q020 (2021): In criminal matters, legal aid cannot be granted for cases not brought to court.
The number of stand-by duty lawyers assigned was over the years 110 000 (2010); 127 000 (2012), 126 000 (2014), 108 500 (2020), and 96 500 (2021).
Q020 (2020): The number of cases in 2020 is considerably lower than previous years, probably in part due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Due to the pandemic, criminal cases had been paused, waiting to be handled.
Q020 (2016): Criminal cases: The discrepancy with previous cycle can be explained by the fact that recently a different distinction in cases is made. Now certain cases (bopz) are categorized as civil cases and immigration cases are categorized as administrative cases.
Q020-1 (General Comment): High Trust: many lawyers and mediators regarded the application for a legal aid certificate as burdensome and time-consuming, and the verification process as bureaucratic. Therefore, alternatives were considered to simplify the verification of applications and expense statements. The LAB introduced a High Trust method for dealing with the applications for certificates. The High Trust method implies that the LAB, and lawyers and mediators work together based on transparency, trust and mutual understanding. High Trust involves greater compliance on the part of the legal profession, both as to administrative proceedings of rules, and working in accordance with the law, fixed procedures and support facilities such as Kenniswijzer (an online tool of the LAB with information about legislation, jurisprudence, and guidelines for the application of certificates). The LAB has developed specific tools for compliance assistance, such as information and instruction meetings, which are free of charge for lawyers and mediators under High Trust. The basic philosophy underlying High Trust is that trust among a larger group of people will more readily lead to positive cooperation and compliance than institutionalised distrust. In 2009, the Board started with its first High Trust pilot. Since 2011, the Board has been implementing High Trust across the country in phases. At the end of 2020, more than three quarters of the certificates are issued to lawyers and mediators who work based on the principles of High Trust. It has become easier for providers of legal aid to apply for certificates without having to send documents along with their applications. The Board grants the certificate shortly after assessing the client's eligibility for legal aid. The applications of the lawyers and mediators that work together with the Board according to High Trust are accepted automatically. This means that the client will very soon receive confirmation on whether or not the application has been granted. Verification takes place after the provider of legal aid has submitted the statement of expenses. There are two ways of verification: either verification based on a random sample, or verification on a one-on-one basis of certificates granted.

Q020-1 (2021): maximum duration prescribed in law/regulation: 40 working days, 8 weeks.
The maximum duration is based on statutory law (Awb: General Administrative Law Act). However, this maximum only applies to approx. 20% of applications. Around 80% of the applications fall under the High Trust regime, in which the application is granted automatically within 7 days (after the income and assets check with the tax authorities); in 2021 these automatically granted applications took on average 3 days. Around 20% of the applications do not fall under the High Trust regime. In 2021 it took on average 16 days to grant these applications.

Q020-1 (2020): 40 working days, so eigh weeks. 12 days was the average in 2020.
The maximum duration is 8 weeks (40 working days). This is based on statutory law (the AWB: the General Administrative Law Act). However, this only applies to approximately 20% of the applications. Around 80% of the applications falls under the High Trust regime (see below) in which the application is granted automatically within 7 days (after the income and assets-check with the tax authorities). High Trust: Many lawyers and mediators regarded the application for a certificate as burdensome and time consuming, and the verification as bureaucratic. Therefore alternatives were considered to simplify the verification of applications and expense statements. The LAB introduced a High Trust method for dealing with the applications for certificates. This High Trust method implies that the LAB and lawyers and mediators work together on the basis of transparency, trust and mutual understanding. The High Trust method involves greater compliance on the part of the legal profession, both as to administrative proceedings of rules and working in accordance with the law, fixed procedures and support facilities such as Kenniswijzer (an online tool of the LAB with information about legislation, jurisprudence and guidelines for the application of certificates). The LAB developed specific tools for compliance assistance, such as information and instruction meetings, which are free of charge for lawyers and mediators under High Trust. The basic philosophy underlying High Trust is that trust among a larger group of people will more readily lead to positive cooperation and compliance than institutionalised distrust. In 2009, the Board started with its first High Trust pilot. Since 2011, the Board has been implementing High Trust across the country in phases. At the end of 2020, more than three quarters of the certificates are issued to lawyers and mediators who work based on the principles of High Trust. It has become easier for providers of legal aid to apply for certificates without having to send documents along with their applications. The Board grants the certificate shortly after assessing the client's eligibility for legal aid. The applications of the lawyers and mediators that work together with the Board according to High Trust are accepted automatically. This means that the client will very soon receive confirmation on whether or not the application has been granted. Verification takes place after the provider of legal aid has submitted the statement of expenses. There are two ways of verification: either verification on the basis of a random sample, or verification on a one-on-one basis of certificates granted.

Q037 (General Comment): Numbers cannot be provided, as compensation may involve people who have been in custody but were not accused or found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or gone missing. Numbers for compensation for wrongful arrest or wrongful conviction used to be generated by the Statistics Bureau (CBS), but that line of research was discontinued after 2016.

Q037 (2019): It's not possible to give specific numbers for these categories.
Compensation may involve people who were in custody, but were not accused or found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest, or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or have gone missing.
Numbers for compensation for wrongful arrest or wrongful conviction used to be generated by the Statistics Bureau (CBS), but that line of research was discontinued after 2016.

Q037 (2018): Numbers cannot be provided for this question, as the compensation may involve people who have been in custody but where not accused of found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest, or posessed goods that have been damaged / sold / destroyed / gone missing. I don't have numbers specific to the categories you ask for. Also, this involves only a restricted group of 'users'.
Q037 (2012): In 2012, in 4 783 cases compensation was awarded for wrongful detention.

Poland

Q016 (General Comment): Civil cases: Each party may request that a professional attorney be appointed by the court. In order to do so, you must make a statement before the court that you are unable to pay the fees of an advocate or a legal advisor without the loss of the necessary support for yourself and your family. An application for a court-appointed attorney is independent of an application for exemption from court costs and may be filed at any stage of the proceedings (also prior to their commencement), until the case is finally resolved in the court having jurisdiction over the case. The court decides on the appointment of the attorney, taking into account the need for his/her participation in the case and the ability of the party to cover his/her remuneration. The appointed attorney represents the party in court and gives him/her appropriate legal advice in the case. In criminal proceedings, unless the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates otherwise, all expenses are temporarily lectured by the State Treasury.

Q016 (2016): Regulations of the act on free legal aid and legal advise were implemented starting 1 January 2016 with some exceptions which were implemented starting 31 August 2015.
Q018 (General Comment): Civil cases:
Exemption from court fees to which a party is entitled by virtue of the law or granted to a party in preliminary proceedings extends to enforcement proceedings. Additionally, it is possible to apply for exemption from court fees only at the stage of enforcement proceedings.
Criminal cases: If the convicted person fails to comply with the obligation to pay the monetary performance or reparation to the injured party, the judgment together with the enforcement order is sent to the court executive officer who initiates the proceedings. The procedure for pursuing such claims is governed by the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure (claims based on Article 196 § 2 of the Executive Penal Code).
In accordance with the Law on court executive officer fees of 28 February 2018. (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 210), the exemption from court costs to which a party is entitled by virtue of the law or which has been granted to a party in the court proceedings extends to the bailiff's costs (Article 45(1) of the Act). If a party does not exercise this right, the party may apply to the district court by which the judicial officer acts for exemption in whole or in part from enforcement costs. The applicant must prove that he or she is unable to pay the bailiff's fees without prejudice to the necessary maintenance of themselves, or their family (Article 45(2) of the Act).

Q018 (2018): The exemption from court costs granted to the party by the court in the exploratory proceeding or from which the party uses the power of the act extends also to enforcement proceedings (Article 771 of the Code of Civil Procedure). In addition, applications: for exemption from court costs and for the appointment of an attorney - an attorney or legal counsel ex officio may also be submitted during enforcement proceedings.
Q018 (2017): The cost are connected to the enforcement agent fees and actions.
Q018 (2016): The cost are connected to the enforcement agent fees and actions.

Q019 (General Comment): *In civil proceedings, exemption from court costs may relate to fees and expenses. Expenses include in particular: travel costs of a party who is exempt from court costs related to a personal appearance ordered by a court; reimbursement of travel and accommodation costs as well as lost earnings or witness income; remuneration and reimbursement of costs incurred by experts, translators and probation officers established for a party in a given case; lump-sum costs of taking evidence from the opinion-giving opinion of a team of court specialists; remuneration due to other persons or institutions and reimbursement of costs incurred by them; costs of carrying out other evidence; the costs of transporting animals and goods, keeping them or storing them; advertising costs; costs of detention and custody; lump sums due to probation officers for conducting environmental interviews in cases of: annulment of marriage, for divorce and separation, as well as for participation in parents' contacts with children determined by the court; the cost of issuing a certificate by a forensic doctor; the cost of mediation conducted as a result of referral by the court.
*In criminal proceedings, unless the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates otherwise, all expenses are temporarily lectured by the State Treasury. A witness shall be entitled to reimbursement of travel expenses from his place of residence to the place where the court proceedings are to be conducted upon the order of the court or the authority conducting the pre-trial proceedings. The witness shall be entitled to reimbursement of travel costs from his place of residence to the place where the procedural activities are to be performed at the request of the court or the authority conducting preparatory proceedings. The witness shall also be entitled to reimbursement of earnings or income lost in connection with appearance at the summons of the court or the authority conducting the pre-trial proceedings. A person summoned as a witness is also entitled to reimbursement of the costs of travel and accommodation on condition of appearance. *If a party to a notary's activity is not able to incur the remuneration required by a notary public for its own and for the family, it may apply to the district court competent for its place of residence to release in full or in part from this remuneration. This provision shall apply accordingly to a legal person that proves that he has insufficient funds to incur the remuneration demanded by a notary public.
The court, after determining that there is a need to perform a notarial act, takes into account the application and appoints a notary to perform the requested notarial activity (Article 6 of the Act of 14 February 1991 on Notary Public Rights).

Q019 (2017): Expert fees and travel cost reimbursement.

Q019 (2016): Expert fees and travel cost reimbursement.

Q020 (2021): Data refers to the number of cases in which an ex officio representative (legal adviser, advocate) was appointed.

Q020 (2020): Data on the number of cases in which a proxy was appointed ex officio (legal adviser, advocate)

Q020-1 (2020): The provisions of the procedure do not specify a time limit for examining the application for appointing a legal representative. However, it should be considered without undue delay.

Q037 (General Comment): The rules for granting a sum of money in case of finding excessive length of proceedings are specified in the Act of 17 June 2004 on complaints of violation of the right of a party to hear a case in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and court proceedings without unreasonable delay. According to art. 12 para. 4 of this Act, having regard to the complaint on (excessive), the court adjudicates from the Treasury, and in the case of complaints about the length of the proceedings conducted by the bailiff - from the bailiff, a sum of PLN 2,000 to PLN 20,000. The amount of the monetary sum, within the limits specified in the first sentence, is not less than PLN 500 for each year of the current duration of the proceedings, regardless of the number of stages of proceedings related to the excessive length of proceedings. The court may award a sum of money higher than PLN 500 for each year of the current duration of the proceedings, if the case is of particular importance to the applicant, who by his attitude did not contribute in a manner to prolonging the proceedings. This sum includes the amounts already awarded 16 to the applicant as a sum of money in the same case. No monetary sum is granted in the event of a complaint filed by the State Treasury or public sector units of the public finance sector.
The accused, who was acquitted or condemned to a more lenient punishment as a result of the resumption of the proceedings or cassation, serves the State Treasury for damages and compensation for the harm suffered resulting from the execution of all or part of the punishment he was not supposed to incur. This provision shall also apply if the proceedings were discontinued after the convicting decision was abrogated as a result of circumstances which were not taken into account in the earlier proceedings. The right to compensation and redress also arises in connection with the application of a safeguard measure under the conditions laid down in those circumstances. Compensation and redress also apply in the event of undoubtedly unjustified detention or detention (Article 552 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

Q037 (2021): *272- number of persons; *12 - number of persons
The amounts of compensations from chapter 75595 paid in 2021 ordered from the State Treasury are presented below, together with an indication of the legal acts on the basis of which the compensations were ordered.
Specification of damages from chapter 75595 amounts paid in 2021
1. Act of 23 February 1991 on declaring invalid judgments issued against persons repressed for activities in favour of the independent existence of the Polish state = EUR 21,625
2 Article 552 of the Act of 6 June 1997 - Code of Criminal Procedure = €6,707; 3 Act of 17 June 2004 on Complaint for Infringement of the Right of a Party to Investigate a Case in Pre-trial Proceedings Conducted or Supervised by a Public Prosecutor and in Judicial Proceedings without Undue Delay € 1,188
4 other damages: inter alia, compensatory pensions, compensation for property damage, unlawful eviction € 324
5 Act of 7 July 2005 on State compensation to victims of certain criminal acts 71 euro
Total compensation in chapter 75595 137 590 pln 29 915 euro
The amount of funds spent on the payment of compensation to entitled persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the legitimacy of claims and the amount of compensation awarded. Course of implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 in the course of the financial year is therefore independent of the activities of the financial services of individual courts, since the payment of funds by the financial branch of the court occurs only on the basis of a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the entitled person.

Q037 (2020): *229 - numer of persons
*19 - numer of persons
Regarding the content of question 37, we would like to inform you that the Ministry of Justice , within its jurisdiction has the following data on the amount of compensation payments also from Section 15 of the State Budget, Chapter 75595, adjudged by the State Treasury in 2020
Specification of compensation from Chapter 75595 in 2020 in euro: 1.On the basis of the Act of 23 February 1991 on the recognition of invalidrulings issued against persons repressed for activities for the benefit of the independent state of Poland - EUR 13 123 0002 On the basis of Article 552 of the Act of 6 June 1997 Code of Criminal Procedure (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1987) 4 552 000 euro3. pursuant to the Act of 17 June 2004 on a complaint for violationof a party's right to examine a case in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and court proceedings without undue delay (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 75) EUR 1 005 0004. other compensations: inter alia, compensatory pensions, compensation in property damage, unlawful eviction 114 000 euro
5. under the Act of 7 July 2005 on State Compensationto victims of certain criminal acts 32 000 euro
Total compensations from chapter 75595 - 18 826 000 euro
The amount of funds spent on compensation payments to entitled persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the legitimacy of claims and the amount of awarded compensation. The course of implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the budget year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial branch of the court, occurs only on the basis of a final court decision to pay compensation to the entitled person.

Q037 (2019): The course of the implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the financial year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial department of the court takes place only on the basis of a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the entitled person.
*Non execution of decision - 317- number of persons
*Wrongful conviction - 26- number of persons

Portugal

Q018 (General Comment): The Portuguese law foresees the total or partial exemption from court fees and other expenses related to the case, such as fees for the enforcement of judicial decisions.
Q019 (General Comment): The Portuguese law provides for the total or partial exemption from court fees and other expenses related to the case.
Q019 (2021): Legal aid may also include fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries) and travel costs. In addition, all applications, certificates and any other documents requested for legal protection purposes are exempt from taxes, fees and charges.
Q019 (2020): Legal aid may also include fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries) and travel costs. In addition, all applications, certificates and any other documents requested for legal protection purposes are exempt from taxes, fees and charges.

Q019 (2019): Legal aid may also include fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries) and travel costs. In addition,all applications, certificates and any other documents requested for legal protection purposes are exempt from taxes, fees and charges.

Q019 (2018): Legal aid may also include fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries) and travel costs. In addition,all applications, certificates and any other documents requested for legal protection purposes are exempt from taxes, fees and charges.

Q020 (2020): The reduction in the number of total legal aid cases may be the result of the measures taken during the COVID pandemic: on the one hand, the suspension of court deadlines and the expiry and prescription periods, and on the other hand, the reduction of conclicts as a result of the confinements. In any case, it should be emphasized that this is merely a perception, since we do not have the tools to perform a sociological analysis of the requests.

Q020 (2016): Data on cases not brought to court concerns only cases of legal advice. It is not possible to determine how many cases terminated at this time.
In 2014, there was an increase in the number of cases brought to court explained by the economic and financial situation that increased the number of labour conflicts as well as family and criminal disputes. The same reasoning and the economy recovery of the following years may explain the present decrease.

Q020 (2014): The increase in the number of cases brought to court in 2014 can be explained by the current economic and financial situation which resulted in the increase in the number of labour conflicts as well as the number of family and criminal disputes.

Q020-1 (2021): The maximum duration of the procedure for granting legal aid is 30 days (article 25 (1) of Law No. 34/2009, of 29 of July. Regarding the actual average duration, it should be noted that in the context of the COVID Pandemic, procedural deadlines were suspended, which has influenced the duration of the procedural timeframes.

Q020-1 (2020): The maximum duration of the procedure for granting legal aid is 30 days (article 25 (1) of Law No. 34/2009, of 29 of July. Regarding the actual average duration, it should be noted that in the context of the COVID Pandemic, procedural deadlines were suspended, which has influenced the duration of the procedural timeframes.

Q037 (General Comment): There is no data with these levels of disaggregation in Portugal.

Romania

Q018 (General Comment): For the enforcement phase, legal aid may be granted as facilities at the payment of judicial duties. Moreover, according to Article 6 letter c) of the Government Emergency Ordinance 51/2008, it can also be the payment of the bailiff's fee.

Q018 (2017): According to the definition at question 17, for the enforcement phase, legal aid may be granted as facilities at the payment of judicial duties, but, according to Article 6 letter c) of GEO no. 51/2008, it can also be the payment of the bailiff's fee.

Q018 (2016): According to the definition at question 17, for the enforcement phase, legal aid may be granted as facilities at the payment of judicial duties, but, according to Article 6 letter c) of GEO no. 51/2008, it can also be the payment of the bailiff's fee.

Q019 (General Comment): According to Article 6 letter b) of the Government Emergency Ordinance 51/2008, public aid may also cover costs of the expert, translator or interpreter services during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to law.

Q019 (2021): According to the Article 6 letter b) GEO no. 51/2008, public aid may be also the payment of the expert, translator or interpreter used during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to the law.

Q019 (2020): According to the Article 6 letter b) GEO no. 51/2008, public aid may be also the payment of the expert, translator or interpreter used during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to the law.

Q019 (2017): According to the Article 6 letter b) GEO no. 51/2008, public aid may be also the payment of the expert, translator or interpreter used during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to the law.

Q019 (2016): According to the Article 6 letter b) GEO no. 51/2008, public aid may be also the payment of the expert, translator or interpreter used during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to the law.

Q020 (2021): In criminal cases data also include ex officio layers.

Q020 (2020): In criminal cases data also include ex officio layers.

Q020 (2012): In 2012, data was available only for the Courts of Appeal and Tribunals. The database Ecris was not functional for first instance courts and the High Court.
Q020-1 (2021): There is no timeframe set for the procedure of granting legal aid by the court. The procedure is urgent as a general rule, being decided in chambers.
Q020-1 (2020): There is no timeframe set for the procedure of granting legal aid by the court. The procedure is urgent as a general rule, being decided in chambers.
Q037 (General Comment): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as a compensation. In criminal matters, the only possibility to obtain damages in case of procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, based on the provisions of the Civil Code. The new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010) provides for a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, he/she solicits the adoption of legal measures remedying to this situation. Please, refer to the regulations of the NCPC as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and a case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Illegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010). For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, common law rules laid down by the Civil Code apply. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trial, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation. The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile. The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Q037 (2020): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as a compensation. In criminal matters, the only possibility to obtain damages in case of procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, based on the provisions of the Civil Code. The new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010) provides for a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, he/she solicits the adoption of legal measures remedying to this situation. Please, refer to the regulations of the NCPC as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and a case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Illegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010). For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, common law rules laid down by the Civil Code apply. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trial, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation. The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile. The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Q037 (2019): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
llegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Q037 (2018): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Ilegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Q037 (2016): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), entered into force on the 15th of February 2013), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 paragraph (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Ilegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her libery is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.

Slovak Republic

Q019 (General Comment): Other costs provided by Centre for Legal Aid are costs for lawyers who represent the client at courts and these lawyers has been provided by Centre for Legal Aid. All costs paid by Centre are established in law no. 655/2004 Z. z.
Under the section 5c of the Act on Providing Legal Aid to persons in material need No. 327/2005: Legal aid shall also include: appointment of an interpreter; translation of documents necessary for decision on merits.

Q019 (2017): Under the section 5c of the Act on Providing Legal Aid to persons in material need (No. 327/2005): Legal aid shall also include: -appointment of an interpreter
-translation of documents necessary for decision on merits
-inevitable travel costs of foreign applicant

Q020 (2020): The 2020 was specific due the COVID 19 pandemic situation, there where smaller amount of request for legal aid.
Q020 (2018): According to the Annual report of the Legal Aid Center, in 2018, out of the total number of applications, the Center granted legal aid to applicants in 17,497 legal cases; of which 2,741 in the civil matters (including 16 in the form of legal advice) and 14,756 in the personal bankruptcy agenda
The number of cases where legal aid was granted in criminal proceedings is not available.
Q020-1 (General Comment): If the application for legal aid contains all the documents needed to issue a decision for granting legal aid then a decision is issued within 30 days. The applicant must meet the requirements for granting legal aid established by Act no. 327/2005 Z. z.. If the application is not complete then the proceeding is suspended for min. 8 days max. 30 days till the application is not complete. When the application is complete according to Act no. 327/2005 Z. z. the proceeding continues and decision is issued if the legal aid will or will not be granted.

Q037 (General Comment): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can be awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time. The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction, non-execution of court decisions can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.

Q037 (2019): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time. The compensation was awarded in the amount of 375 912 eur in 2019.
The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction, non-execution of court decisions can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.
The number of requests for compensation delivered on the Ministry of Justice of the SVK was 214. Out of these only 4 request were satisfied:
one non-execution of court decisions (allocated amount 8.640,65 €),
one wrongful conviction (167,78 €),
two other (administrative mistake of the court, allocated amount 980,16 €).
Some of the unsatisfied request end up on the court in the civil procedure. During 2019 Ministry of Justice of SVK compensated in addition (due the court decision) in 45 cases in the amount of 553 395 euros. In these cases, we do not provide precise information on the reason for compensation, but we can say that in most cases it was compensation for wrongful conviction, in which the applicant was not found guilty.

Q037 (2018): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time.
The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.

Slovenia

Q018 (General Comment): In the proceeding of enforcement of judicial decisions the exemption from court fees (according to the Court Fees Act) and legal aid in the form of legal advice, legal representation and the exemption from payment of the procedural costs (the Free Legal Aid Act) is possible.
Q018 (2020): See general comment.

Q018 (2014): In the previous cycle, the answer was No, while for 2014 it changed to Yes, because the question was interpreted as regarding the court fees, exemption of which is regulated under the Court Fees Act and not under the legal aid as regulated by the Free Legal Aid Act (fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions are still not paid by the party, but the legal ground for the exemption from payment is not legal aid).

Q019 (General Comment): The Free Legal Aid Act (FLAA) prescribes that legal aid shall mean the right of the eligible person to the entire or partial provision of funds necessary to cover the costs of legal assistance and the right to exemption of payment of the costs of the judicial proceeding. Further on the law defines that legal aid may be approved for legal advice, legal representation and other legal services, for all forms of judicial protection before all courts of general jurisdiction and specialised courts based in the Republic of Slovenia, before the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Slovenia, and before all authorities, institutions or persons in the Republic of Slovenia authorised for out-of-court settlement, as well as in the form of exemption from payment of the costs of the judicial proceeding.
The law specifically lists the costs that can be covered by the approved legal aid: for legal advice; for the formulation, verification and certification of documents on legal relations, facts and statements; for legal advice and representation in cases of out-of-court settlement; for legal advice and representation before courts in the first and second instances; for legal advice and representation involving extraordinary appeals; for legal advice and representation involving constitutional action; for legal advice and representation before international courts; for legal advice and representation involving the filing of a petition for the assessment of constitutionality; in the form of exemption from payment of the costs of the judicial or extrajudicial proceeding.
Legal aid may also be granted in the form of an exemption from payment of the costs of proceedings before courts, particularly in the form of an exemption from payment of: costs of experts, witnesses, interpreters, servicing orders and translations, costs of external operations of the court or other authority in the Republic of Slovenia, and other justified costs; security deposits for the costs or of the costs, of the implementation of the proceeding (advance payments); costs of public documents and receipts required for the proceeding before a court; other costs of the proceeding. The legal aid system does not cover the costs of the proceeding and actual expenditure of and remuneration for the person representing the opposing party.

Q019 (2020): See general comment.

Q020 (General Comment): The reported values for Q20 use the categorisation by forms of legal aid granted. In a single legal aid case, the request can be granted for multiple forms of legal aid, therefore the reported numbers at Q20 can be higher than the number of resolved legal aid cases. For the list of all possible forms of legal aid, please see comment to Q12. The data on the number of resolved legal cases is not reported, since one or more forms of legal aid can be granted in a single resolved case, making impossible the distinction to “cases brought to court” or “cases not brought to court”.
Cases brought to court include: 1) legal advice and representation before courts at first and second instance and 2) involving extraordinary appeals.
Cases not brought to court include: 1) legal advice and representation in cases of out-of-court settlement; 2) formulation, verification and certification of documents on legal relations, facts and statements.
The following forms of legal aid are not included in figures at Q20: 1) legal advice and representation involving constitutional action; 2) legal advice and representation at international courts; 3) legal advice and representation involving the filing of a petition for the assessment of constitutionality and 4) exemption from payment of costs of judicial or extrajudicial proceedings.

Q020 (2020): No particular explanation can be given regarding difference in number of Cases not brought to court between the years.
Q020 (2016): The following forms of legal aid are not included in the figures above:
1) legal advice and representation involving constitutional action: 16
2) for legal advice and representation before international courts: 1
3) for legal advice and representation involving the filing of a petition for the assessment of constitutionality: 1
4) exemption from payment of the costs of the judicial or extra judicial proceedings: 2.118

Q020 (2014): The figure provided for 2014 for cases not brought to court for which legal aid has been granted irepresents all the granted forms of legal aid. Please note that in a single legal aid case, the request can be granted for multiple forms of legal aid, therefore the given number can be greater than the number of resolved legal aid cases, where the request was granted.
The number of cases not brought to court for which legal aid has been granted includes: legal advice (469), formulation, verification and certification of documents on legal relations, facts and statements (332); and legal advice and representation in cases of out-of-court settlement (47).

Q020 (2012): The number of cases not brought to court for which legal aid has been granted in 2012 includes: first legal advice (218), legal advice surpassing initial legal advice (207), formulation, verification and certification of documents on legal relations, facts and statements (244); legal advice and representation in cases of out-of-court settlement (29).

Q020-1 (General Comment): If the applicant would miss the deadline or would loose a right in the time it takes to process the application for free legal aid, the court can approve an "urgent" free legal aid, without taking in regard the material criteria for eligibility (however, the lack of merits is still checked). The material criteria are subsequently checked at a later time.

Q037 (General Comment): The Protection of Right to Trial without Undue Delay Act gives a party to court proceedings the right to have his rights, duties and any charges brought against him in his case before the court to be decided upon by the court without undue delay, as well as a right to compensation, if the aforementioned right was infringed.
The procedure for compensation in the case of wrongful arrest and wrongful condemnation is regulated by the Criminal Procedure Act.
Before filing the claim for compensation with the court, the injured person has to address his claim to the Office of the State Attorney General to try and reach agreement about the existence of the damage and the type and extent of compensation. If the request for compensation is not granted or the Office of the State Attorney General and the injured person do not reach accord within three months of the filing of the request, the injured person may file a claim for compensation with the court.
The compensation, offered by the State Attorney's Office for wrongful arrest varies from case to case, since circumstances of the individual case (e.g. length of wrongful arrest, effect on the injured person's family life and his closest social circle, effects of media exposure, effect to injured person's health, etc.), as well as court decisions in similar cases, are taken into account.

Q037 (2021): *The figures above represent cases, closed in 2021, with compensations to be paid in 2021 or later. The figures above represent cases before courts only (court decisions and court settlements).
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2021 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 33;
Number of settlements: 10;
Total amount (in €): 21.715 EUR;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 32;
Number of settlements: 8;
Total amount (in €): 63.174 EUR;
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 0;
Total amount (in €): 0.

Q037 (2020): *The figures above represent cases, closed in 2020, with compensations to be paid in 2020 or later. The figures above represent cases before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2020 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 60;
Number of settlements: 10;
Total amount (in €): 23.222;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 30;
Number of settlements: 8
Total amount (in €): 140.330
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 8;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 1.260.

Q037 (2019): *The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed in 2019, with compensations to be paid in 2019 or later. The figures above represent cases
before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2019 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 69;
Number of settlements: 22;
Total amount (in €): 35.956;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 44;
Number of settlements: 16;
Total amount (in €): 99.493;
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 36.460.

Q037 (2018): *The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed in 2018, with compensations to be paid in 2018 or later. The figures above represent cases before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2018 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 68;
Number of settlements: 17;
Total amount (in €): 31.105;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 15;
Number of settlements: 9
Total amount (in €): 36.213,22
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 9;
Number of settlements: 2;
Total amount (in €): 68.648,98.

Q037 (2016): *The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed at the State Attorney in 2016, with compensations to be paid in 2016 or later. *The figures above represent cases before courts only. Before filing the claim for damages with the court, the injured person has to address his claim to the Office of the State Attorney General to try and reach agreement about the existence of the damage and the type and extent of compensation. If the request for recovery of damages is not granted or the Office of the State Attorney General and the injured person do not reach accord within three months of the filing of the request, the injured person may file a claim for damages with the court. The compensation, offered by the State Attorney's Office for wrongful arrest varies from case to case, since circumstances of the individual case (e.g. length of wrongful arrest, effect on the injured person's family life and his closest social circle, effects of media exposure, effect to injured person's health, etc.), as well as court decisions in similar cases, are taken into account.. Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2016: 1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 71; Number of settlements: 37; Total amount (in €): 430.262; 2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 50; Number of settlements: 31 Total amount (in €): 144.881 3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 0; Number of condemnations: 0; Total amount (in €): 0.
The Protection of Right to Trial without Undue Delay Act gives a party to court proceedings the right to have his rights, duties and any charges brought against him in his case before the court to be decided upon by the court without undue delay. For detailed explanation on Excessice length of proceedings see Q40.
The procedure for compensation in the case of wrongful arrest and wrongful condemnation is regulated by the Criminal Procedure Act.

Spain

Q018 (General Comment): The legal aid supposes the exemption of the taxes for the judicial procedure. The proceeding for the enforcement of judicial decisions is not subject to taxes or judicial fees. Any case, the concepts and costs covered by legal aid in the enforcement would be the same as in the trial.
In relation to enforcement agents, this role is performed by public officials in Spain.

Q019 (General Comment): According to Legal Aid Act: Legal assistance to the arrested, prisoner or accused who had not appointed a lawyer, for any police action; Free insertion of announcements, during the process, in official newspapers; Free expert assistance; Free collection (or reduction of 80% of fees depending on cases) of copies, testimonies, instruments and notarial acts; Reduction of 80% of fees for notes, certifications, annotations, in the Property and Commercial Registries.

Q020 (2021): Source 2021 data: "XVI Informe del Observatorio de la Justicia Gratuita"
Criminal cases = arrested person assistance of a lawyer (page 29) + genre violence (page 26) + officio lawyer criminal cases (page 28)
According to the report cited, after the paralysis caused by the pandemic, normalization gradual both daily life and judicial activity led to an increase in cases, especially in ex officio cases and in labour cases

Q020 (2020): The methodology of presentation of data, namely the model of calculation, has been changed between 2019 and 2020.
Source 2020 data: "XV Informe del Observatorio de la Justicia Gratuita"
Criminal cases = arrested person assistance of a lawyer (page 31) + genre violence (page 28) + officio lawyer criminal cases (page 30)

Q020 (2014): The total indicated for 2014 includes cases brought to court as well as cases not brought to court.

Q020 (2012): In 2012, 662 434 applications have been granted legal aid. This total includes cases brought to court as well as cases not brought to court.

Q037 (2021): In 2021, 368 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 205 for preventive detention, 83 for judicial error. € 802.735 were paid for administrative condemnations and € 1.486.968 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater
than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. SOURCE: La Justicia dato a dato, (document issued by the CGPJ)

Q037 (2020): In 2020, 320 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 62 for preventive detention, 223 for judicial error. € 124.367,5 were paid for administrative condemnations and €445.491,3 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater
than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. The answer tries to group the Spanish categories into those of the CEPEJ.

Q037 (2019): In 2019, 347 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 151 for preventive detention, 79 for judicial error. € 3.484.896 were paid for administrative condemnations and €934.491,7 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. The answer tries to group the Spanish categories into those of the CEPEJ. In the section 'wrongful conviction', we give the cases of the Spanish category of 'judicial error'. Possibly, other years these cases have simply been included in 'other'. It is a change of criteria with no effect on the total.

Q037 (2018): In 2018, 332 files were initiated for abnormal functioning, 104 for preventive detention, 94 for judicial error. € 722,888.06 were paid for administrative condemnations and € 1,210,585.35 for judicial condemnations

Q037 (2016): According Article 293 of the Organic Law of the Judicial Power: The interested party will direct his indemnification petition directly to the Ministry of Justice, processing it according to the regulatory norms of the patrimonial responsibility of the state. A contentious-administrative appeal will be available against the resolution. The right to claim compensation shall expire a year, from the day on which it could be exercised.
The number of requests because of "judicial error" (non exactly the same concept as Wrongful conviction) that were estimated in 2016 was ONE (1).

Indicator 5: Legal aid

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

Question 016. Does legal aid apply to:

Question 018. Can legal aid be granted for the fees that are related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (e.g. fees of an enforcement agent)?

Question 019. Can legal aid be granted for other costs (different from those mentioned in questions 16 to 18, e.g. fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries), travel costs etc.)?

Question 020. Please indicate the number of cases for which legal aid has been granted:

Question 020-1. Please indicate the timeframes of the procedure for granting legal aid, in relation to the duration from the initial legal aid request to the final approval of the legal aid request:

Question 016

Austria

(General Comment): In principle every person who retains a defence lawyer or another representative has to bear the costs him or herself even if the lawyer was appointed ex officio. By virtue of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the court has to decide on total or partial legal aid on the request of the defendant if the defendant cannot bear the total costs for the defence lawyer without impairment of his/her own or his/her family's maintenance which enables him/her to a simple lifestyle and if it is necessary in the interest of justice in particular in the interest of an adequate defence. Where in any case the defendant needs a defence lawyer, the court has to decide on legal aid ex officio even if the defendant does not request for it but further requirements to provide legal aid are given.

Civil Cases:

A party with insufficient financial means may apply for legal aid when entering into litigation or at any time later as long as the civil proceeding is still pending. As far as required the court can give legal aid by (wholly or partially) freeing the indigent party from court fees and other fees (fees for experts, interpreters, witnesses and guardians appointed by the court - as representatives for absent parties or parties in need of guardianship -, the parties' travelling expenses, and costs of announcements) and by providing legal representation (by a lawyer) free of charge. Where legal representation is provided, legal aid also covers the pre-trial advice given by the lawyer. Legal aid is granted only as the applicant - according to his income, assets and maintenance obligations - is unable to bear (any or part of) the costs mentioned above without endangering the minimum subsistence level necessary to allow a simple standard of living. Legal aid is denied if the claim or defence of the applicant is manifestly unfounded or if the claim has no prospect of success. Legal aid is granted in all civil and commercial court proceedings regardless of the applicant's nationality or place of residence. If legal aid is granted in the main proceeding, the same also applies to the enforcement proceedings. A party which was granted legal aid for a particular legal dispute in another EU Member State is also entitled to legal aid in Austria for a proceeding concerning the recognition and enforcement of the decision given in that dispute. If an application for legal aid is submitted concerning an urgent case (e.g. legal representation in the case of interim measures) the court has to decide speedily. If the court decides that the legal aid includes the assistance of a lawyer, the regional Bar Association selects a lawyer from among its members, by alphabetical order.

However, the applicant may propose a lawyer himself. Although this proposal is not binding on the regional Bar Association, it will in general accept a well-founded proposal (e.g. if the lawyer is willing and already familiar with the case). The regional Bar Association usually appoints a lawyer to represent the applicant within a few days. The application form (ZPForm 1) contains a summary of assets (income, property such as real estate, money in bank accounts, insurance policies, etc.) and liabilities (maintenance, etc.), personal data and information on the applicant's living conditions. Supporting documents are to be submitted as far as possible. False or maliciously incomplete information can lead to considerable fines and can also result in civil liability or criminal prosecution for fraud. At its discretion the courts may grant full legal aid or – depending on the applicant's circumstances and taking into account expected costs – partial legal aid, covering only certain fees. But if the applicant looses the case, he has to reimburse the successful party's procedural costs.

Legal aid covers all stages of the proceedings. As long as it has not been withdrawn because of a change in the applicant's circumstances or annulled by the court if it is established that the conditions under which the aid was granted were not borne out. legal aid covers any appeal (or appeal procedure).

(2017): As far as civil cases are concerned, according to § 64 of the Austrian Civil Procedure Order (Zivilprozessordnung, ZPO) legal aid may cover a provisional exemption from court fees, fees for witnesses, experts, interpreters and guardians, costs of the necessary announcements and the cash expenditure of guardians or lawyers, representation by a court official or – if necessary – a lawyer.
In criminal cases:
According to sec 391 par 1 CCP the enforcement of the court's decision on costs has to take into account the ability of the convicted person to bear the costs for the daily life for him/herself and the family as well as the obligation of compensation in regard of the offence. The court may, if the costs cannot be enforced because of an impecunious defendant, declare the costs unrecoverable. If the court assumes that in the future the costs will be recoverable but for the time being they are not, the economic capacity of the person concerned has to be re-examined after a certain period. The statute for limitation to recover the costs is five years after the final decision in the proceeding. If the court decides that the convicted person has to bear the costs of the proceeding and further on he or she is not able to pay the costs the authorities, responsible to recover costs, may prolong the payment deadline, allow to pay instalments, or to abate the costs.
In principle every person who retains a defence lawyer or another representative has to bear the costs him or herself even if the lawyer was appointed ex officio (sec 393 par 1 of CCP). According to sec 61 para 2 CCP the court has to decide on total or partial legal aid on the request of the defendant if the defendant cannot bear the total costs for the defence lawyer without impairment of his/her own or his/her family's maintenance which enables him/her to a simple lifestyle and if it is necessary in the interest of justice in particular in the interest of an adequate defence. In any case legal aid has to be granted
during the whole procedure if and as long as the defendant is held in pre trail detention; • during the entire procedure on the confinement in an institution for mentally abnormal offenders; • during the trail on the confinement in an institution for addicted offenders in need of curing and on the confinement in an institution for dangerous subsequent offender; •during the trail in front of a jury or of a court of lay assessors; •during the trail in front of a single judge if the sentence which may be imposed is more than three years of deprivation of liberty; •during the appeal procedure against a verdict of a court of jury or a court of lay assessors, in case the European Court for Human Rights has determined a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights or an additional Protocol to it for conducting the request for the reopening of the procedure and for the trail in public;
•if the defendant is blind, deaf, mute or otherwise handicapped or is not able to conduct the defense by him/herself because he/she can do not understand the language at court,
•for the appeal procedure,
•if the factual and legal position is difficult.
Where in any case the defendant needs a defense lawyer, the court has to decide on legal aid ex officio even if the defendant does not request for it but further requirements to provide legal aid are given.
With regard to the decision on legal aid the court has to examine the defendant's economic capacity to bear the costs for a defense lawyer. The economic capacity is determined by the maintenance which enables the defendant and his/her family to a simple lifestyle, and can be identified at the bases of the minimum living wage which may not be garnished given by sec 5 of the act on garnishment of wages and the appropriate maintenance which is higher than the minimum living wage. In particular the income and other assets on the one hand and the number of persons who are entitled to maintenance on the other hand

Belgium

(2017): In Belgium there are three types of "legal aid": first-line legal aid, second-line legal aid and legal assistance.
First-line legal aid consists of practical information, legal information, a first legal opinion or referral to a specialised body (Article 508/1 of the Judicial Code).
Second-line legal aid: legal aid granted to a natural person in the form of a detailed legal opinion or legal assistance in or out of court proceedings or assistance in a trial, including legal representation.
Legal assistance consists in exempting, in whole or in part, those who do not have the necessary income to afford the costs of a procedure, from paying the related costs, which will therefore be covered by the State budget (Article 664 of the Judicial Code). Legal assistance may be obtained in civil or criminal matters and in any proceedings (judicial, administrative or arbitral).

(2016): In Belgium there are three types of "legal aid": front-line legal aid, second-line legal aid and legal assistance.
Front-line legal aid consists of practical information, legal information, a first legal opinion or referral to a specialized body (section 508/1 of the Judicial Code).
Second-line legal aid: legal aid granted to a natural person in the form of a detailed legal opinion or legal assistance in the context or not of a procedure or assistance in the context of a trial including representation. Legal assistance consists in providing, in whole or in part, those who do not have the necessary income to meet the costs of a procedure, to pay the related costs which will therefore be borne by the budget of the State (Article 664 of the Judicial Code). Legal aid may be obtained in civil or criminal matters and in any proceeding (judicial, administrative or arbitral).

Bulgaria

(General Comment): Legal aid is granted only to natural persons, in criminal, civil and administrative matters before courts of all instances. Legal aid authorities are the Ministry of Justice which conducts the State policy in the sphere of legal aid; the National Legal Aid Bureau /NLAB/ which provides general and methodological guidance of the activity concerning the granting of legal aid by issuing mandatory instructions on the application of the Act and the statutory instruments of secondary legislation; the Bar Councils which organize and administer legal aid within the respective geographical jurisdiction (network of Regional Counseling Centers / RCCs /, established at thirteen bar councils in the country); the authority directing the procedural steps, the court or the relevant police or customs authority which decide whether to grant legal aid or not in civil or administrative cases. Consultations are provided as well as through the National Telephone for Legal Aid at the NLAB. The NLAB grants or refuses granting legal aid for a consultation with a view to reaching a settlement prior to bringing legal proceedings or to bringing a case before a court and/or preparation of documents for a trial. The types of legal aid are: pre-litigation advice with a view to reaching a settlement prior to bringing legal proceedings or to bringing a case before a court; preparation of documents for bringing a case before a court; representation in court by legal counsel; representation upon detention under Article 72 of the Ministry of Interior Act and under Article 16a of the Customs Act and under Art. 124b, para. 1 of the Law on the State Agency for National Security. The legal aid system covers cases in which the assistance of a lawyer, a stand-by defence counsel or representation is mandatory as provided for by the Criminal Procedure Code, the Civil Procedure Code and the Administrative Procedure Code. Legal aid system covers also cases in which the applicant is unable to pay for a lawyer, wishes to benefit of a legal assistance, and the interests of the justice require such legal assistance. Legal aid for alternative dispute resolution (ADR) does not apply.

(2014): In 2014, changes were made in the Regulations of the organization and activities of the National Legal Aid Bureau. Since May 2015, within the NLAB are permanently operating the National Primary Legal Aid Hotline and the Regional Consultation Centers for vulnerable social groups.

(2012): Legislative changes in the Legal Aid Act have been carried out in several directions: increasing the powers of the legal aid system authorities and exercising control over granting legal aid; introduction of the stand-by defence counsel with the purpose of expediting court proceedings in criminal matters; changes in the order and circumstances for entering and striking from the National Legal Aid Register; introducing legislative requirements for reporting legal aid; the scope of the legal aid has been expanded.

Croatia

(2014): The new Free Legal Aid Act entered into force in 2014. The procedure of exercising the right to primary legal aid (legal information, legal advice, drawing up submissions in procedures before public and international bodies, representation in proceedings in public bodies, legal aid in amicable, out-of-court dispute resolution) is substantially simplified. Involvement of civil society groups, legal clinics and government bodies in the system of primary legal aid and legal counseling increased the territorial availability of expert legal aid. As to the approval of secondary legal aid in court proceedings and exoneration from paying court costs and fees, the focus of the reform has been placed on increasing the property and income threshold for approving legal aid.

Cyprus

(2017): x

Denmark

(General Comment): Criminal cases:
Defendants are in all cases appointed a defence attorney. Victims of certain criminal offences (e.g. sexual offences, homicide and acts of violence) have access to representation in court by a support attorney. Basic legal advice is available to all persons in criminal cases. Further legal advice is only available subject to certain economic criteria. If the prosecuted person is acquitted, the costs of the defence attorney remain free of charge. Contrarily, it is normally the court who decides if the prosecuted person must pay for the defence attorney and other expenses of the case, if the person is convicted. Finally, if the prosecuted person picks his or her own defence attorney, he or she will as a starting point have to pay the attorney's fee.
Other cases:
In civil cases it is normally the losing part who has to pay both one's own and the opposite party's expenses in relation to the court case. The court can decide that both parties must pay their own costs, if the case doesn't have an actual winner.

Germany

(General Comment): Criminal Cases:
The concept of "necessary defense" provides that in all criminal cases in which accusations of considerable weight are involved, which are not merely simple in nature or in which the accused is particularly in need of protection, the accused shall be provided with a defense counsel representing him or her upon request or ex officio, irrespective of his or her financial circumstances (Section 140 of the Criminal Procedure Code). In a case of necessary defense the court or - in urgent cases - the public procecutor will assign a defense counsel to the defendant upon his or her request prior to his or her interrogation. A defense counsel has to be appointed ex officio in cases of necessary defense, if (1) the defendant is to be brought before a court for a decision on detention or provisional placement, (2) it becomes known that the accused, to whom the accusation of the crime has been opened, is in an institution on the basis of a judicial order or with judicial authorization, (3) it becomes apparent in the preliminary proceedings that the accused will not be able to defend himself or herself, in particular if the accused is questioned or confronted or if (4) he or she has been summoned to make a statement on the indictment (Section 141 of the Criminal Procedure Code). The appointment of the defense counsel ends with the discontinuation or final conclusion of the criminal pro-ceedings [Section 143 (1) of the Criminal Code]. The defense counsel settles his fees with the state treasury. However, since his or her costs are part of the costs of the proceedings, the defendant must pay them as far as he or she is convicted and insofar as the defendant is ac-quitted, the state treasury must bear the costs and expenses of the proceedings.
Rules for witnesses and victims in criminal cases:
Especially vulnerable witnesses, e.g. children or handicapped persons, can - without proof of being financially needy - be assigned a lawyer free of charge by the court to assist them during an interview ("Zeugenbeistand", section 68b (2) Code of Criminal Procedure).
Victims of certain crimes, especially violent or sexual crimes, and also close relatives, spou-ses and partners of killed persons, who are entitled to be joint plaintiffs, can be assigned a lawyer without having to cover the expenses and without having to prove their financial need (see sections 397a and 406h (3) Code of Criminal Procedure). Victims of other crimes, who can also be joint plaintiffs, have the possibility to apply for legal aid as financial assistance if their income is too low to cover the costs fully or only in part and if they are unable to assert their own interests sufficiently or cannot be expected to do so (see section 397a (2), 406h (3) Code of Criminal Procedure).
Legal aid can also be granted to persons who claim compensation for damages or pain and suffering in the criminal proceedings in a so-called adhesion claim ("Adhäsionsklage", see sections 403, 404 (5) Code of Criminal Procedure), if they are not able to cover the expenses (fully or in part) and their legal action offers sufficient expectation of success and is not wanton. The same applies to persons who act as private prosecutors to achieve a punishment of the perpetrator in cases where the prosecution has declined to pursue the offence due to a lack of public interest in the prosecution ("Privatklage", see sections 374, 379 (3) Code of Criminal Procedure).

(2017): In Germany there is no legal aid for legal representation in criminal cases because the law provides for the so called "necessary defense" implying mandatory legal representation.

Hungary

(General Comment): According to the Legal Aid Act LXXX of 2003, the Legal Aid Service may grant legal aid in judicial and extrajudicial cases. The county justice services, as offices of first instance and in charge of receiving the applications for legal aid, do not merely assess the eligibility for aid but, in simple cases, provide legal assistance directly as well – without prior screening of the clients' financial capabilities. However, legal aid (legal advice, drafting a document) is primarily provided by legal aid providers (attorneys, notaries public, non-governmental organizations etc.) who are recorded into the Register of legal aid providers who have contractual relation with the Legal Aid Service. The latter provides professional legal assistance for socially disadvantaged people. The law defines the situations in which legal aid can be granted and those in which no legal aid may be provided.

Ireland

(2017): Under Irish law, there is a distinguishment between "legal aid" which refers specifically to "representation in court" and "legal advice". This question is being answered on the basis that the words "legal aid" refers to "legal aid and legal advice" and "Representation in Court" means "Legal Aid".

Italy

(General Comment): Legal advice does not exist as such in Italy, but lawyers play a role in ADR procedures.

Luxembourg

(2017): /

Malta

(2017): Despite the fact that our current legal aid system does not provide for clients to use the service specifically for legal advice without the requirement of representation in court, in actual practice clients using the services of the Agency are still voluntarily provided with legal advice when solicited.

(2014): In 2014, Malta implemented a major reform in the provision of legal aid, by establishing it as an independent Agency with its own budget and management structure. Prior to this, legal aid was a function falling within the remit of the office of the Attorney General.

Poland

(General Comment): Civil cases: Each party may request that a professional attorney be appointed by the court. In order to do so, you must make a statement before the court that you are unable to pay the fees of an advocate or a legal advisor without the loss of the necessary support for yourself and your family. An application for a court-appointed attorney is independent of an application for exemption from court costs and may be filed at any stage of the proceedings (also prior to their commencement), until the case is finally resolved in the court having jurisdiction over the case. The court decides on the appointment of the attorney, taking into account the need for his/her participation in the case and the ability of the party to cover his/her remuneration. The appointed attorney represents the party in court and gives him/her appropriate legal advice in the case. In criminal proceedings, unless the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates otherwise, all expenses are temporarily lectured by the State Treasury.

(2016): Regulations of the act on free legal aid and legal advise were implemented starting 1 January 2016 with some exceptions which were implemented starting 31 August 2015.

Question 018

Austria

(General Comment): If legal aid is granted in the main proceeding, the same also applies to the enforcement proceeding. According to the Austrian Civil Procedure Order, the requirements for granting legal aid have only to be re-examined, if the enforcement proceeding will be opened one year after the main proceeding has been closed.

(2019): According to § 64 of the Austrian Civil Procedure Order (Zivilprozessordnung, ZPO) legal aid extends to enforcement proceedings.

(2018): Legal aid according to § 64 of the Austrian Civil Procedure Order (Zivilprozessordnung, ZPO) extends to enforcement proceedings.

Belgium

(General Comment): Judicial assistance (one of the components of the legal aid in the sense of the questionnaire) consists in exempting, in whole or in part, those who do not have the necessary means of subsistence to meet the costs of proceedings, even extrajudicial proceedings, from paying the various fees - registration, registry and shipping, as well as other costs related to the proceedings. The beneficiaries are also entitled to free of charge services of public and ministerial officials. They can also have free assistance of a technical adviser during judicial expertise. According to Article 665, 2° of the Judicial Code, judicial assistance covers acts relating to enforcement of judgments and decisions of justice.

(2020): Legal aid consists in exempting, in whole or in part, those who do not have the necessary means of existence to meet the costs of a procedure, even an extrajudicial one, from paying the various fees, registration, clerk's office and dispatch fees and other costs that it entails. It also assures the interested parties that the ministry of public and ministerial officers is free of charge. It also allows the interested parties to benefit from the free assistance of a technical advisor during judicial expertises. According to article 665, 2° of the Belgian Judicial Code, legal aid is applicable to acts relating to the execution of judgments and decisions.

Croatia

(General Comment): Exemption from court fees in other than criminal cases is one of the forms of secondary legal aid proscribed by the Law on Legal Aid and it may be granted in proceedings related to the enforcement of judicial decisions. The situation changed few times in the last years. While till 2014, the exemption from payment of court fees could be granted in all judicial proceedings, including enforcement procedures and security procedures, due to changes in the Legal Aid Act in 2014, there was no more this possibility to finally again reinstall it again in 2016 Free Legal Aid Act (Official Gazette 143/13) and allow to grant legal aid for the fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions.

(2021): e.g. in enforcement proceedings following child maintenance proceedings; labour disputes

(2019): Legal aid may be granted for exemption of payment of fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions.

(2018): Legal aid may be granted for exemption of payment of fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions.

(2017): In enforcement proceedings legal aid is granted when it comes to enforcing a claim arising from a civil or administrative court procedure for which legal aid may be granted under the provisions of Free Legal Aid Act (Official Gazette 143/13).

(2016): In enforcement proceedings legal aid is granted when it comes to enforcing a claim arising from a civil or administrative court procedure for which legal aid may be granted under the provisions of Free Legal Aid Act (Official Gazette 143/13).

Cyprus

(2017): x

Czech Republic

(General Comment): Legal aid could be granted at every stage of the proceedings – it could be granted even only for enforcement of judicial decision.

(2017): Legal aid can be granted in any stage of the proceeding.

(2016): Legal aid can be granted in any stage of the proceeding.

Denmark

(General Comment): The bailiff's court can grant legal aid if the person appearing before the court is deemed to need a lawyer's assistance, and the person fulfils certain economic criteria. (Danish Administration of Justice Act, article 500(2)).

Estonia

(General Comment): Legal aid cannot be granted for fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (except for representing a person in enforcement proceedings), but procedural assistance can be granted to release a person from all or a part of the expenses related to enforcement proceedings.

(2019): Partial or full coverage of the costs related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (incl. fees of an enforcement agent) depending on the financial situation of the claimant. The advance payment of enforcement costs shall not be demanded by the bailiff from the claimant who is a natural person and who has received legal aid for the payment of procedural costs (incl court fees) as well as in case of collection of compensation for damage caused by a criminal offence as well as in case of collection of maintenance support.

(2018): Partial or full coverage of the costs related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (incl. fees of an enforcement agent) depending on the financial situation of the claimant. The advance payment of enforcement costs shall not be demanded by the bailiff from the claimant who is a natural person and who has received legal aid for the payment of procedural costs (incl court fees) as well as in case of collection of compensation for damage caused by a criminal offence as well as in case of collection of maintenance support.

(2017): Partial or full coverage of the costs related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (incl. fees of an enforcement agent) depending on the financial situation of the claimant. The advance payment of enforcement costs shall not be demanded by the bailiff from the claimant who is a natural person and who has received legal aid for the payment of procedural costs (incl court fees) as well as in case of collection of compensation for damage caused by a criminal offence as well as in case of collection of maintenance support.

(2016): Partial or full coverage of the costs related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (incl. fees of an enforcement agent) depending on the financial situation of the claimant. The advance payment of enforcement costs shall not be demanded by the bailiff from the claimant who is a natural person and who has received legal aid for the payment of procedural costs (incl court fees) as well as in case of collection of compensation for damage caused by a criminal offence as well as in case of collection of maintenance support.

Finland

(General Comment): The granting of legal aid exempts the recipient from liability for the enforcement fees pertaining to the judgment or the court order and any expenses payable in advance. All necessary costs of enforcement are covered from state funds, if they cannot be collected from the opposing party. (Legal Aid Act, Section 4(4)).

(2020): The granting of legal aid exempts the recipient from liability for the enforcement fees pertaining to the judgment or the court order and any expenses payable in advance. All necessary costs of enforcement are covered from state funds, if they cannot be collected from the opposing party. (Legal Aid Act, Section 4(4)).

(2019): The granting of legal aid exempts the recipient from liability for the enforcement fees pertaining to the judgment or the court order and any expenses payable in advance. All necessary costs of enforcement are covered from state funds, if they cannot be collected from the opposing party. (Legal Aid Act, Section 4(4)).

(2017): Legal aid covers exemption from execution fees resulting from court's decision.

France

(General Comment): Enforcement agents can be appointed to enforce any court decision for a beneficiary of legal aid, either as a continuation of the proceedings or separately. Article 11 of the Law of 10 July 1991 provides for that legal aid "shall apply as of right to procedures, acts or measures for the enforcement of justice decisions obtained with its benefit, unless enforcement is suspended for more than one year for a reason other than the exercise of an appeal or a decision to suspend enforcement". In addition, Article 10 of the Law of 10 July 1991 provides for that legal aid may be granted "in connection with the enforcement on French territory of a court decision or any other enforceable title, including if they emanate from another Member State of the European Union" (except Denmark). Source SADJAV

(2020): Article 11 of the aforementioned law provides that legal aid "shall apply as of right to proceedings, acts or measures for the enforcement of legal decisions obtained with its benefit, unless enforcement is suspended for more than one year for a reason other than the exercise of an appeal or a decision to suspend enforcement."

(2019): Article 11 of the aforementioned law provides for that legal aid "applies automatically to procedures, acts or measures for the enforcement of court decisions obtained with its benefit, unless enforcement is suspended for more than one year for a reason other than the exercise of a remedy or a decision to suspend enforcement".

(2018): Article 11 of the aforementioned Act provides that legal aid "shall automatically apply to proceedings, acts or measures for the enforcement of court decisions obtained with its benefit, unless enforcement is suspended for more than a year for a cause other than the exercise of a remedy or a stay order. "

Germany

(General Comment): In civil matters, legal aid in compulsory enforcement is granted for the entire enforcement proceeding and not for individual enforcement measures.

(2018): -

(2016): Legal aid in compulsory enforcement is granted for the entire enforcement proceedings and not for individual enforcement measures.

Greece

(General Comment): Low-income citizens are entitled to the provision of free legal assistance, that is, the granting of a lawyer, bailiff or notary, in cases of criminal, civil and commercial law of any degree. These include divorce, alimony, custody and communication, insult, paternity recognition, etc.
Greek citizens, EU citizens, as well as third-country citizens or stateless persons are entitled to legal aid if they have a legal residence or habitual residence in Greece. Low-income citizens, beneficiaries of Legal Aid, are those whose annual family income does not exceed two-thirds of the minimum annual individual earnings provided for by the National General Collective Labor Agreement.
Legal Aid is provided at the request of the beneficiary and is provided by law 3226/2004 as in force after its Amendment and completion by law 4274/20

(2019): article 9 par. 2 and 3 of law 3226/2004: Exemption of court fees in civil and commercial cases, of payment of a bailiff as well as the costs of the enforcement procedure

(2018): Exoneration from paying court fees in civil and commercial cases covers court bailiffs' fees.

(2017): Legal aid also includes the bailiff's remuneration.

Hungary

(General Comment): If legal aid is authorized, it extends to all stages of the proceedings, including the enforcement phase. However, it concerns only the fee of the legal aid provider. Besides, legal representation cannot be granted in such cases, but only extrajudicial assistance (legal advice, drafting of documents).

(2021): Legal aid cannot be granted for the fees that are related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (e.g. fees of an enforcement agent), because in Hungary the state-financed legal aid basically covers only the lawyer's fee and, as of 2022, a 25% flat-rate for the lawyer. Previously we marked “Yes” due to a different interpretation, because legal aid extends to all stages of the proceedings, including the enforcement actions, but the state does not pay the fees that are related to the enforcement of judicial decisions (e.g. fees of an enforcement agent).

Ireland

(General Comment): Civil legal aid does not generally include fees in respect of enforcement by an enforcement agent (this is distinct from enforcement of proceedings in a court which may be covered).

Italy

(General Comment): Legal aid also covers expenses related to the enforcement of judicial decisions.

Latvia

(General Comment): In the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from payment of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of the law (Section 567 of the Civil Procedure Law). Moreover, in accordance with Section 11 of the Cabinet of Ministers Regulations No 454 of 26 June 2012 “Regulations on the Remuneration Rates of Sworn Bailiffs”, a sworn bailiff has the right to reduce the remuneration fees.
It is also possible to submit a complaint to the court about the actions of sworn bailiffs, incl. regarding of the fees. Legal aid in such cases is granted. This also applies to previous years' questionnaire periods

(2020): Answer for Q18 is “No”, but in the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism how persons receive support at the enforcement of judicial decisions stage – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from the payment of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of law and in addition sworn bailiffs right to reduce the remuneration fees in another cases.

(2019): Answer for Q18 is “No”, but in the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism how persons receive support at the enforcement of judicial decisions stage – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from the payment of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of law and in addition sworn bailiffs right to reduce the remuneration fees in another cases.

(2017): Answer for Q18 is “No”, but in the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism how persons receive support at the enforcement of judicial decisions stage – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from the payment of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of law and in addition sworn bailiffs right to reduce the remuneration fees in another cases.

(2016): Answer for Q18 is “No”, but In the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism how persons receive support at the enforcement of judicial decisions stage – a legal framework that provides for exemptions from the payment to sworn bailiffs of enforcement of the judgment expenditures on the basis of law and in addition sworn bailiffs right to reduce the remuneration fees in another cases.

Lithuania

(General Comment): The costs of secondary legal aid cover the costs of the execution process (Article 2(1) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid). However, the costs incurred by the debtor in the execution process are not covered.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The amended Law of 10 August 1991 on the profession of lawyer (Art. 37 and 37-1) and, more specifically, the amended Regulation of the Grand-Duché of 18 September 1995 on legal aid (Art. 8) include "fees and costs of bailiffs" among the amounts that may be covered by legal aid.

(2021): The amended Law of 10 August 1991 on the profession of lawyer (Art. 37 and 37-1) and, more specifically, the amended Regulation of the Grand-Duché of 18 September 1995 on legal aid (Art. 8) include "fees and costs of bailiffs" among the amounts that may be covered by legal aid.

(2018): An enforcement agent may be required to have a judicial decision executed.

(2017): An enforcement agent can be mandatory to get a judicial decision executed.

Malta

(General Comment): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through legal aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

(2021): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through legal aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

(2018): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through legal aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

(2017): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through Legal Aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

(2016): Eligible candidates can enforce foreign judgements in Malta through legal aid as long as the procedure is carried out through court representation.

Netherlands

(General Comment): It is noteworthy that the court fees are lower in respect of litigants with lower incomes.

(2021): Article 12, Criminal law on prosecution (Wetboek van Strafvordering)

(2020): Article 12, criminal law on prosecution (wetboek van strafvordering)

(2019): Article 12, Law on Legal Aid (Wet op de Rechtsbijstand)

(2018): Article 12, criminal law on prosecution (wetboek van strafvordering)

(2017): Article 12, criminal law on prosecution (wetboek van strafvordering)

Poland

(General Comment): Civil cases:
Exemption from court fees to which a party is entitled by virtue of the law or granted to a party in preliminary proceedings extends to enforcement proceedings. Additionally, it is possible to apply for exemption from court fees only at the stage of enforcement proceedings.
Criminal cases: If the convicted person fails to comply with the obligation to pay the monetary performance or reparation to the injured party, the judgment together with the enforcement order is sent to the court executive officer who initiates the proceedings. The procedure for pursuing such claims is governed by the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure (claims based on Article 196 § 2 of the Executive Penal Code).
In accordance with the Law on court executive officer fees of 28 February 2018. (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 210), the exemption from court costs to which a party is entitled by virtue of the law or which has been granted to a party in the court proceedings extends to the bailiff's costs (Article 45(1) of the Act). If a party does not exercise this right, the party may apply to the district court by which the judicial officer acts for exemption in whole or in part from enforcement costs. The applicant must prove that he or she is unable to pay the bailiff's fees without prejudice to the necessary maintenance of themselves, or their family (Article 45(2) of the Act).

(2018): The exemption from court costs granted to the party by the court in the exploratory proceeding or from which the party uses the power of the act extends also to enforcement proceedings (Article 771 of the Code of Civil Procedure). In addition, applications: for exemption from court costs and for the appointment of an attorney - an attorney or legal counsel ex officio may also be submitted during enforcement proceedings.

(2017): The cost are connected to the enforcement agent fees and actions.

(2016): The cost are connected to the enforcement agent fees and actions.

Portugal

(General Comment): The Portuguese law foresees the total or partial exemption from court fees and other expenses related to the case, such as fees for the enforcement of judicial decisions.

Romania

(General Comment): For the enforcement phase, legal aid may be granted as facilities at the payment of judicial duties. Moreover, according to Article 6 letter c) of the Government Emergency Ordinance 51/2008, it can also be the payment of the bailiff's fee.

(2017): According to the definition at question 17, for the enforcement phase, legal aid may be granted as facilities at the payment of judicial duties, but, according to Article 6 letter c) of GEO no. 51/2008, it can also be the payment of the bailiff's fee.

(2016): According to the definition at question 17, for the enforcement phase, legal aid may be granted as facilities at the payment of judicial duties, but, according to Article 6 letter c) of GEO no. 51/2008, it can also be the payment of the bailiff's fee.

Slovenia

(General Comment): In the proceeding of enforcement of judicial decisions the exemption from court fees (according to the Court Fees Act) and legal aid in the form of legal advice, legal representation and the exemption from payment of the procedural costs (the Free Legal Aid Act) is possible.

(2020): See general comment.

(2014): In the previous cycle, the answer was No, while for 2014 it changed to Yes, because the question was interpreted as regarding the court fees, exemption of which is regulated under the Court Fees Act and not under the legal aid as regulated by the Free Legal Aid Act (fees related to the enforcement of judicial decisions are still not paid by the party, but the legal ground for the exemption from payment is not legal aid).

Spain

(General Comment): The legal aid supposes the exemption of the taxes for the judicial procedure. The proceeding for the enforcement of judicial decisions is not subject to taxes or judicial fees. Any case, the concepts and costs covered by legal aid in the enforcement would be the same as in the trial.
In relation to enforcement agents, this role is performed by public officials in Spain.

Question 019

Austria

(General Comment): In civil matters, the Austrian Civil Procedure Order provides for that legal aid may cover not only the (provisional) exemption from court fees but also the exemption from fees for witnesses, experts, interpreters and guardians, costs of the necessary announcements and the cash expenditure of guardians or lawyers, representation by a court official or – if necessary – a lawyer. If the personal presence of the parties at a hearing is ordered by the court, their necessary travel expenses are also replaced. Where legal representation is provided, legal aid also covers the pre-trial advice given by the lawyer. If legal aid is granted in the main proceeding, the same also applies to the enforcement proceedings. A party which was granted legal aid for a particular legal dispute in another EU Member State is also entitled to legal aid in Austria for a proceeding concerning the recognition and enforcement of the decision given in that dispute. In criminal matters, there are no costs to bear for the parties, until the court has taken a final decision, which also encompasses a decision on the costs. In case of an acquittal, the State has to bear all the costs. The Public Prosecutor does not have to bear any costs in any case. The Code of Criminal Procedure pinpoints only one exception to this rule, if a person, different from the Public Prosecutor, i.e. “Privatankläger” holds the accusation and loses the case because of an acquittal. In this case, the so called Privatankläger (private prosecutor) has to bear the costs. In case of a false accusation, the person who knowingly accused the (acquitted) perpetrator would have to bear the costs of the trial.

(2019): see general comments

(2018): See above Point 016-1.

Belgium

(General Comment): Judicial assistance is applicable:
1) to all acts related to applications to be brought or pending before a judge in all legal matters (civil, criminal, administrative) or before arbitrators;
2) to acts related to the enforcement of judgments;
3) to proceedings on request;
4) to procedural acts that fall within the jurisdiction of a civil or criminal judge or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer;
5) to mediation procedures, extrajudicial or judicial, conducted by an accredited mediator;
6) to all extrajudicial proceedings imposed by law or by the judge;
7) for the enforcement of authentic acts in another member State of the European Union in the frame of Article 11 of the Council Directive 2002/8/EC of 27 January 2003 to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes, under the conditions defined by that Directive;
8) to the assistance of a technical adviser when a legal expert is required.

(2020): "Legal aid is applicable:
1° to all acts relating to claims to be brought or pending before a judge of the judicial or administrative order or before arbitrators;
2° to acts relating to the execution of judgments and decisions;
3° proceedings on request;
4° to procedural acts that fall within the competence of a member of the judicial order or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer
5° to mediation procedures, extrajudicial or judicial, conducted by a certified mediator
6° to all extrajudicial procedures imposed by law or the judge
7° for the enforcement of authentic instruments in another Member State of the European Union within the framework of Article 11 of Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes, under the conditions defined by this Directive
8° to the assistance of a technical adviser in the case of judicial expertise.
"

(2018): Legal aid is applicable: 1° to all acts relating to claims to be brought or pending before a judge of the judicial or administrative order or before arbitrators;
2° to the acts relating to the execution of judgments and decisions;
3° to the proceedings on request;
4° to the procedural acts that fall within the jurisdiction of a member of the judiciary or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer;
5° to the mediation procedures, extrajudicial or judicial, conducted by an approved mediator;
6° to all extrajudicial proceedings imposed by law or by the judge;
7° for the enforcement of authentic instruments in another Member State of the European Union under Article 11 of Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 aimed at improving access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes, under the conditions defined by that Directive;
8° to the assistance of a technical adviser during judicial expert appraisals.

(2017): Legal assistance is applicable:
(1) to all acts relating to claims to be brought or pending before a judge (civil, penal or administartive) or before arbitrators;
(2) to acts relating to the enforcement of judgments and court decisions;
(3) to proceedings on request;
(4) to procedural acts that fall within the jurisdiction of a member of the civil and penal order or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer;
(5) voluntary or judicial mediation procedures conducted by a mediator approved by the commission referred to in section 1727;
(6) to all extrajudicial proceedings imposed by law or by the judge;
(7) to the enforcement of authentic acts in another Member State of the European Union under Article 11 of the Council Directive 2003/8/EC of 27 January 2003 aimed at improving access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes, under the conditions defined by that Directive.
(8) to the assistance of a technical adviser during judicial expert appraisals.
Articles 691 to 692bis of the Judicial Code set out a series of costs advanced by the State (transport and subsistence costs of judges and public or ministerial officials, witness taxes, interpreters' costs, disbursements of bailiffs, notaries, etc.) for the benefit of the person receiving legal assistance.

(2016): Legal assistance is applicable to:
1 ° all acts relating to applications to be made or pending before a judge of the judicial or administrative order or before arbitrators;
2 ° acts relating to the execution of judgments and decisions;
3 ° proceedings on request;
4° proceedings that fall within the jurisdiction of a member of the Judicial Order or require the intervention of a public or ministerial officer;
5° mediation procedures, whether voluntary or judicial, conducted by a mediator approved by the commission referred to in article 1727;
6 ° [to all extrajudicial procedures imposed by law or by the judge;
7 ° for the enforcement of authentic instruments in another Member State of the European Union within the framework of Article 11 of Council Directive 2003/8 / EC of 27 January 2003 on improving access to justice in cross-border cases by establishing common minimum rules on legal aid granted in such cases, under the conditions laid down in that directive.]
8 ° to the assistance of a technical advisor during judicial appraisals.
Articles 691 to 692bis of the Judicial Code set forth a series of costs advanced by the State (transportation and subsistence expenses of magistrates and public or ministerial officers, taxes of witnesses, interpreters' fees, disbursements of bailiffs, notaries etc ...); to the discharge of the person benefiting from legal aid.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The travel expenses of an official defence counsel are covered by the budget for legal aid administering.
Legal Aid Act: Art. 38 (5) The appointed lawyer shall furthermore be reimbursed for the necessary expenses on the defence, incurred for visit to the places of deprivation of liberty or to detention facilities and on defence in another nucleated settlement according to the procedure established by the Ordinance on Domestic Business Trips.

(2019): Art 38 ал.5 LAA The travel expenses of an official defence counsel are covered by the budget for legal aid administering.

(2017): The travel expenses of an official defense counsel are covered by the budget for legal aid administering.

Croatia

(General Comment): Exemption from court-proceeding-expenses in other than criminal cases is one of the forms of secondary legal aid prescribed by the Law on Legal Aid. It includes exemption from payment costs of witnesses, expert witnesses, court-sworn translators, costs of site visits and court advertisements. The exemption from payment of litigation costs depends on the material conditions and the type of procedure.

(2018): Legal aid may be granted in the form of exemption from payment of court proceeding costs (costs of witnesses, expert witnesses, court-sworn translators, costs of site visits and court advertisements).

(2017): The legal aid can be granted in civil and administrative court proceedings (other than criminal cases) for exemption form payment of court proceedings. The exemption from payment of court proceedings includes the exemption from payment of an advance for the costs of witnesses, expert witnesses, investigation and judicial announcements.

(2016): The legal aid can be granted in civil and administrative court proceedings (other than criminal cases) for exemption from payment of court proceedings. The exemption from payment of court proceedings includes the exemption from payment of an advance for the costs of witnesses, expert witnesses, investigation, judicial announcements.

Cyprus

(2021): These costs can only be given following a court order.

(2019): in 2019 the legal aid law was amended and European arrest warrant procedure was included. These costs include interpreter fees, translation costs, travel expenses of witnesses.

(2017): x

Czech Republic

(General Comment): If legal aid is granted, it covers all costs, including lawyer’s fees, fees of judicial experts, etc.

Denmark

(General Comment): With regard to other than criminal cases, legal aid can be granted for all necessary costs associated with the proceedings. The court decides which expenses are covered by legal aid, e.g. expenses that have been held in connection with a trial with good reason. Fees for technical advisors or experts are covered in criminal cases under special circumstances.

Estonia

(General Comment): At the request of a lawyer who has provided state legal aid, the court, investigative body or prosecutor's office shall determine the reimbursable travel and accommodation expenses incurred by the lawyer or the manager of the law firm in connection with the provision of state legal aid. Travel and accommodation expenses shall be reimbursed only if the State legal aid has been provided in a place other than the town or municipality where the law firm or the structural unit through which the lawyer provides legal services is located.

Finland

(General Comment): The fees and compensations arising from the interpretation and translation services required in the consideration of the matter are waived for a recipient of legal aid. Compensation for a witness called by a party receiving legal aid is paid from the state funds. Other costs arising from presenting evidence by a party receiving legal aid are paid from the state funds if the evidence was necessary for deciding the case. If a party receiving legal aid, other than the defendant in a criminal case, has been summoned to the court in person, the compensation for the costs of appearing before the court are paid from the state funds. Legal aid can be granted for travel and lodging costs for the lawyer, as well as for the expenses of witnesses, expert witnesses included. A state-covered support person may be appointed to a victim of violent or sexual crimes, in addition to his/her legal representation.

(2020): Legal aid can be granted for travel and lodging costs for the lawyer, as well as for the expenses of witnesses, expert witnesses included. A state-covered support person may be appointed to a victim of violent or sexual crimes, in addition to his/her legal representation.

(2019): Legal aid can be granted for travel and lodging costs for the lawyer, as well as for the expenses of witnesses, expert witnesses included. A state-covered support person may be appointed to a victim of violent or sexual crimes, in addition to his/her legal representation.

(2017): Legal aid can include, for example, fees from interpretation services and costs from adducing evidence.

France

(General Comment): Articles 40 and 40-1 of the law of 10 July 1991 on legal aid provide for that the beneficiary of legal aid is entitled to the assistance of a lawyer and all public or ministerial officers (enforcement agents, solicitors and notaries in particular). He/she is also exempt from paying, advancing or depositing all costs relating to the instances, procedures or acts for which it has been granted (expert reports, social surveys, family mediation, etc.), with the exception of a pleading fee of €13.
Source SADJAV

(2020): Legal aid covers all legal costs related to a case (in case of total legal aid); notaries, bailiffs, experts can be paid.

(2019): Legal aid covers all the legal costs related to an instance (in case of total legal aid); can thus be covered notaries', bailiffs' and experts' fees.

(2018): Legal aid covers all legal costs related to a case (in the case of a total AJ); notaries, bailiffs, experts may thus be paid.

(2016): Legal aid may be granted for notary, bailiff and expert fees in the frame of legal proceedings. It may also be granted for the assistance of a lawyer during mediation or settlement.

Germany

(General Comment): The approval of legal aid includes the costs for the taking of evidence (e.g. witnesses, experts), as well as travel expenses of the recipient to attend a court hearing if personal attendance at the hearing is necessary. Expenditure for the preparation of the proceedings (e.g. expert witnesses, interpreters) may be refundable as necessary expenditure of the appointed solicitor.
With regard to criminal cases: Other costs are considered costs of the proceedings. These are settled after the discontinuation or final conclusion of the criminal proceedings and not paid in advance. The only exception being travel costs of a defendant who does not have sufficient financial means. However, since these costs are also considered costs of the proceedings, the defendant must pay them as far as he or she is convicted. Insofar as the defendant is acquitted, the state treasury must bear the costs and expenses of the proceedings.

(2017): If granted, legal aid covers all of the costs of the legal dispute. In particular, this includes the cost of a court-ordered taking of evidence, as well as the costs for compensating witnesses or obtaining expert reports.

(2016): If granted, legal aid covers all of the costs of the legal dispute. In particular, this includes the cost of a court-ordered taking of evidence, as well as the costs for compensating witnesses or obtaining expert reports.

Greece

(General Comment): Furthermore, if an expert's opinion is considered by the court to be necessary then the relevant costs are covered by the State.
With regard to administrative courts, there is not any such legislative provision, while in civil and commercial cases legal aid is granted for expert fees.

(2019): appointment of a lawyer, notary, bailiff
payment of a lawyer, notary, bailiff, witness

(2017): Regarding "criminal cases", the ex officio appointment of a lawyer is provided. Furthermore, if an expert's opinion is considered by the court to be necessary then the relevant costs are covered by the State. As far as "civil and commercial cases" are concerned, legal aid also includes notaries, bailiff's and services of judicial documents cost.
With regard to Administrative courts, there is no specific legislative provision, except Articles 199 and 200 of the code of civil procedure.

Hungary

(2021): In both cases (“Criminal cases” and “Other than criminal cases”) the state-financed legal aid basically covers only the lawyer's fee and, as of 2022, a 25% flat-rate for the lawyer; however, the reimbursement of a few other costs (for example: travel, parking costs and phone, postal expenses) may also be requested. We must note that we don’t have accurate data regarding this question since in criminal cases the appointment of the officially appointed defence counsels and determining the fee of an officially appointed defence counsel are the competence of the Bar Association, and legal aid belongs to the government offices.

Ireland

(General Comment): In criminal cases, legal aid can cover the cost of expert witnesses (medical and technical), interpreters, translation service providers, travel costs, disbursements i.e. photocopying costs, prison visits.
In civil cases, fees of other professionals may be covered where it is necessary having regard to the circumstances of the case.

(2017): In criminal cases, legal aid can cover the cost of expert witnesses (medical and technical), interpreters, translation service providers, travel costs, disbursements i.e. photocopying costs, prison visits.
In other than criminal cases, a legally aided person may apply through their solicitor for the fees of expert witnesses and other experts to be covered.

Italy

(General Comment): Legal aid can also be granted for costs related to private detectives, interpreters and expert witnesses.

Latvia

(General Comment): In the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism - a legal framework that provides for exemptions from payment of court costs granted on the basis of the law by the judge in civil proceedings (Section 43 of the Civil Procedure Law). Besides, the Criminal Procedure Law stipulates which costs, for example, conducting of inspections, shall be assumed by the State. The mentioned regulation is applying to court proceedings and exemptions rules in their respect (for example concerning the expertise costs etc).
In addition, according to the State Ensured Legal Aid Law, in cross-borders cases a person has the right to receive the following: 1) services of an interpreter; 2) translation of documents requested by the court or the competent authority and submitted by the recipient of legal aid, which are necessary for adjudication of the matter; 3) payment of expenses related to the attendance at court sittings, if the presence of the person in court is provided for by the law or if the court requests so, deciding that the relevant person cannot be heard in another way (the Legal Aid Administration makes a decision).
In accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1493 of 22 December 2009 “Regulations Regarding the Amount of State-ensured Legal Aid, the Amount of Payment, Reimbursable Expenses and the Procedures for Payment Thereof”, if legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses shall be covered from the State budget. It is relevant for all cases – civil, administrative and criminal. In asylum cases and cases related to foreigners who are obligated to be returned, the responsible institution – the Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs or the Legal Aid Administration – shall ensure the communication of the applicant for legal aid with the provider of legal aid, which covers costs of the interpretation services.
In questions 16-18 it is indicated that the state provides representation in court and legal advice, but in Latvia it is provided and paid also for preparation of procedural documents in all types of cases and in criminal cases for representation in the pre-trial criminal proceedings.

(2020): We can indicate that additional persons are exempted, for example, from expertise, interpreters and travel expenses (in cross border disputes). If the legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses also shall be covered from the State budget. In questions 16-18 it is indicated that the state provides representation in court and legal advice, but in Latvia it is provided and paid also for preparation of procedural documents in all types of cases and in criminal cases for representation in the pre-trial criminal proceedings.

(2019): We can indicate that additional persons are exempted, for example, from expertise, interpreters and travel expenses (in cross border disputes). If the legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses also shall be covered from the State budget. In questions 16-18 it is indicated that the state provides representation in court and legal advice, but in Latvia it is provided and paid also for preparation of procedural documents in all types of cases and in criminal cases for representation in the pre-trial criminal proceedings.

(2017): We can indicate that additional persons are exempted, for example, from expertise, interpreters and travel expenses (in cross border disputes). If the legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses also shall be covered from the State budget. In questions 16-18 it is indicated that the state provides representation in court and legal advice, but in Latvia it is provided and paid also for preparation of procedural documents in all types of cases and in criminal cases for representation in the pre-trial proceedings.

(2016): indicates that additional persons are exempted, for example, from expertise, interpreters and travel expenses.
In accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1493 of 22 December 2009 “Regulations Regarding the Amount of State-ensured Legal Aid, the Amount of Payment, Reimbursable Expenses and the Procedures for Payment Thereof” the State shall pay to the provider of legal aid also for drawing up procedural documents in all kind of legal aid cases and for representation in pre-trial criminal proceedings.

Lithuania

(General Comment): The costs of secondary legal aid from which the applicant is exempted are: litigation costs incurred in civil proceedings, the costs incurred in administrative proceedings, the costs related to the hearing of a civil action brought in a criminal matter, the costs related to defence and representation in court (including the appeal and cassation proceedings, irrespective of the initiator) as well as the costs of the execution process, the costs related to the drafting of procedural documents and collection of evidence, interpretation, representation in the event of preliminary extrajudicial consideration of a dispute, where such a procedure has been laid down by laws or by a court decision (Article 14(2) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid). The costs of state-guaranteed legal aid cover also the costs of interpretation of communication between the lawyer and the applicant where, in the cases provided for in treaties of the Republic of Lithuania, it is impossible to ensure that a person providing state-guaranteed legal aid communicates with the applicant in the language which the latter understands (Article 14(10) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid).
Where the physical presence of an applicant is required by the law or by the court, the travel costs to be borne by an applicant are borne by the State-guaranteed legal aid service (Article 20(2) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid). Where the physical presence of an applicant is required by the law or by the court, the travel costs to be borne by an applicant are borne by the State-guaranteed legal aid service (Article 20(2) of the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid).

Luxembourg

(2017): /

Netherlands

(General Comment): Legal aid can also be granted for the following costs: travel costs, interpreter and translation costs, administrative costs, medical expert costs in injury cases for which a special regulation exists.

(2018): Legal aid can also be granted for the following costs: travel costs, interpreter and translation costs, administrative costs, special regulation for medical expert costs in injury cases.

Poland

**(General Comment): ***In civil proceedings, exemption from court costs may relate to fees and expenses. Expenses include in particular: travel costs of a party who is exempt from court costs related to a personal appearance ordered by a court; reimbursement of travel and accommodation costs as well as lost earnings or witness income; remuneration and reimbursement of costs incurred by experts, translators and probation officers established for a party in a given case; lump-sum costs of taking evidence from the opinion-giving opinion of a team of court specialists; remuneration due to other persons or institutions and reimbursement of costs incurred by them; costs of carrying out other evidence; the costs of transporting animals and goods, keeping them or storing them; advertising costs; costs of detention and custody; lump sums due to probation officers for conducting environmental interviews in cases of: annulment of marriage, for divorce and separation, as well as for participation in parents' contacts with children determined by the court; the cost of issuing a certificate by a forensic doctor; the cost of mediation conducted as a result of referral by the court.
*In criminal proceedings, unless the Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates otherwise, all expenses are temporarily lectured by the State Treasury. A witness shall be entitled to reimbursement of travel expenses from his place of residence to the place where the court proceedings are to be conducted upon the order of the court or the authority conducting the pre-trial proceedings. The witness shall be entitled to reimbursement of travel costs from his place of residence to the place where the procedural activities are to be performed at the request of the court or the authority conducting preparatory proceedings. The witness shall also be entitled to reimbursement of earnings or income lost in connection with appearance at the summons of the court or the authority conducting the pre-trial proceedings. A person summoned as a witness is also entitled to reimbursement of the costs of travel and accommodation on condition of appearance. *If a party to a notary's activity is not able to incur the remuneration required by a notary public for its own and for the family, it may apply to the district court competent for its place of residence to release in full or in part from this remuneration. This provision shall apply accordingly to a legal person that proves that he has insufficient funds to incur the remuneration demanded by a notary public.
The court, after determining that there is a need to perform a notarial act, takes into account the application and appoints a notary to perform the requested notarial activity (Article 6 of the Act of 14 February 1991 on Notary Public Rights).

(2017): Expert fees and travel cost reimbursement.

(2016): Expert fees and travel cost reimbursement.

Portugal

(General Comment): The Portuguese law provides for the total or partial exemption from court fees and other expenses related to the case.

(2021): Legal aid may also include fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries) and travel costs. In addition, all applications, certificates and any other documents requested for legal protection purposes are exempt from taxes, fees and charges.

(2020): Legal aid may also include fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries) and travel costs. In addition, all applications, certificates and any other documents requested for legal protection purposes are exempt from taxes, fees and charges.

(2019): Legal aid may also include fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries) and travel costs. In addition,all applications, certificates and any other documents requested for legal protection purposes are exempt from taxes, fees and charges.

(2018): Legal aid may also include fees of technical advisors or experts, costs of other legal professionals (notaries) and travel costs. In addition,all applications, certificates and any other documents requested for legal protection purposes are exempt from taxes, fees and charges.

Romania

(General Comment): According to Article 6 letter b) of the Government Emergency Ordinance 51/2008, public aid may also cover costs of the expert, translator or interpreter services during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to law.

(2021): According to the Article 6 letter b) GEO no. 51/2008, public aid may be also the payment of the expert, translator or interpreter used during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to the law.

(2020): According to the Article 6 letter b) GEO no. 51/2008, public aid may be also the payment of the expert, translator or interpreter used during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to the law.

(2017): According to the Article 6 letter b) GEO no. 51/2008, public aid may be also the payment of the expert, translator or interpreter used during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to the law.

(2016): According to the Article 6 letter b) GEO no. 51/2008, public aid may be also the payment of the expert, translator or interpreter used during the trial, with the consent of the court or of the jurisdictional authority, if this payment is the obligation of the one requiring judicial public aid, according to the law.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): Other costs provided by Centre for Legal Aid are costs for lawyers who represent the client at courts and these lawyers has been provided by Centre for Legal Aid. All costs paid by Centre are established in law no. 655/2004 Z. z.
Under the section 5c of the Act on Providing Legal Aid to persons in material need No. 327/2005: Legal aid shall also include: appointment of an interpreter; translation of documents necessary for decision on merits.

(2017): Under the section 5c of the Act on Providing Legal Aid to persons in material need (No. 327/2005): Legal aid shall also include: -appointment of an interpreter
-translation of documents necessary for decision on merits
-inevitable travel costs of foreign applicant

Slovenia

(General Comment): The Free Legal Aid Act (FLAA) prescribes that legal aid shall mean the right of the eligible person to the entire or partial provision of funds necessary to cover the costs of legal assistance and the right to exemption of payment of the costs of the judicial proceeding. Further on the law defines that legal aid may be approved for legal advice, legal representation and other legal services, for all forms of judicial protection before all courts of general jurisdiction and specialised courts based in the Republic of Slovenia, before the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Slovenia, and before all authorities, institutions or persons in the Republic of Slovenia authorised for out-of-court settlement, as well as in the form of exemption from payment of the costs of the judicial proceeding.
The law specifically lists the costs that can be covered by the approved legal aid: for legal advice; for the formulation, verification and certification of documents on legal relations, facts and statements; for legal advice and representation in cases of out-of-court settlement; for legal advice and representation before courts in the first and second instances; for legal advice and representation involving extraordinary appeals; for legal advice and representation involving constitutional action; for legal advice and representation before international courts; for legal advice and representation involving the filing of a petition for the assessment of constitutionality; in the form of exemption from payment of the costs of the judicial or extrajudicial proceeding.
Legal aid may also be granted in the form of an exemption from payment of the costs of proceedings before courts, particularly in the form of an exemption from payment of: costs of experts, witnesses, interpreters, servicing orders and translations, costs of external operations of the court or other authority in the Republic of Slovenia, and other justified costs; security deposits for the costs or of the costs, of the implementation of the proceeding (advance payments); costs of public documents and receipts required for the proceeding before a court; other costs of the proceeding. The legal aid system does not cover the costs of the proceeding and actual expenditure of and remuneration for the person representing the opposing party.

(2020): See general comment.

Spain

(General Comment): According to Legal Aid Act: Legal assistance to the arrested, prisoner or accused who had not appointed a lawyer, for any police action; Free insertion of announcements, during the process, in official newspapers; Free expert assistance; Free collection (or reduction of 80% of fees depending on cases) of copies, testimonies, instruments and notarial acts; Reduction of 80% of fees for notes, certifications, annotations, in the Property and Commercial Registries.

Question 020

Austria

(2016): Legal aid can not be granted for cases that have not been brought to court. Analysis of the non-litigious cases for which legal aid has been granted is not avaiable.

Belgium

(2021): For second line legal aid, the number of cases closed for the year 2020-2021 amounts to 217 039 for Belgium. For the year 2020-2021, the number of cases closed in criminal matters amounts to 79 662 and 137 377 for other matters.
As regards judicial assistance (one of the components of the legal aid in the sense of the questionnaire), the figure is 17 995: these are cases brought before the following courts: first instance courts (civil and family section), company courts and labour tribunals, courts of appeal, criminal section (in criminal matters) and courts of appeal, civil section, and labour court (in other matters). The number of closed cases for which legal aid was granted in full or in part is included in the figures in each category.

(2020): For second-line legal aid, the number of cases closed for the year 2019-2020 amounts to 203,305 for Belgium. The figures for the 2018-2019 year were 196,840.
For the year 2019-2020, the number of cases closed in criminal matters is 76,561 and 126,744 for other matters.
Regarding legal aid, it can be noted that the figure of 16,266 corresponds to cases brought before the following courts: court of first instance (civil and family sections), enterprise court and labor court, court of appeal, criminal section (in criminal matters), and court of appeal, civil section, and labor court (in matters other than criminal).The number of closed cases for which legal aid was granted is included in the figures each time.

(2016): With regard to cases brought to courts, the only figure in our possession is the number of lawyers' appointments. This does not necessarily mean that the case will be closed or even brought to court (even if it is often the case). For the year 2015-2016, there has been 272,313 lawyers' designations (knowing that there may be several designations for a procedure). There is no distinction by subject.
With regard to second-line legal aid, however, the number of cases closed in criminal cases (excluding court work) for the 2015-2016 judicial year is available: 78172. For other subjects (year 2015- 2016): 155,769.
Regarding the number of cases (cases not brought to courts) that benefited from second-line legal aid, we have partial figures from the OVB (order of the Flemish Bars) for the year 2015- 2016: Cases that ended with an amicable settlement or transaction: 4097.

(2014): As for secondary legal assistance, for the judicial year 2013-2014 the number of cases solved which benefited from legal aid was 212 495. Regarding legal assistance, data are incomplete. Concerning 1st instance courts (civil cases), there were 20 033 orders granting or refusing legal assistance. In respect of commercial courts, 1 023 orders of the Legal Assistance Office granted legal assistance.
For the period 2013-2014 (September to September), secondary legal assistance has been allocated in favour of 212 495 resolved cases. As regards legal assistance, data are incomplete. And regarding first instance courts ruling on civil matter, 20 033 orders have been made, granting or refusing legal assistance. For commercial courts, 1 023 orders of the Judicial Assistance Office have approved the legal assistance.

(2012): For 2012, the number of non-litigious cases for which legal aid has been granted was 16 432 as regards the Order of the French and German Speaking Bars (Ordre des barreaux francophones et germanophones (OBFG)) and 41 618 as regards the Order of the Dutch Speaking Bars (Ordre des Barreaux néerlandophones (OVB)).

Bulgaria

(General Comment): According to the Bulgarian Law on Legal Aid / LPA / there are four types of legal aid: 1. preliminary legal aid for consultation with a view to reaching an agreement before the commencement of court proceedings or for filing a case; 2. preparation of documents for filing a case; 3. legal aid for procedural representation in an already initiated case in the court or in the pre-trial bodies; 4. legal assistance in case of detention under the Law on the Ministry of Interior and under the Law on Customs, which is a representation by a lawyer before pre-trial criminal proceedings are instituted. The provided data is only in respect of the legal aid for procedural representation in an already initiated case in the court or in the pre-trial bodies (3.)

(2020): The provided data is only in respect of the legal aid for procedural representation in an already initiated case in the court or in the pre-trial bodies.

(2018): The number of other than criminal cases brought to court for which legal aid has been granted increased due to the broadening of the net of Regional Centres for consultation functioning in some Bar Councils. The consultations in the centres are predominantly of civil matters and in most of the cases there are grounds for bringing legal proceedings.

(2016): The increasing of the number of cases other than criminal for which legal aid was provided is due to the amendments (in force from 19 March 2013) in the Legal Aid Act according to which the circle of persons entitled to legal aid was broadened. Foremost there was an increase of the number of cases for which legal aid was provided for seekers of international protection under the Asylum and Refugees Act; under the Law on Child Protection; for persons entitled to maintenance under Council Regulation (EC) No 4/2009 on jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation in matters relating to maintenance obligations; for victims of domestic or sexual violence or of trafficking in human beings. Furthermore, there are two new forms for providing legal aid for consultation – the National Telephone Line for Legal Aid as well as Regional Centres for consultation functioning in some the the Bar Councils. Thanks to those two forms for providing legal aid the number of other than criminal cases increased. In respect to criminal cases not brought to court, they remain 0 as in 2014. The increase in the number of criminal cases brought to court for which legal aid has been granted stems also from the amendment to the Legal Aid Act and the extension of the legal aid scope.

Croatia

(2021): Information not available on cases brought/not brought to court following granting legal aid

(2018): In 2018. the annual approved and implemented public budget for provision of legal aid in other than criminal cases for cases not brought to court has been increased. This is the result of the increased number of financed projects (NGO's and Legal Clinics) for providing primary legal aid and, subsequently, number of cases in which primary legal aid has been provided increased in this period.

(2016): The difference between data for 2014 and 2016 occur because data for 2014 only covered the period from 1 September to 31 December 2014, since keeping the record started on 1 September, while data for 2016 include the period of 1 January to 31 December 2016.

(2014): In 2014, the most of the cases for which free legal aid was granted were family law cases. In total of 374 cases, an exemption from paying costs of court proceedings was granted. In 1167 cases, an exemption from payment of court fees was approved.
In the frame of the 2014 exercise, the attention was drawn on the entry into force of a new Free Legal Aid Act in January 2014. Accordingly, the range of legal issues in which primary free legal aid (cases not brought to court) can be granted has been expanded (with certain exceptions, in proprietary rights, labour relations, enforcement and insurance proceedings, amicable dispute resolution, administrative and civil proceedings). On the contrary, in 2012, primary free legal aid could have been granted only with regard to the citizen status rights, retirement and/or health insurance, exceptionally, in all the other administrative proceedings and the protection of employees' rights with regard to the employer. Due to this expansion and the fact that primary free legal aid is available to a wider range of users, there is a significant increase of the number of cases for which legal aid has been granted (1018 in 2014 in comparison to 465 in 2012).

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been specified that from 1st February 2009 until 7 November 2013, legal aid has been granted in 18,905 other than criminal cases (both brought to the court and not brought to the court). In 2012, it has been granted in 5,872 other than criminal cases (both brought to the court and not brought to the court).
In the frame of the 2012 evaluation cycle, it has been specified that from 1st February 2009 until 7 November 2013, legal aid was granted in 2,900 cases that were not conducted before a court. In 2012, legal aid was granted in 465 such cases.

Cyprus

(2020): Other cases include civil cases for serious violations of human rights and family court cases. In the last cycle we did not have available statistics on the family court cases, and in this cycle we have included these cases.

Denmark

(2021): In Denmark, there are four different authorities that can grant legal aid: 1) The courts can grant legal aid to the cases listed in section 327 of the Administrative Procedure Act. 2) In other cases legal aid is granted by the Civil Affairs Agency. 3) The Ministry of Justice processes legal aid cases where the Civil Affairs Agency declares itself incompetent.
4) Complaints over decisions made by the Civil Affairs Agency and the Ministry of Justice can be brought before the Appeals Permission Board. The total number of cases listed above (4098 cases) stems from information given by the the National Board of Justice. It includes all cases brought before the courts where legal aid was granted by either the courts, the Civil Affairs Agency, the Ministry of Justice or the Appeals Permission Board. We are unable to obtain the number of cases not brought before the courts, but where legal aid was granted.

(2016): The 2.071 cases mentioned above is the number of civil cases in district courts where it is noted on the case that one or all parties have been granted legal aid.

(2014): In 2014, the overall number of finalized civil cases has decreased about 15% and the number of cases granted with legal aid follows the same trend. The number of petty cases where parties are not supposed to have a lawyer – and therefore do not need legal aid - did not overall fall that much. Accordingly, cases where legal aid does not apply constitute a bigger part of the total, while the number of cases granted with legal aid decreased.
According to 2014 data, there are several voluntary organizations as well as law students etc., offering free assistance in legal matters. It is also possible to pay an insurance to safeguard oneself if a situation arises where help is needed. It is not a part of the "system" as such but it is definitely a part of the overall picture.

Estonia

(General Comment): The number of cases referred to court for which legal aid has been granted and the number of cases for which legal aid has been granted only for legal advice cannot be separated.

(2014): The total number of cases for which legal aid has been granted in 2014 is 16 110.

(2012): The total number of cases for which legal aid has been granted in 2012 is 17 031.

Finland

(General Comment): Legal aid decisions are taken by the State Legal Aid Offices. Legal aid can be provided in respect of almost any sort of legal matter. In court cases the applicant has a choice of lawyers: (1) a public legal aid lawyer (working at the State Legal Aid Office) or (2) a private lawyer, who can be an advocate (member of the Finnish Bar Association) or a licensed lawyer (lawyer who has been granted a permit by the Licensed Lawyers Board to act as an licensed lawyer). In certain matters legal aid is only given by public legal aid lawyers.

(2021): At the moment, the requested data cannot be provided because the reporting system of the legal aid is currently being renewed.

(2020): At the moment, the requested data cannot be provided because the reporting system of the legal aid is currently being renewed.

(2018): The public legal aid offices received a total of 48 045 cases of which 6 751 were criminal cases and 41 294 other than criminal cases. 20 % of cases dealt with by the legal aid offices were closed with court proceedings. Private lawyers received 32 683 legal aid cases of which 22 040 were criminal cases and 10 643 other than criminal cases.

(2016): The public legal aid offices received a total of 50,369 cases (2014: 46734), of which 6,762 were criminal cases and 43,607 other than criminal cases. Of the 50,369 cases dealt with by the legal aid offices 20 per cent were closed with court proceedings.
Private lawyers handled 41,315 legal aid cases, of which 54 per cent were criminal cases and 46 per cent other than criminal cases.

France

(General Comment): The data provided correspond to the number of admissions to legal aid per year.

(2021): The discrepancies are due to the effects of the health crisis. Source SADJAV

(2020): We do not have the information to distinguish between the number of cases brought and not brought to court. The decrease in the number of cases that received legal aid is explained by the particular context of the health crisis in 2020.

(2014): In 2012, 52 transactional negotiations were the subject of a mission of assistance under legal aid. In addition, for information or legal advice but also for measures of settlement of disputes, 741,459 people were received in a House of Justice and Law, including by associations in the field of access to the law or lawyers, notaries and bailiffs for legal consultations or by justice conciliators.

(2012): In 2012, 68 transactional negotiations were the subject of a mission of assistance under legal aid. In addition, for information or legal advice but also for measures of settlement of disputes, 713,319 people were received in a House of Justice and Law, including by associations in the field of access to the law or lawyers, notaries and bailiffs for legal consultations or by justice conciliators.

Germany

(General Comment): In criminal cases, legal aid is granted. However, this is not separately statistically recorded. Therefore: "NA".

(2012): The information provided for 2012 included approvals of legal aid with installment payments.
The 2012 data referred to the number of cases where legal advice and assistance was granted by the local courts, including the certificates issued by the local courts entitling the applicant to legal advice and assistance, upon application filed directly by the person seeking redress and/or with the support of a lawyer. Data from Bremen and Hamburg are not included since these Länder have public legal advice offices.

Greece

(2020): Evidence has been provided by different courts, but not by their totality, so there is not enough data to give a full answer.

(2018): From the 657 cases, 637 correspond to cases from administrative disputes in general, while 20 cases correspond to the Council of State (the same 20 cases that were brought to court). More specifically, for the Council of State and for 2018, 52 applications were submitted, 20 of which were accepted.

(2016): Statistical data may be available next year.

Hungary

(2021): The provided total data is based on data directly from the specialised filing system. The total number is an aggregate only of the numbers of the 19 counties and the capital city, and is not available as requested (distinguished to “In criminal cases” and “In other than criminal cases”.)
As it is well known, in 2020 due COVID-19 pandemic the personal appearance of the clients strongly decreased, therefore the applications for legal aid and the number of cases where legal aid was granted decreased also heavily in comparison to 2018. In 2021, the case numbers began to increase again. Only the total numbers are available, so we marked “NA”, beacause there is no specific data available for “criminal cases” and “other than criminal cases”.

(2016): Official statistics of the Ministry of Justice

Ireland

(General Comment): In Criminal Cases - this represents the number of criminal legal aid certificates which originated from the criminal prosecutions in the District Court.
In "other than criminal cases" the 'number of cases brought before the court' is the number of legal aid certificates granted. The number of 'cases not brought to court/non-litigious cases' is the number of applications for civil legal aid and advice. However please note that any advice case may progress to being an aid case and the Legal Aid Board does not keep a record of what specific cases never progressed beyond advice stage (i.e. this figure includes all of the cases which eventually became aid cases).

(2020): We have data for the total criminal legal aid certificates issue, but the necessary breakdown is not available.

(2018): In Criminal Cases - this represents the number of criminal legal aid certificates, which originated from the criminal prosecutions in the District Court.
In "other than criminal cases" the 'number of cases brought before the court' is the number of legal aid certificates granted.
The number of 'cases not brought to court/non-litigious cases' is the number of applications for civil legal aid and advice. However please note that any advice case may progress to being an aid case and the Legal Aid Board does not keep a record of what specific cases never progressed beyond advice stage (i.e. this figure includes all of the cases which eventually became aid cases).

(2012): The 2012 data does not include asylum cases where legal aid was granted.

Italy

(General Comment): On the occasion of the 2012 evaluation cycle, it has been explained that the higher number of cases for which legal aid had been granted compared to 2010 was due to the fact that the threshold concerning the income and assets evaluation had been slightly increased. Owing to that, since 2012, Italy is experiencing a positive trend in this respect. Additionally, more and more people are living under the threshold under which legal aid can be granted. These numbers must also be seen in the light of the trend of the incoming cases. In recent years the number of incoming cases has decreased, especially in 2019-2020 due to the pandemic.

(2020): The number of cases not brought to court is not available because this figure is not registered anywhere.
Since these cases are not brought to court, these events are outside the sphere of competence/vision of the Ministry of Justice.
However, the vast majority of legal aid cases is ascribed to cases brought to court. For this reason, even though the total is composed of both components, when calculating the total we can omit cases not brought to court.
Covid19 has deeply affected the flow of the incoming cases. Not only the courts were temporary closed but other than that we went through a long period of lockdown and therefore most existing proceedings were delayed and incoming cases drastically fell. The fall of LA cases is the obvious consequence of the above-described scenario.

(2018): The above figure included number of legal aid granted to administrative proceedings.

Latvia

(General Comment): The Legal Aid Administration is the competent authority for providing State ensured legal aid in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases and in a Constitutional Court process. It cannot identify data on legal aid granted specifically to cases referred to court. It is noteworthy that one case can last for several years. Consequently, in a given year the Legal Aid Administration shall provide legal aid both in cases undertaken in the previous years and new cases. In criminal proceedings, the advocate shall provide the State ensured legal aid upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the elder of the sworn advocates or if urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates. In these cases, the Legal Aid Administration shall perform payments to an advocate regarding the legal assistance provided. The Legal Aid Administration cannot identify data on legal aid granted specifically to cases referred to court.

(2021): Legal Aid Administration is the competent authority of providing the State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases. In 2021 the Legal Aid Administration received 1212 applications for request of State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases, decisions on ensuring legal aid were adopted in 864 cases, legal aid was ensured in 62 asylum and return cases. It must be noted that one case can last for several years, depending on the duration of proceedings, consequently, in a given year the Legal Aid Administration shall provide the legal aid both in cases undertaken in the previous years and new cases. The advocate shall provide the State ensured legal aid in criminal proceedings upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the senior of the sworn advocates or in urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates. In these cases, the Legal Aid Administration shall perform payments to an advocate regarding the legal assistance provided. According to the data available to the Legal Aid Administration legal aid was provided in approximately 6224 criminal proceedings. Legal Aid Administration alone cannot select data on legal aid in cases existing directly in proceedings.

(2020): Legal Aid Administration is the competent authority of providing the State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases. In 2020 the Legal Aid Administration received 1146 applications for request of State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases, decisions on ensuring legal aid were adopted in 847 cases, legal aid was ensured in 54 asylum and return cases. It must be noted that one case can last for several years, depending on the duration of proceedings, consequently, in a given year the Legal Aid Administration shall provide the legal aid both in cases undertaken in the previous years and new cases. The advocate shall provide the State ensured legal aid in criminal proceedings upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the senior of the sworn advocates or in urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates. In these cases, the Legal Aid Administration shall perform payments to an advocate regarding the legal assistance provided. According to the data available to the Legal Aid Administration legal aid was provided in approximately 7286 criminal proceedings. Legal Aid Administration alone cannot select data on legal aid in cases existing directly in proceedings.

(2018): Legal Aid Administration is the competent authority of providing the State ensured legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases. The Legal Aid Administration alone cannot select data on legal aid in existing cases directly in proceedings. In 2018 the Legal Aid Administration received 1665 applications for request of State ensured legal aid, decisions on ensuring legal aid in civil cases were adopted in 1253 cases, legal aid was ensured in 31 asylum cases. It must be noted that one case can last for several years, depending on the duration of proceedings, consequently, in a given year the Legal Aid Administration shall provide the legal aid both in cases undertaken in the previous years and new cases. The advocate shall provide the State ensured legal aid in criminal proceedings upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the senior of the sworn advocates or in urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates. In these cases, the Legal Aid Administration shall perform payments to an advocate regarding the legal assistance provided. According to the data available to the Legal Aid Administration legal aid was provided in approximately 8 347 criminal proceedings. Legal Aid Administration alone cannot select data on legal aid in cases existing directly in proceedings.

(2016): In the Republic of Latvia there is another mechanism - the Civil Procedure Law and the Criminal Procedure Law stipulates which costs, for example, conducting of inspections, costs of the services of an interpreter shall be assumed by the State.
According the State Ensured Legal Aid Law in cross border cases in addition a person has the right to receive the following:
1) services of an interpreter;
2) a translation of such document requested by the court or the competent authority and submitted by the recipient of legal aid, which is necessary for adjudication of the matter; and
3) the payment of such expenses which are related to attendance at court sittings, if the presence of the person in court is provided for in law or if the court requests it, deciding that the relevant person cannot be heard in another way.
In accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1493 of 22 December 2009 “Regulations Regarding the Amount of State-ensured Legal Aid, the Amount of Payment, Reimbursable Expenses and the Procedures for Payment Thereof”, if the legal aid is provided outside the place of practice of the provider of legal aid, his or her travelling (transport) expenses and hotel (accommodation) expenses shall be covered from the State budget.
In accordance with the Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 1493 of 22 December 2009 “Regulations Regarding the Amount of State-ensured Legal Aid, the Amount of Payment, Reimbursable Expenses and the Procedures for Payment Thereof” the State shall pay to the provider of legal aid also for drawing up procedural documents in all kind of legal aid cases and for representation in pre-trial criminal proceedings.

(2014): For 2014, the Legal Aid Administration received 2 318 applications requesting State ensured legal aid which was granted to 1 850 civil cases and 9 administrative cases. In criminal matters, legal aid was provided in approximately 10 300 cases.

Lithuania

(General Comment): The number provided for non-litigious cases or cases not brought to court indicates the number of matters when primary legal aid (legal information, legal advice, drafting of the documents to be submitted to State and municipal institutions, with the exception of procedural documents, advice on the out-of-court settlement of a dispute, actions for the amicable settlement of a dispute and drafting of a settlement agreement) was granted.

(2021): The number provided for cases not brought to court indicates the number of matters when primary legal aid was granted. The number for cases brought to court indicates the number of matters when secondary legal aid was granted. In total 28184 cases: 19616 criminal cases (18421 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a lawyer is mandatory and 1195 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service where the presence of a lawyer is not mandatory) and 8568 other cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service.

(2020): The number provided for cases not brought to court indicates the number of matters when primary legal aid was granted. The number for cases brought to court indicates the number of matters when secondary legal aid was granted. In total 36544 cases: 27442 criminal cases (26102 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a lawyer is mandatory and 1340 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service where the presence of a lawyer is not mandatory) and 9102 in other than criminal cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service.
The number of decisions to grant secondary legal aid decreased due to the Covid-19 related extreme situation and quarantine. The number of applications decreased despite the fact that it was possible to submit an application by electronic means or mail.

(2018): Primary legal aid (cases not brought to court) was granted for 41791 legal enquires.
Secondary legal aid (cases brought to court) was granted in total in 42248 cases: - 26833 criminal cases (24944 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a lawyer is mandatory and 1889 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service where the presence of a lawyer is not mandatory);
- 15415 civil and administrative matters by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service.

(2016): It is not possible to calculate and separate the cases where persons who were granted secondary legal aid have eventually brought their cases to courts. Only the total number of secondary legal aid provided is available. In total secondary legal aid was granted in 41063 cases: 24609 criminal cases (22777 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a defence lawyer is mandatory and 1832 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service where defence is not mandatory or the person is an aggrieved party).
Secondary legal aid was granted for 16454 civil and administrative matters by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid service.

(2014): In criminal cases, litigants have the right to legal aid in pre-trial investigation procedures. However, the latter may be terminated due to various reasons. Accordingly, it is impossible to identify the number of cases granted with legal aid and referred to court. Only the total number of secondary legal aid provided is available: 32 699 criminal cases (30879 cases by decisions of a pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or the court when the presence of a defence lawyer is mandatory and 1820 cases by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid services where defence is not mandatory or the person is an aggrieved party); 14 206 civil and 722 administrative matters by decisions of State-guaranteed legal aid services.
In 2014, primary legal aid (legal information, legal advice and drafting of the documents to be submitted to state and municipal institutions, with the exception of procedural documents) was granted for 45443 legal enquires.

The Law on State-guaranteed Legal Aid has been amended from 1st of January 2014, enabling easier access to secondary legal aid (e.g. applicants are no longer obligated to address local tax administrator for a stamp on their annual declaration of income and assets; they may choose any practising lawyer for the provision of secondary legal aid).

(2012): For 2012, the number of criminal cases subsumes: cases for which the presence of a defence lawyer is mandatory and for which legal aid was granted by a decision of a pre-trial investigation officer (17 853), prosecutor or the court (15 312); cases for which defence is not mandatory or the person is an aggrieved party and for which legal aid was granted by a decision of State-guaranteed legal aid services (2 146). The number of other than criminal cases includes cases where legal aid was granted in civil (13 595) or administrative (786) matters by a decision of State-guaranteed legal aid services.

Luxembourg

(2021): The Diekirch Bar did not provide details on the legal matter of the cases that were granted with legal aid. Among the cases that received legal aid at the Luxembourg Bar, which corresponds to 85% of the total number of cases granted with legal aid, 27% were criminal cases and 73% were other than criminal cases.

Malta

(General Comment): The figures quoted for civil and criminal cases do not refer to the actual number of cases but to the number of nominations (requests) for legal aid. For example, if a case is brought to court having 5 accused people requiring legal aid, then this would count as 5 requests but just 1 case.

(2021): Towards the end of April 2020, Legal Aid Malta started offering legal advice (not representation in courts) to clients experiencing domestic violence. In addition to the 265 cases brought to court, Legal Aid Malta offered legal advice to 160 clients experiencing DV. The nature of the advice given to the victims of domestic violence is both 'criminal' and 'other than criminal' in nature. Each client referred to or requiring assistance from Legal Aid Malta Agency in relation to domestic violence is being assigned a legal aid lawyer for the necessary legal advice required. Such clients do not always want to pursue assistance at Court. This service has fulfilled the obligation set in the Istanbul Convention and has been incorporated in domestic law under Article 57 of the schedule attached to Chapter 581 of the Laws of Malta. In other than criminal cases, legal aid is granted to any party whose annual income does not exceed the national minimum wage for persons over 18 years of age. For 2021 the national minimum wage stood at €181.08 weekly
(€9,416.19 yearly). In 2021, the net asset value should not exceed €6,988 for means test eligibility for legal aid.

(2020): In Other than Criminal Cases, the low figure quoted as compared to previous evaluations relates to the disruptive effect that the COVID-19 pandemic had on court operations. During 2020, most services at the Legal Aid Agency were limited to the provision of services and the Courts of Law were closed for non-urgent court applications.
It is important to note that towards the end of April 2020, Legal Aid Malta started offering legal advice (not representation in courts) to clients experiencing domestic violence. In addition to the 129 cases brought to court, Legal Aid Malta offered legal advice to 191 clients experiencing DV. Each client referred to or requiring assistance from Legal Aid Malta Agency in relation to domestic violence is being assigned a legal aid lawyer for the necessary legal advice required. Such clients do not always want to pursue assistance at Court. This service has fulfilled the obligation set in the Istanbul Convention and has been incorporated in domestic law under Article 57 of the schedule attached to Chapter 581 of the Laws of Malta.

(2018): The figures quoted for civil and criminal cases do not refer to the actual number of cases but to the number of nominations (requests) for legal aid. For example, if a case is brought to court having 5 accused people requiring legal aid, then this would count as 5 requests/ nominations. Legal Aid in Malta is mainly granted for court representation but it also provides legal advice in the circumstances outlined in Q16.

(2016): The above data reflects the number of requests (nominations) made for legal aid in both the civil and criminal fields. These figures do not necessarily reflect the number of cases in which legal aid was granted.

(2014): Regard being had to the peculiarity of the methodology of presentation of data, the number 607 provided in 2014 in respect of the category “criminal cases brought to court” is a more representative figure of the number of individuals requesting for legal aid.

(2012): In criminal matters, statistics started being collected with effect from August 2012. Accordingly, the 2012 data refers to the period August - December 2013. Between January and October 2013, the number of criminal cases granted legal aid amounted to 463.

Netherlands

(General Comment): In criminal matters, legal aid cannot be granted for cases not brought to court.
Policy in the Netherlands makes a distinction between primary and secondary legal aid. Primary legal aid aims at solving judicial problems of citizen without necessarily going to court. There are, for example, Legal Service Counters, where people receive free legal advice on simple judicial problems. The provided figures relate to legal aid certificates. It is worth mentioning that besides legal aid certificates, the Legal Aid Board also provides stand-by duty lawyers. A subsidized lawyer visits each criminal suspect, alien or psychiatric patient who has been lawfully deprived of his liberty against his will. The bulk of such cases are criminal cases. These stand-by lawyers are part of the secondary legal aid system (and not of the primary system). However, the legal aid certificates and the assignment of stand-by duty lawyers are two different operating systems, with different payment methods. Cases (not brought to court) for which stand-by duty lawyers have been assigned are excluded, as these are not payed for with a legal aid certificate. The numbers on stand-by duty lawyers assigned over the years are included in the comment under the question. Once a criminal case for which a stand-by duty lawyer was assigned is brought before the court, a legal aid certificate IS given subsequently. Those certificates ARE included in Q20. Cases dealt with by Legal Service Counters are not counted.

(2021): In criminal matters, legal aid cannot be granted for cases not brought to court.
The number of stand-by duty lawyers assigned was over the years 110 000 (2010); 127 000 (2012), 126 000 (2014), 108 500 (2020), and 96 500 (2021).

(2020): The number of cases in 2020 is considerably lower than previous years, probably in part due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Due to the pandemic, criminal cases had been paused, waiting to be handled.

(2016): Criminal cases: The discrepancy with previous cycle can be explained by the fact that recently a different distinction in cases is made. Now certain cases (bopz) are categorized as civil cases and immigration cases are categorized as administrative cases.

Poland

(2021): Data refers to the number of cases in which an ex officio representative (legal adviser, advocate) was appointed.

(2020): Data on the number of cases in which a proxy was appointed ex officio (legal adviser, advocate)

Portugal

(2020): The reduction in the number of total legal aid cases may be the result of the measures taken during the COVID pandemic: on the one hand, the suspension of court deadlines and the expiry and prescription periods, and on the other hand, the reduction of conclicts as a result of the confinements. In any case, it should be emphasized that this is merely a perception, since we do not have the tools to perform a sociological analysis of the requests.

(2016): Data on cases not brought to court concerns only cases of legal advice. It is not possible to determine how many cases terminated at this time.
In 2014, there was an increase in the number of cases brought to court explained by the economic and financial situation that increased the number of labour conflicts as well as family and criminal disputes. The same reasoning and the economy recovery of the following years may explain the present decrease.

(2014): The increase in the number of cases brought to court in 2014 can be explained by the current economic and financial situation which resulted in the increase in the number of labour conflicts as well as the number of family and criminal disputes.

Romania

(2021): In criminal cases data also include ex officio layers.

(2020): In criminal cases data also include ex officio layers.

(2012): In 2012, data was available only for the Courts of Appeal and Tribunals. The database Ecris was not functional for first instance courts and the High Court.

Slovak Republic

(2020): The 2020 was specific due the COVID 19 pandemic situation, there where smaller amount of request for legal aid.

(2018): According to the Annual report of the Legal Aid Center, in 2018, out of the total number of applications, the Center granted legal aid to applicants in 17,497 legal cases; of which 2,741 in the civil matters (including 16 in the form of legal advice) and 14,756 in the personal bankruptcy agenda
The number of cases where legal aid was granted in criminal proceedings is not available.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The reported values for Q20 use the categorisation by forms of legal aid granted. In a single legal aid case, the request can be granted for multiple forms of legal aid, therefore the reported numbers at Q20 can be higher than the number of resolved legal aid cases. For the list of all possible forms of legal aid, please see comment to Q12. The data on the number of resolved legal cases is not reported, since one or more forms of legal aid can be granted in a single resolved case, making impossible the distinction to “cases brought to court” or “cases not brought to court”.
Cases brought to court include: 1) legal advice and representation before courts at first and second instance and 2) involving extraordinary appeals.
Cases not brought to court include: 1) legal advice and representation in cases of out-of-court settlement; 2) formulation, verification and certification of documents on legal relations, facts and statements.
The following forms of legal aid are not included in figures at Q20: 1) legal advice and representation involving constitutional action; 2) legal advice and representation at international courts; 3) legal advice and representation involving the filing of a petition for the assessment of constitutionality and 4) exemption from payment of costs of judicial or extrajudicial proceedings.

(2020): No particular explanation can be given regarding difference in number of Cases not brought to court between the years.

(2016): The following forms of legal aid are not included in the figures above:
1) legal advice and representation involving constitutional action: 16
2) for legal advice and representation before international courts: 1
3) for legal advice and representation involving the filing of a petition for the assessment of constitutionality: 1
4) exemption from payment of the costs of the judicial or extra judicial proceedings: 2.118

(2014): The figure provided for 2014 for cases not brought to court for which legal aid has been granted irepresents all the granted forms of legal aid. Please note that in a single legal aid case, the request can be granted for multiple forms of legal aid, therefore the given number can be greater than the number of resolved legal aid cases, where the request was granted. The number of cases not brought to court for which legal aid has been granted includes: legal advice (469), formulation, verification and certification of documents on legal relations, facts and statements (332); and legal advice and representation in cases of out-of-court settlement (47).

(2012): The number of cases not brought to court for which legal aid has been granted in 2012 includes: first legal advice (218), legal advice surpassing initial legal advice (207), formulation, verification and certification of documents on legal relations, facts and statements (244); legal advice and representation in cases of out-of-court settlement (29).

Spain

(2021): Source 2021 data: "XVI Informe del Observatorio de la Justicia Gratuita"
Criminal cases = arrested person assistance of a lawyer (page 29) + genre violence (page 26) + officio lawyer criminal cases (page 28)
According to the report cited, after the paralysis caused by the pandemic, normalization gradual both daily life and judicial activity led to an increase in cases, especially in ex officio cases and in labour cases

(2020): The methodology of presentation of data, namely the model of calculation, has been changed between 2019 and 2020.
Source 2020 data: "XV Informe del Observatorio de la Justicia Gratuita"
Criminal cases = arrested person assistance of a lawyer (page 31) + genre violence (page 28) + officio lawyer criminal cases (page 30)

(2014): The total indicated for 2014 includes cases brought to court as well as cases not brought to court.

(2012): In 2012, 662 434 applications have been granted legal aid. This total includes cases brought to court as well as cases not brought to court.

Question 020-1

Austria

(General Comment): Where legal representation is provided, legal aid also covers the pre-trial advice given by the lawyer. Legal aid is granted only as the applicant - according to his income, assets and maintenance obligations - is unable to bear (any or part of) the costs mentioned above without endangering the minimum subsistence level necessary to allow a simple standard of living. Legal aid is denied if the claim or defence of the applicant is manifestly unfounded or manifestly not brought in good faith. Legal aid is granted in all civil and commercial court proceedings regardless of the applicant's nationality or place of residence.
If legal aid is granted in the main proceeding, the same also applies to the enforcement proceedings. A party which was granted legal aid for a particular legal dispute in another EU Member State is also entitled to legal aid in Austria for a proceeding concerning the recognition and enforcement of the decision given in that dispute. If an application for legal aid is submitted concerning an urgent case (e.g. legal representation in the case of interim measures) the court has to decide speedily. If the court decides that the legal aid includes the assistance of a lawyer, the regional Bar Association selects a lawyer from among its members, by alphabetical order.
Legal aid covers all stages of the proceedings. As long as it has not been withdrawn because of a change in the applicant's circumstances or annulled by the court if it is established that the conditions under which the aid was granted were not borne out, legal aid covers any appeal (or appeal procedure).

(2021): criminal cases: 3,64 days; other than criminal cases: 32,35 days; total: 23,9 days regional administrative courts: maximum duration prescribed in law/regulation: 6 months
supreme administrative court: 29 days

(2020): Actual average duration:
criminal law: 3,67 days; civil law 34,48 days; total: 24,87 days
supreme administrative court: 23 days
regional administrative courts: maximum duration prescribed in law/regulation: 6 months
Actual average duration: 40 days

Belgium

(General Comment): For second-line legal aid, Article 508/15, paragraph 1, of the Judicial Code states that "Except in urgent cases, the applicant and, where appropriate, his or her lawyer, shall be informed of the decision of the office within fifteen days of the application".

(2021): For second-line legal aid, Article 508/15, paragraph 1, of the Judicial Code states that "Except in urgent cases, the applicant and, where appropriate, his or her lawyer, shall be informed of the decision of the office within fifteen days of the application".As regards judicial assistance, the average duration varied between 11 and 4 days (for criminal cases 9 days, civil cases 11 days, before the labour court 7 days and before the labour tribunal 4 days).

(2020): No data available.

Bulgaria

(2021): According to the Law on Legal Aid, 14 days is the deadline for providing legal aid for consultation and preparation of documents for the initiation of a case, which within the meaning of the law is a primary legal aid, which is provided by decision of the Chair of the National Legal Aid Bureau. The 14 days period shall run from the moment when all the documents required by law are presented or available and the legal problem is specified. The average time for processing the application for legal aid and preparing the decision is up to 5 working days, provided that the application is accompanied by all documents certifying that the person is eligible for legal aid.

(2020): The term of 14 days is provided in the Law on Legal Aid, in force from January 1, 2006 / SG no. 79 of 2005
Actual average duration- up to 7 days

Croatia

(2021): According to the provisions of the Criminal procedure Act (OG 152/08, 76/09, 80/11, 121/11, 91/12, 143/12, 56/13, 145/13, 152/14, 70/17, 126/19, 126/19), the defendant submits a reasoned request to be granted legal aid on budget charges to the State Attorney processing the indictment or to the court upon submission the indictment. The decision to grant legal aid against budgetary resources shall be decided by a reasoned decision of the State Attorney or the President of the Council or an individual judge. An appeal against the decision of the State Attorney shall be decided by the investigating judge, while an appeal against the decision of the President of the Council or the individual judge shall be decided by the Council.
Where the defendant has made a request for legal aid against budgetary resources, the administering authority shall not be authorised to take action in which the defendant has the right to participate or decide on the legal remedy or remedy submitted, before deciding on the validity of the request of the defendant for the appointment of the defence counsel against budgetary resources or before the appointment of the defence counsel against budgetary resources, unless those actions are not subject to delay. The administering authority shall provide the appointed defence with adequate time to prepare the defence.

(2020): Eviseaged timeframe for granting legal aid in other then criminal cases is set out in Law on Legal Aid. However, the proceeding for obtaining legal aid for cases not brought to court in other than criminal cases (primary legal aid) is initiated by directly contacting the primary-legal-aid-provider and there is no proscribed timeframe, that is to say the primary-legal-aid-provider shall provide legal aid imeddiately upon contact with free-legal-aid-recipient. To obtain legal aid for cases brought to court in other than criminal cases (secondary legal aid) an application must be submitted to one of the county-administrative-bodies or Administrative Body of the City of Zagreb and they shall render decision in 15 days of the subbmision of the application.
According to the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Act (OG 152/08, 76/09, 80/11, 121/11, 91/12, 143/12, 56/13, 145/13, 152/14, 70/17, 126 / 19, 126/19) the defendant shall submit a reasoned request for the appointment of a defense counsel at the expense of budgetary funds to the State Attorney until the indictment is filed, or to the court after the indictment is filed. The State Attorney or the President of the Council or a judge shall decide on the merits of the request for the appointment of a defense counsel at the expense of the budget. An appeal against the decision of the State Attorney shall be decided by the investigating judge, while an appeal against the decision of the president of the panel or an individual judge shall be decided by the panel.

Denmark

(2021): There is no binding legislation on the maximum duration in cases of granting legal aid. At mentioned under the comments to Q20 legal aid can be granted by four different authorities. The average processing time in cases of legal aid request processed by the Civil Affair Agency was 93 days in 2021. It has not been possible to obtain information regarding the average processing time in regards to requests that have been processed by the courts, the Ministry og Justice and the Appeals Permission Board, since this would entail reviewing all the cases manually, which we do not have the resources for.

(2020): The Ministry of Justice Civil Affairs Department has provided information that there is no binding legislation on the maximum duration in cases of granting legal aid. The average processing time in cases of legal aid requests was 60 days in 2020.

Estonia

(2020): The data of legal aid is in two seperate information systems and it is not possible to collect data on actual average duration.

France

(2021): Concerning the average reel duration, the precise figure is 49.8 days.
source SADJAV

(2020):
"The processing time for legal aid applications has been set at less than 45 days in the 2020 Annual Performance Project indicators. The actual average time is the time between the filing of the application and the date of the admission or rejection decision, calculated from the time limits maintained by each legal aid office
There is no distinction provided for criminal and non-criminal cases.
"

Germany

(General Comment): Regarding the statement of the opposing party:
According to the Code if Civil Procedure (Section 118 Approval Procedure), the opponent is to be given the opportunity to state his position as to whether or not he believes the prerequisites for the approval of legal aid have been met, unless this is deemed inappropriate for special reasons (e.g. in the case of a claim for an injunction). The Act on Proceedings in Family Matters and in Matters of Non-contentious Jurisdiction includes a similar provision (Section 77).

(2021): The duration of the proceedings depends, among other things, on when the evidence for the means test is submitted in full, whether a statement by the opposing party has to be considered and whether the court has to issue legal notices if necessary.

(2020): The duration of the proceedings depends, among other things, on when the evidence for the means test is submitted in full, whether a statement by the opposing party has to be considered and whether the court has to issue legal notices if necessary.

Greece

(2020): Law 3226/2004 (as amended and in force with articles 41-47 Law 4689/2020).

Hungary

(General Comment): 5 days (if the application form was handed in in person)
15 days (if the application form was not handed in in person)
The timeframes are set by Section 23, Subsection (1) of Act LXXX of 2003 on Legal Aid .

Ireland

(2021): The average actual duration in 2021 was 20 weeks

(2020): Legal Aid Certificates for Emergency / Priority applications (including Child Abduction applications and applications under Sex Offenders Acts) are addressed within 24 hours. Legal Aid Certificates for Standard applications (including foreign applications and non urgent Central Authority cases) are addressed within 2 weeks i.e. granted, refused or further information requested

Latvia

(General Comment): Application on legal aid in a Constitutional Court process, in civil matters and certain types of administrative cases shall be reviewed and decision on granting or refusal to grant legal aid shall be adopted by the Administration within 21 days, but in matters affecting children's rights - within 14 days from the date of receipt of an application for legal aid, as well as in partial legal aid cases, the Legal Aid Administration takes a decision within one month. The advocate shall provide the state ensured legal aid in criminal proceedings upon a request from the person directing the criminal proceedings to the senior of the sworn advocates (process takes maximum 3 days, the estimated term in criminal cases is fixed in the Criminal Procedure Law) or in urgent in conformity with the schedule of the advocates on duty compiled by the elder of the sworn advocates.

Lithuania

(General Comment): According to the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid, primary legal aid must be provided as soon as the person applies to the municipality. If it is not possible to provide primary legal aid immediately, the applicant will be notified of the time available, which must be no later than 5 working days from the date of application.
Decisions on the provision of secondary legal aid shall be adopted by the SGLAS not later than within 7 working days from the date of receipt of the required documents and information. In cases when in the interests of the applicant the decision to grant secondary legal aid must be taken urgently, the decision shall be taken immediately, but not later than the date of the procedural step which requires lawyers assistance.
There is no timeframe for the decisions of pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or court on state guaranteed legal aid (when presence of lawyer is mandatory in criminal cases).

(2020): According to the Law on State-guaranteed legal aid, primary legal aid must be provided as soon as the person applies to the municipality. If it is not possible to provide primary legal aid immediately, the applicant will be notified of the time available, which must be no later than 5 working days from the date of application.
Decisions on the provision of secondary legal aid shall be adopted by the SGLAS not later than within 7 working days from the date of receipt of the required documents and information. In cases when in the interests of the applicant the decision to grant secondary legal aid must be taken urgently, the decision shall be taken immediately, but not later than the date of the procedural step which requires lawyers assistance.
There is no timeframe for the decisions of pre-trial investigation officer, prosecutor or court on state guaranteed legal aid (when presence of lawyer is mandatory in criminal cases).

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The Luxembourg Bar Association has informed us that the average response time to an application for legal aid (LA) is impossible to determine. According to the Bar association, the majority of the applications for legal aid received are incomplete and will have to be returned before a final decision can be taken. The date of this decision depends on how quickly the applicant responds. The Bar association does not have statistics on this point. The processing time of an application for legal aid by the Legal Aid Department of the Luxembourg Bar is on average +/- 1 month, i.e. after receipt of an application for legal aid until a decision is taken, which can be either an approval or a refusal or a return in case of an incomplete application. However, it should be noted that urgent requests are treated as a priority by the service.

Malta

(2020): The average number of days indicated above (19 days) refers to Other than Criminal cases and is computed as follows:
> 5 days: from the time a person asks for legal aid information up to the presentation of the actual means test documents.
> between 7 to 14 days (avg: 10.5 days): from the presentation of the documents by the client to the day set for an appointment with the Advocate for Legal Aid.
> 3 days: from date a Court application is presented at the Court's registry up to the day the Judge gives a decree.
In criminal cases:
No means test is required. When a person is referred to Legal Aid for a criminal case assistance and court representation, the Agency only requires the summons issued by the Police to draft the necessary Court applications, or a copy of the judgment in case of appeals. The average duration of the procedure for the granting of Legal Aid in Criminal Cases, from the point of referral to the day when a Court application is filed, is 4 days.

Netherlands

(General Comment): High Trust: many lawyers and mediators regarded the application for a legal aid certificate as burdensome and time-consuming, and the verification process as bureaucratic. Therefore, alternatives were considered to simplify the verification of applications and expense statements. The LAB introduced a High Trust method for dealing with the applications for certificates. The High Trust method implies that the LAB, and lawyers and mediators work together based on transparency, trust and mutual understanding. High Trust involves greater compliance on the part of the legal profession, both as to administrative proceedings of rules, and working in accordance with the law, fixed procedures and support facilities such as Kenniswijzer (an online tool of the LAB with information about legislation, jurisprudence, and guidelines for the application of certificates). The LAB has developed specific tools for compliance assistance, such as information and instruction meetings, which are free of charge for lawyers and mediators under High Trust. The basic philosophy underlying High Trust is that trust among a larger group of people will more readily lead to positive cooperation and compliance than institutionalised distrust. In 2009, the Board started with its first High Trust pilot. Since 2011, the Board has been implementing High Trust across the country in phases. At the end of 2020, more than three quarters of the certificates are issued to lawyers and mediators who work based on the principles of High Trust. It has become easier for providers of legal aid to apply for certificates without having to send documents along with their applications. The Board grants the certificate shortly after assessing the client's eligibility for legal aid. The applications of the lawyers and mediators that work together with the Board according to High Trust are accepted automatically. This means that the client will very soon receive confirmation on whether or not the application has been granted. Verification takes place after the provider of legal aid has submitted the statement of expenses. There are two ways of verification: either verification based on a random sample, or verification on a one-on-one basis of certificates granted.

(2021): maximum duration prescribed in law/regulation: 40 working days, 8 weeks.
The maximum duration is based on statutory law (Awb: General Administrative Law Act). However, this maximum only applies to approx. 20% of applications. Around 80% of the applications fall under the High Trust regime, in which the application is granted automatically within 7 days (after the income and assets check with the tax authorities); in 2021 these automatically granted applications took on average 3 days. Around 20% of the applications do not fall under the High Trust regime. In 2021 it took on average 16 days to grant these applications.

(2020): 40 working days, so eigh weeks. 12 days was the average in 2020.
The maximum duration is 8 weeks (40 working days). This is based on statutory law (the AWB: the General Administrative Law Act). However, this only applies to approximately 20% of the applications. Around 80% of the applications falls under the High Trust regime (see below) in which the application is granted automatically within 7 days (after the income and assets-check with the tax authorities). High Trust: Many lawyers and mediators regarded the application for a certificate as burdensome and time consuming, and the verification as bureaucratic. Therefore alternatives were considered to simplify the verification of applications and expense statements. The LAB introduced a High Trust method for dealing with the applications for certificates. This High Trust method implies that the LAB and lawyers and mediators work together on the basis of transparency, trust and mutual understanding. The High Trust method involves greater compliance on the part of the legal profession, both as to administrative proceedings of rules and working in accordance with the law, fixed procedures and support facilities such as Kenniswijzer (an online tool of the LAB with information about legislation, jurisprudence and guidelines for the application of certificates). The LAB developed specific tools for compliance assistance, such as information and instruction meetings, which are free of charge for lawyers and mediators under High Trust. The basic philosophy underlying High Trust is that trust among a larger group of people will more readily lead to positive cooperation and compliance than institutionalised distrust. In 2009, the Board started with its first High Trust pilot. Since 2011, the Board has been implementing High Trust across the country in phases. At the end of 2020, more than three quarters of the certificates are issued to lawyers and mediators who work based on the principles of High Trust. It has become easier for providers of legal aid to apply for certificates without having to send documents along with their applications. The Board grants the certificate shortly after assessing the client's eligibility for legal aid. The applications of the lawyers and mediators that work together with the Board according to High Trust are accepted automatically. This means that the client will very soon receive confirmation on whether or not the application has been granted. Verification takes place after the provider of legal aid has submitted the statement of expenses. There are two ways of verification: either verification on the basis of a random sample, or verification on a one-on-one basis of certificates granted.

Poland

(2020): The provisions of the procedure do not specify a time limit for examining the application for appointing a legal representative. However, it should be considered without undue delay.

Portugal

(2021): The maximum duration of the procedure for granting legal aid is 30 days (article 25 (1) of Law No. 34/2009, of 29 of July. Regarding the actual average duration, it should be noted that in the context of the COVID Pandemic, procedural deadlines were suspended, which has influenced the duration of the procedural timeframes.

(2020): The maximum duration of the procedure for granting legal aid is 30 days (article 25 (1) of Law No. 34/2009, of 29 of July. Regarding the actual average duration, it should be noted that in the context of the COVID Pandemic, procedural deadlines were suspended, which has influenced the duration of the procedural timeframes.

Romania

(2021): There is no timeframe set for the procedure of granting legal aid by the court. The procedure is urgent as a general rule, being decided in chambers.

(2020): There is no timeframe set for the procedure of granting legal aid by the court. The procedure is urgent as a general rule, being decided in chambers.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): If the application for legal aid contains all the documents needed to issue a decision for granting legal aid then a decision is issued within 30 days. The applicant must meet the requirements for granting legal aid established by Act no. 327/2005 Z. z.. If the application is not complete then the proceeding is suspended for min. 8 days max. 30 days till the application is not complete. When the application is complete according to Act no. 327/2005 Z. z. the proceeding continues and decision is issued if the legal aid will or will not be granted.

Slovenia

(General Comment): If the applicant would miss the deadline or would loose a right in the time it takes to process the application for free legal aid, the court can approve an "urgent" free legal aid, without taking in regard the material criteria for eligibility (however, the lack of merits is still checked). The material criteria are subsequently checked at a later time.

Question 037

Austria

(General Comment): The Public Authority's Liability Act (Amtshaftungsgesetz) provides for liability of the state (and other legal entities) for misconduct of their employees in the exercise of public authority, including court proceedings and court decisions, causing damage to persons or property by excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and/or wrongful condemnation. The liability presupposes both wrongfulness and fault. In the case of wrongful arrest or wrongful criminal condemnation, compensation can also be obtained according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act (Strafrechtliches Entschädigungsgesetz) without proving fault of the Authorities. The compensation procedure is laid down in para. 8 ff. Amtshaftungsgesetz and para. 9 ff. Strafrechtliches Entschädigungsgesetz. The injured person may demand – free of costs - of the legal entity against which the claim for damages is to be raised to forward her/him within a three months' term a written statement indicating as to whether it accepts or partially or totally rejects the claim for damages. If the claim is partially or totally rejected, the complaint can still be filed at court. The exclusive jurisidiction over the claim of the injured person against the legal entity rests in the first instance with the regional court (Landesgericht) in charge of civil matters in whose range of jurisdiction the infringement of law occurred. Compensation is funded by the Public Authority's general budget. The liability is unlimited, indemnity is to be paid in terms of money only. To make sure that compensation is paid following the concrete circumstances of each individual case, there is no such thing as a daily tariff or a flat compensation sum. The amount of compensation depends solely on the magnitude of damage suffered by the victim and the degree of fault attributable to the Public Authority.
According to sec 67 CCP victims have the right to claim reimbursement for the damage caused by the criminal act or compensation for the impairment of their legally protected interests. The extent of the damage or the impairment has to be established ex officio as far as this can be done on the basis of the results of the criminal proceeding or with the help of additional simple investigations. If for the assessment of a bodily injury or damage to the health of a person an expert is appointed, he/she also has to be requested to establish the periods of pain.

(2021): The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act and the Penal Law's Compensation Act cannot be quantified regarding the different circumstances. Only the total amount of the payments can be provided. On this basis the payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act were 714.676,17 Euro and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were 574.038,47 Euro.

(2020): The payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act and the Penal Law's Compensation Act cannot be quantified regarding the different circumstances. Only the total amount of the payments can be provided. On this basis the payments according to the Public Authority's Liability Act were 444.740,27 Euro and those according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act were 865.635,22 Euro.

(2016): The Public Authority's Liability Act (Amtshaftungsgesetz) provides for liability of the state (and other legal entities) for misconduct of their employees in the exercise of public authority, including court proceedings and court decisions, causing damage to persons or property by excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and/or wrongful condemnation. The liability presupposes both wrongfulness and fault. In the case of wrongful arrest or wrongful criminal condemnation, compensation can also be obtained according to the Penal Law's Compensation Act (Strafrechtliches Entschädigungsgesetz) without proving fault of the Authorities. The compensation procedure is laid down in para. 8 ff. Amtshaftungsgesetz and para. 9 ff. Strafrechtliches Entschädigungsgesetz. The injured person may demand – free of costs - of the legal entity against which the claim for damages is to be raised to forward her/him within a three months' term a written statement indicating as to whether it accepts or partially or totally rejects the claim for damages. If the claim is partially or totally rejected, the complaint can still be filed at court.
The exclusive jurisidiction over the claim of the injured person against the legal entity rests in the first instance with the regional court (Landesgericht) in charge of civil matters in whose range of jurisdiction the infringement of law occurred. Compensation is funded by the Public Authority's general budget. The liability is unlimited, indemnity is to be paid in terms of money only. To make sure that compensation is paid following the concrete circumstances of each individual case, there is no such thing as a daily tariff or a flat compensation sum. The amount of compensation depends solely on the magnitude of damage suffered by the victim and the degree of fault attributable to the Public Authority.

Belgium

(General Comment): In Belgian law, the terminology is "inoperative preventive detention" and not "wrongful arrest".
Compensation via the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the liability of the state for damages resulting from faults committed by the public prosecutor's office or judges, falls under Article 1382 of the Civil Code (action in tort). According to article 1382 of the Civil Code: "Any act of man whatsoever which causes damage to another person obliges the person by whose fault it occurred to make reparation". The fault may consist of negligence according to the terms of article 1383 which provides that "everyone is responsible for the damage he causes not only by his own act but also by his negligence or imprudence". In order to obtain compensation, the plaintiff must demonstrate the existence of a fault, damage and a causal link between the fault and the damage. According to the Constitutional Court (see Constitutional Court ruling of June 30, 2014 (No. 99/2014)), a constitutionally correct interpretation of Article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that the state can be held liable for a fault of a judge/body deciding at the last instance, even if the decision is not repealed, amended, annulled or revoked. It is necessary that the fault consists of a sufficiently serious violation of the applicable rule of law and that, given the limited remedies available against the erroneous decision, it is not possible to obtain an annulment of the decision. Such claims are brought before the civil courts.
Reference should also be made to the Act of 13 March 1973 on compensation for inoperative preventive detention. Article 28 of this law provides that "Any person who has been held in preventive detention for more than eight days without this detention or its continuation having been caused by his own conduct may claim compensation:
a) if he or she has been directly or indirectly excluded from liability by a judicial decision that has become res judicata;
b) if he/she has benefited from an order or a ruling of dismissal;
c) if he/she has been arrested or kept in detention after the public action has been extinguished by prescription;
The amount of such compensation shall be determined in equity, taking into account all the circumstances of public and private interest.
If the person concerned is unable to bring an action for compensation before the ordinary courts, the compensation must be requested in writing to the Minister of Justice, who shall decide within six months.
The compensation shall be awarded by the Minister of Justice at the expense of the Treasury, if the conditions provided for in § 1 are met.
If the compensation or the allocation is refused, if the amount of the compensation or the number of days allocated is deemed insufficient, or if the Minister of Justice has not taken a decision within six months of the request, the person concerned may apply to the Commission for Inoperative Preventive Detention.
With regard to the "number of convictions" for "wrongful arrests": it should be noted that the figure in the table does not correspond to "convictions" but represents the number of cases for which there has been a definitive grant of compensation. In "inoperative preventive detention" cases there is no conviction. It is either a grant of compensation or a refusal of compensation. Therefore, the title of the third column of the table does not correspond to the content (in any case for the ""inoperative preventive detention"")

(2021): For the item "wrongful arrest" (corresponding in Belgium to "inoperative preventive detention"): concerning the number of decisions taken, there were 20 decisions granting and 21 decisions refusing compensation (+ 39 pending cases), in total 80 applications. Only the 20 decisions granting compensation and the total number of applications are included in the table.

(2019): 1. Reference should also be made to the Law of 13 March 1973 relating to compensation in the event of inoperative preventive detention. Article 28 stipulates the following:
Any person who has been held in preventive detention for more than eight days without this detention or its extension having been caused by his/her own conduct is entitled to compensation:
a) if s/he has been exonerated directly or indirectly by a court decision that has the force of res judicata;
(b) if s/he has benefited from an order or judgment of dismissal;
(c) if s/he has been arrested or detained after the termination of the prosecution by prescription;
The amount of such compensation shall be fixed in equity and taking into account all circumstances of public and private interest.
If the person concerned is unable to bring an action for compensation before the ordinary courts, the compensation must be requested by written request addressed to the Minister of Justice, who shall decide within six months. If compensation or imputation is refused, if the amount of compensation or the number of days imputed is deemed insufficient, or if the Minister of Justice has not made a decision within six months of the request, the interested party may apply to the "Inoperative Preventive Detention" Commission.
2. Compensation through the civil liability procedure:
In Belgium, the State liability for damage resulting from faults made by the public prosecutor office or judges, falls under the article 1382 of the Civil Code (claims on the basis of tort). According to article 1382 Civil Code: “Any act whatever of man which cause damage to another obliges him by whose fault it occurred to make reparation”. To obtain compensation, the plaintiff must demonstrate the existence of a fault, of damage and of a causal link between the fault and damage. According to the Constitutional Court a constitutionally correct interpretation of article 1382 of the Civil Code implies that the State may be held liable for a fault of a judicial body deciding in last instance, even if the decision is not repealed, amended, annulled or revoked. It is required that the fault consists in a sufficiently serious breach of the applicable legal rule and that, given the limited legal remedies available against the wrongful decision, it is not possible to obtain an annulment of the decision. These claims are brought before the civil courts.
Exceeding a reasonable time is also to be considered as a fault. However, article 21ter of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that as a consequence of a violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time, the courts can either impose a penalty below the statutory minimum or simply pronounce a guilty verdict without imposing a sentence. In addition, the Court of Cassation has ruled that the Chambre du conseil (which is the investigative court that intervenes in case of a judicial inquiry) can declare the criminal claim inadmissible if the rights of the defence have been seriously and irretrievably damaged due to the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time. In other less serious cases, the Chambre du conseil may establish the violation of the right to be tried within a reasonable time and commit the case for trial, after which the trial court is bound to give a proper response to this violation, in accordance with Article 21ter of the Preliminary Title of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(2016): Compensation is only awarded for wrongful arrest. Excessive length may have consequences to the extent that a reduction of the sentence granted is possible: If the length of criminal proceedings exceeds a reasonable time, the judge may convict the offender simply by conviction or impose a sentence that is less than the minimum sentence prescribed by law.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities sets out the procedure for liability for the activity of the Administration, law enforcement authorities, Commission for Forfeiture of Unlawfully Acquired Assets, and Liability for actions of the judiciary bodies, for violation of the right to a hearing and pronouncement of judgment within a reasonable time.
Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions, or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion, the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions, or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of an administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, list the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities, or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions, or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

(2021): Statistics on excessive length of proceedings use data by the Procedural Representation before the ECHR Directorate of the Ministry of Justice on the review of applications for the domestic compensatory remedy for an excessive length of proceedings under the Judicial System Act. Sums paid may include payments under applications from December of the previous year. Statistics on wrongful arrest include prosecution data (on detention in custody and house arrest, but also on wrongful charges, because the numbers on the provision for seeking compensation for those are aggregate) and on 24-hour police detention.

(2019): Chapter Three "a" of the Judiciary System Act (JSA) establishes a procedure for the examination of applications submitted by citizens or legal persons against instruments, actions or omissions of the judicial authorities which infringe the right of the citizen or legal person to have the case thereof heard and disposed of within a reasonable time. The verification of the applications is carried out by the Inspectorate to the Supreme Judicial Council, and after its completion the documents in the file are sent to the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice or a person authorized by him/her rejects the application as unfounded or determines the amount of compensation in accordance with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and proposes an agreement with the applicant, in cases where the applicant's right to a hearing within a reasonable time is violated. The verification of the circumstances and the ruling on the application shall be carried out within 6 months from its receipt. The maximum amount of compensation may not exceed BGN 10,000. The persons who have received compensation under the Judiciary System Act may not seek compensation on the same grounds in court.
Pursuant to the Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities (ALDISM), the state and the municipalities shall be liable for any damage inflicted on individuals and legal persons by legally non-conforming acts, actions or omissions of State bodies and municipal authorities and officials upon or in connection with the performance of administrative activity, as well as for the damages caused by the action of repealed as illegal or declared as null and void legal acts (Art. 1, para 1).
Art. 2, para. 1 and para. 2 of the ALDISM, lists the cases in which the State shall be liable for any damage inflicted on citizens by criminal investigation authorities, public prosecution authorities or court.
The scope of the ALDISM includes the responsibility for illegal acts, actions or omissions of the bodies and officials under the Anti-Corruption and Confiscation of Illegally Acquired Property Act, performed during or on the occasion of exercising their powers or service, as well as the responsibility of the bodies of the judiciary for violation of the right to consider and resolve the case within a reasonable time.

(2016): The Act on the Liability for Damage Incurred by the State and the Municipalities sets out the procedure for laibility for activity of the Administration, law-enforcement authorities, Commission for Forfeiture of Unlawfully Acquired Assets and Liability for actions of the judiciary bodies, for violation of the right to a hearing and pronouncement of judgment within a reasonable time.
Chapter Three A of the Judiciary System Act regulates the rules for reviewing applications against the right to be heard within a reasonable time, payment of compensation in case of violations and the relevant measures to remedy the breaches.

Croatia

(2020): The data in the table refer to the compensation for unjustified arrest and unjustified conviction
An application for compensation for unjustified arrest and unjustified conviction shall be submitted to the Ministry of Justice and Public Administration. If the applicant does not accept the offer of the Ministry of Justice and Public Administration, he has a right to sue at the competent court.
The Ministry of Justice of the Administration issued a Decision on 19 November 2019, which established that the financial compensation in the mediation procedure amounts to HRK 280.00 for each day of imprisonment for unfounded arrest or unjustified conviction. Therefore, there was an increase in the amount of compensation and a greater number of acceptance of bids, and for that reason there was a greater number of resolved cases.
The amount paid for 2020 refers to payments based on decisions rendered in amicable procedure and court judgments, cases and from previous years in which the payment was made in 2020.
For excessive length of proceedings, the compensation can not exceed 35.000 Croatian kunas (cca 4.600 EUR) per case.

(2018): * The information in the table also refers to compensation for wrongful arrest and unjustified conviction.
An application for compensation for unjustified arrest and unjustified conviction shall be submitted to the Ministry of Justice. If the applicant does not accept the offer of the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Justice has the right to bring an action before the competent court. The amount of compensation offered by the Ministry to the parties as just financial compensation on that basis is unique in all cases and ranges from the following amounts - up to 30 days in custody in the amount of HRK 200.00 per day of deprivation of liberty, for custody of 30 to 90 days in the amount of HRK 160.00 per day of imprisonment, for detention of more than 90 days in the amount of HRK 120.00 per day of imprisonment. The amount paid for 2018 relates to payments made under the amicable settlement and court rulings.

(2016): Number of requests for compensation and number of condemnation is 167 and refers both to compensation for wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction.
The amount of compensation that the Ministry offers to the injured parties as a fair monetary compensation for claim for damages for wrongful and unjustified conviction is unique in all cases and ranges in the following amounts - for a custody of up to 30 days in the amount of 200,00 HRK per day of deprivation of liberty , for a custody from 30 to 90 days in the amount of HRK 160,00 HRK per day of deprivation of liberty, for a custody of more than 90 days in the amount of HRK 120,00 HRK per day of deprivation of liberty. The amount paid in 2016 (3 155 925 EUR) refers to payments based on decisions issued in a friendly settlement and on court judgements.
• Excessive length of proceedings
According to the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia, everyone shall be entitled have his/her rights and obligations, or suspicion or accusation of a criminal offence decided upon fairly before a legally established, independent and impartial court within a reasonable period.
According to the Courts Act, a party considering that the competent court has not reached a decision within a reasonable time on the party's right or obligation or criminal suspicion or charge, can file an application to the Court President where the proceedings is conducted, for the right to trial within reasonable time. The Court President shall demand from the judge conducting the case the report on the file and determine the term by which the case has to be resolved. Conduct term shall not be longer than 6 months. If the case is not resolved within set time, the judge conducting the case is obliged to deliver a written report to the Court President, President of the immediately superior court and to the Ministry of Justice on the reasons for not resolving the case.
If the court does not decide within the set time, the party can address the request for right to trial within reasonable time to the immediately superior court. If the court decides positively on the merits of the application filed by the applicant, it shall determine a time framework for the court before which the case is heard to decide on the right or obligation or suspicion or criminal charge against the applicant, and shall determine a just compensation to the applicant for violation of the right to trial within reasonable time.
The compensation shall be paid out from the State budget within 4 months from the day the party submits the request for payment of the compensation. The amount of the compensation for the proceeding concerned cannot exceed the amount of 35.000,00 Croatian kunas.
The number of requests for compensation provided in the table above is the total number of the requests received in the 2016 for the compensation for violation of the right to trial within reasonable time (in county courts, High Commercial Court of RoC, Supreme Court of RoC); the number of condemnation is the number of requests that were considered founded by the courts and the total amount is the amount of the just compensation awarded in the judgments.
• Non-execution of court decisions The Republic of Croatia provides the compensation in cases related to the non-execution of final decisions of the European court of Human Rights, according to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental freedoms. If this question refers to non-execution of court decisions only of domestic courts, then we can confirm that there is no compensation system for non-execution of court decision.

(2014): According to 2014 data and in respect of the excessive length of proceedings, the right to a fair trial within a reasonable time is enshrined in the Constitution. Besides, according to the Courts Act (2013), a party considering that the competent court has not reached a decision within a reasonable time, can file an application to the Court President (according to the previous Courts Act, a party could file an application with the immediately superior court). The latter shall demand from the judge conducting the case the report on the file and determine the term by which the case has to be resolved (not longer than 6 months). If the case is not resolved within the set time, the judge conducting the case has to deliver a written report to the Court President, the President of the immediately superior court and the Ministry of Justice on the reasons for not resolving the case. If the court does not decide within the set time, the party can apply to the immediately superior court. If the latter decides positively on the merits of the application, it shall determine a time framework for the court before which the case is heard, and shall determine a just compensation to the applicant for violation of the right to a trial within a reasonable time. The compensation shall be paid out from the State budget within 4 months from the day the party submits the request and the amount cannot exceed 35000 Croatian kunas.
As for the non-execution of court judgments, compensation can be granted in case of non-execution of final decisions of the European Court of Human Rights, according to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental freedoms. Conversely, there is no compensation system for non-execution of domestic courts' judgments.
With regard to wrongful arrest, detention or condemnation, the Constitution provides for the right to an indemnification and a public apology, in compliance with the law. According to the Criminal Procedure Act (2008), a person unjustifiably convicted of a criminal offence or unfoundedly arrested shall be entitled to full rehabilitation, compensation of damage from the State budget and other rights established by law. No compensation is possible if the proceedings were discontinued or the charge rejected because in the new proceedings the subsidiary prosecutor or private prosecutor desisted from prosecution on the basis of an agreement with the defendant. Moreover, a person who caused his arrest by illicit acts is not entitled to compensation of damages.
The compensation can be requested within three years from the day the first instance judgment of acquittal or judgment rejecting the charge became final or from the day the first instance ruling discontinuing the proceedings became final, and if a higher court decided on an appeal, from the day of receipt of the decision of the higher court.

Before bringing a civil action for the compensation of damages, the injured person is bound to submit his request to the Ministry of Justice in order to reach a settlement on the existence of damage and the type and amount of compensation. The Ministry of Justice annually receives an average of between 200 and 250 requests for compensation, while the settlement is reached in approximately 50%.

A person who was unjustifiably detained is entitled to all types of monetary and non-monetary damages according to the provisions of the Obligations Act (OG 35/05, 41/08 and 125/11), for the full amount of damages suffered. An injured person may be awarded compensation for non-monetary damages in case of harm inflicted on his/her individual rights, namely the right to freedom, honor, reputation and respect. Monetary compensation is usually awarded as a result of the loss of earnings or income. The amount of monetary compensation offered to injured persons on the basis of non-monetary damages depends

Cyprus

(2019): The law providing effective remedies for exceeding reasonable time in identifying civil rights and obligations provides for the filing of an action against the government for undue delay in the hearing of a case. The cases are still pending.

Czech Republic

(2021): There were 5 356 requests for compensation in 2021, from this number 3 045 requests filed to the Ministry of Justice and 2 311 reguests filed to the courts. In 2 490 cases in total was the applicant successful, either fully or partially. 9 617 860 Euro in total was paid.

Denmark

(2021): We can only supply data for the two sub-groups that can be filtered correct. The figures that do not fit under the other categories now appear under "other". It should be noted that the data comes from a case filing tool, and therefore is not a statistics tool. Data may be subject to entry-errors of all sorts such as compensation amount, categorization etc.

(2020): Data in the table (Q37) has been created outside the standard model. Specifically developed data models are tested, but there is a greater risk of unidentified errors than when using the standard model. Data in the table are thus associated with considrable uncertainty. All figures indicating condemnations of requests and total amount are the sum of cases and amounts fully or partially granted. In regards to the "Other" category, the figures given are total numbers minus the numbers in the three categories for which separate figures are given (excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction).

(2019): The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains rules concerning the possibility to obtain compensation for criminal prosecution. These rules allow for compensation under certain circumstances for example due to the excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction. The Prosecution Service decide on requests for compensation for criminal prosecution and these decisions can be brought before the courts. The Prosecution Service annually decides on approximately 2000 requests for compensation of which approximately 100 are brought before the courts. The budget for the total amount of compensation due criminal prosecution paid in accordance with the rules of the Danish Administration of Justice Act was approximately DKK 31.400.000. This amount is however revised at the end of the year.

(2018): The Danish Administration of Justice Act contains rules concerning the possibility to obtain compensation for criminal prosecution. These rules allow for compensation under certain circumstances for example due to the excessive length of proceedings, wrongful arrest and
wrongful conviction. The Prosecution Service decide on requests for compensation for criminal prosecution and these decisions can be brought before the courts. The Prosecution Service annually decides on approximately 2000 requests for compensation of which approximately 100 are brought before the courts. In 2018 the total amount of compensation due criminal prosecution paid in accordance with the rules of the Danish Administration of Justice Act was approximately DKK 23.000.000.

Estonia

(2016): There is now a system for excessive length of proceedings or non-execution of court decision, but we do not have the numbers.

Finland

(2021): In criminal cases the primary means to compensate excessive length of proceedings for a convicted person is to reduce the sentence. Therefore the number of compensation paid does not does not reflect the whole picture of the cases where the proceeding has taken too long. For excessive length the compensation is 1500 euro/unduly delayed year, maximum 10.000 euro, which may be exceeded if
there are special circumstances.
The information on wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction are compiled together. There were 415 requests. A total of 1 530 000 euros has been paid as compensation. For wrongful arrest the compensation is in practice approximately 120 euro/day but it can be higher due to the circumstances. For wrongful conviction the compensation covers fair legal costs.

(2020): In criminal cases the primary means to compensate excessive length of proceedings for a convicted person is to reduce the sentence. Therefore the number of compensation paid does not does not reflect the whole picture of the cases where the proceeding has taken too long. For excessive length the compensation is 1500 euro/unduly delayed year, maximum 10.000 euro, which may be exceeded if
there are special circumstances.
The information on wrongful arrest and wrongful conviction are compiled together. There were 437 requests. A total of 2 916 000 euros has been paid as compensation. For wrongful arrest the compensation is in practice approximately 120 euro/day but it can be higher due to the circumstances. For wrongful conviction the compensation covers fair legal costs.

(2019): Correction: Excessive length of proceedings number of Number of condemnations in year 2018 should have been 41, not reported 28. The number reported was the number of rejected.

France

(2021): The sub-directorate for legal affairs of the Ministry of Justice, in conjunction with the State judicial agent, monitors liability actions relating to the defective functioning of the public service of Justice (essentially based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation, with regard to users of this service). The State judicial agent directly follows up actions for compensation for pre-trial detention undergone in the context of criminal proceedings that have ended with a decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit (Articles 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure).
1. Regarding liability actions relating to the defective functioning of the public service of Justice: The vast majority of them are based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organisation. According to this article, the State is obliged to allow a compensation for damage caused by the defective functioning of the Justice service. Except in the case of special provisions, this liability is incurred only in the event of serious fault or a denial of justice. This regime of liability concerns only the user of the public service of Justice, the third party to the legal proceedings being able to engage only the liability without fault of the State for breach of equality before public charges.
During 2021, the number of new liability actions brought against the State in connection with the functioning of the civil and criminal justice is 1 016 (compared with 908 in 2020, and 510 in 2019). Of these 1 016 new cases, 754 relate to the excessive length of proceedings before labour courts. In 2021, 580 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the public Justice service, out of a total of 717 decisions on the merits of the case (compared with 249 convictions out of 398 decisions in 2020, and 352 convictions out of 485 decisions in 2019).
Out of the 717 decisions, 530 decisions involve the State's responsibility for the excessive length of proceedings, of which 31 decisions concern the length of proceedings in criminal matters and 499 in civil matters (compared with 17 convictions for excessive length in criminal matters and 200 in civil matters in 2020).
The amount of the condemnations is of 2 514 646,05 euro for excessive length of proceedings out of a total amount of 5 225 167,81 euros (compared with 1 388 393 euros out of a total of 1 975 018 euros in 2020).
2) With regard to actions based on Article 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure: article 149 of the Code of Criminal Procedure gives the right, under certain conditions, to full compensation for the damage suffered as a result of detention in proceedings that have been dismissed, acquitted or discharged. Any person who has been held in pre-trial detention during proceedings which have ended in a decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit that has become final, shall be entitled, subject to the exceptions precisely defined by Article 149 of the CCP, at his or her request, to full compensation for the moral and material damage caused by this detention. The compensation awarded is payable by the State.
It is the First president of the court of appeal within whose jurisdiction the decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit, resulting in the detainee's innocence, has been taken, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a reasoned decision that can be appealed to the national commission for compensation for detention placed at the Court of Cassation (CNRD).
According to data from the State Judicial Agent (SJA) (Sillage application and dashboards), the key data for 2021 are as follows: 571 new cases registered; 575 decisions handed down by the First presidents of the courts of appeal; 19 settlements concluded; 53 decisions rendered by the CNRD with an average detention period of almost 140 days; 28 appeals to the CNRD in 2021 (12 at the initiative of the SJA and 16 at the initiative of the applicants). Source - Sub-Directorate for Legal Affairs, SEM, General Secretariat

(2020): "The sub-directorate for legal affairs of the Ministry of Justice, in conjunction with the State judicial agent, monitors liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public justice service (essentially based on Article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organization, with regard to users of this service).
The State's judicial agent directly follows up actions for compensation for pre-trial detention undergone in the context of criminal proceedings that have ended with a decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit (Articles 149 et seq. of the Code of Criminal Procedure).
1. With regard to liability actions relating to the defective functioning of the public service of justice:
The vast majority of them are based on article L. 141-1 of the Code of Judicial Organization.
Under the terms of this article, the State is obliged to repair the damage caused by the defective functioning of the judicial service. Except in the case of specific provisions, this liability is only incurred by gross negligence or by a denial of justice. This system of liability concerns only the user of the public service of justice, the third party to the legal proceedings being able to engage only the liability without fault of the State for breach of equality before public charges.
During the year 2020, the number of new liability actions brought against the State for gross negligence or denial of justice is 908 compared to 510 in 2019. During the same year 2020, 249 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the public service of justice against 352 in 2019, out of a total of 398 decisions on the merits rendered in this matter.
Of the 249 condemnation decisions, 217 decisions implicated the responsibility of the State due to the excessive length of the proceedings, of which 17 decisions concerned proceedings in criminal matters and 200 in civil matters.
The amount of the sentences pronounced is 1,388,393 euros for excessive length of proceedings out of a total amount of 1,975,018 euros. 2. Article 149 of the Code of Criminal Procedure gives the right, under certain conditions, to full compensation for the damage suffered as a result of detention in the context of proceedings that have been dismissed, acquitted or discharged.
Any person who has been remanded in custody in the course of proceedings that have ended in a decision to dismiss, discharge or acquit that has become final, is entitled, with the exceptions specifically defined by Article 149 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, at his or her request, to full compensation for the moral and material damage caused by this detention. The compensation awarded is to be paid by the State.
It is the first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision to dismiss the case, acquit or acquit the detainee was handed down, which results in the detainee's innocence, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a reasoned decision that can be appealed to the national commission for compensation for detentions placed at the Court of Cassation (CNRD).
According to data from the State Judicial Agent (Sillage application and follow-up tables), the key data for the year 2020 are as follows
- 423 new cases registered.
- 436 decisions rendered by the first presidents of the courts of appeal.
- 8 settlements reached.
- 83 decisions rendered by the CNRD with an average length of compensated detention of less than 400 days.
- 27 appeals to the CNRD in 2020 (4 at the initiative of the AJE and 23 at the initiative of the claimants).

(2019): 1) The Legal Affairs Sub-Directorate of the Ministry of Justice monitors, in conjunction with the State's judicial agent, liability actions relating to the defective operation of the public service of justice. The vast majority of them are based on Art. L. 141-1 of the Judicial Organization Code. The State is required to repair the damage caused by the defective functioning of the justice system. Except in the case of special provisions, this liability is engaged in respect of court users in case of gross negligence or denial of justice. The third party in the proceedings can engage only the no-fault liability of the State for breach of equality.
In 2019, the number of new liability actions brought against the State for gross negligence or denial of justice is 510, compared with 482 in 2018. 352 decisions condemned the State for malfunctioning of the justice against 393 in 2018 (out of a total of 513). Of the 352 convictions, 302 decisions involved State responsibility due to the excessive length of proceedings (20 in criminal matters and 283 in civil matters) and the amount of 1,599,340 euros was paid out of a total amount of 5 292 676, 47 euros.
2)Article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code entitles the accused to full compensation from the State, under certain conditions, for damages suffered as a result of detention in connection with proceedings that have been dismissed, discharged or acquitted. It is the first president of the court of appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision of dismissal/ acquittal was pronounced, who decides, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a motivated decision that can be appealed to the national commission for reparation of detentions before the Court of Cassation (CNRD). The State's judicial officer directly follows such actions for compensation. The key data for the year 2019 are as follows: 519 new cases registered; 408 decisions handed down by the first presidents of courts of appeal; 4 transactions concluded. 83 decisions handed down by CNRD with an average compensated detention period of less than 400 days. 55 appeals to the CNRD in 2019 (7 at the initiative of the AJE and 48 at the initiative of the claimants).

(2016): The category “other” refers to compensation for pre-trial detention. Indeed, article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code provides for the right, under certain conditions, to full compensation for the damage suffered as a result of detention in the context of proceedings which have been the subject of a decision of dismissal, release or acquittal. Any person who has been detained in custody in the frame of proceedings terminated by a decision of dismissal, release or acquittal that has become final is entitled, subject to exceptions specifically pinpointed by article 149 of the Criminal Procedure Code, at his/her request, to full compensation for the moral and material damage caused by such detention. The compensation awarded shall be borne by the State. It is the first president of the Court of Appeal in whose jurisdiction the decision of dismissal, release or acquittal resulting in the innocence of the detainee has been pronounced, who rules, after a public and contradictory procedure, by a reasoned decision subject to appeal before the National Commission for Compensation of Detentions placed within the Court of Cassation (CNRD).
According to the computer application of the State judicial officer, the latter would have recorded 468 requests in 2012, 480 in 2013, 553 in 2014, 521 in 2015 and 491 in 2016. In 2015, 528 decisions were rendered by the First Presidents of Courts of Appeal. Of these 528 decisions, 84 resulted in rejection and 444 in compensation. 499 decisions were rendered in 2016 (the rejection/compensation ratio is not available). The number of appeals brought before the National Commission for Reparation of Detentions is stable in 2015 and 2016 since the NCRD registered 62 and 61 appeals respectively for these two years. CNRD rendered 84 decisions for the year 2015 and 64 decisions for the year 2016.

Germany

(General Comment): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation.
The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non- pecuniary disadvantages.
In criminal proceedings, the passage of time between the offence and the conviction, as well as the length of the proceedings, must also be taken into account and compensated ex officio by the court and the public prosecutor’s office in favour of the accused. Depending on the extent of the delay and the disadvantages suffered by the accused as a result, compensation may be provided by a ruling that a quantified part of the sentence imposed is already deemed to have been enforced (this will be stated in the operative part of the judgment). In individual cases, it may suffice – even at the investigation stage by the public prosecutor’s office – to discontinue proceedings (e.g. pursuant to Sections 153, 153a or 154 of the German Code of Criminal Procedure [Strafprozessordnung – StPO]), to dispense with imposing a penalty (Section 60 of the German Criminal Code [Strafgesetzbuch – StGB]) or, in the event of minor delays, to establish in the grounds of the judgment that the proceedings have been delayed in breach of the rule of law. In extreme cases, undue delay may constitute a procedural impediment that requires the court to terminate proceedings. If compensation has been provided in the criminal proceeding, except for compensation for material damage, the accused has received sufficient redress and is not further entitled to compensation in accordance with the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings.
If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence

(2020): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation. The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non-pecuniary disadvantages.

In criminal proceedings, the passage of time between the offence and the conviction, as well as the length of the proceedings, must also be taken into account and compensated ex officio by the court and the public prosecutor's office in favour of the accused. Depending on the extent of the delay and the disadvantages suffered by the accused as a result, compensation may be provided by a ruling that a quantified part of the sentence imposed is already deemed to have been enforced (this will be stated in the operative part of the judgment). In individual cases, it may suffice – even at the investigation stage by the public prosecutor's office – to discontinue proceedings (e.g. pursuant to Sections 153, 153a or 154 of the German Code of Criminal Procedure [Strafprozessordnung – StPO]), to dispense with imposing a penalty (Section 60 of the German Criminal Code [Strafgesetzbuch – StGB]) or, in the event of minor delays, to establish in the grounds of the judgment that the proceedings have been delayed in breach of the rule of law. In extreme cases, undue delay may constitute a procedural impediment that requires the court to terminate proceedings. If compensation has been provided in the criminal proceeding, except for compensation for material damage, the accused has received sufficient redress and is not further entitled to compensation in accordance with the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings.

If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.

If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.

A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.

In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.

Anyone who has suffered damage from a criminal conviction is compensated by the Treasury if the conviction is quashed or

(2019): According to the Act on Legal Redress for Excessive Length of Court Proceedings and of Criminal Investigation Proceedings (Gesetz über den Rechtsschutz bei überlangen Gerichtsverfahren und strafrechtlichen Ermittlungsverfahren) a person affected may file a complaint about undue delay (censure of delay) to the court seized of the case if proceedings seem unreasonably long. Subsequently, the person affected may bring a court action claiming compensation. The claim may be brought even before completion of the main proceedings. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary and non-pecuniary disadvantages.

If parties to a legal dispute suffer damage due to the excessive length of court proceedings, a compensation claim may also ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch – BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz – GG). A claim under these provisions requires that an official intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty incumbent upon him in relation to a third party. If the official breaches his duties in a judicial decision in a legal matter, then the state is only liable if the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence. This limitation does not apply if the official refuses or delays the exercise of his duty. However, the manner in which a judge conducts the legal proceedings may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.

If the official responsible for the execution of the court decision has delayed compulsory enforcement intentionally or negligently and in breach of his official duty, a compensation claim may ensue under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law.

A claim may also exist under Section 839 of the German Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the German Basic Law in cases of wrongful arrest if the official responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty. Decisions by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in criminal investigation proceedings, may, however, only be examined for their justifiability.

In the case of a wrongful conviction a state liability claim requires that the judge responsible intentionally or negligently breaches the official duty in such a way that the breach of duty consists in a criminal offence.

Anyone who has suffered damage from a criminal conviction is compensated by the Treasury if the conviction is quashed or reduced in reopened proceedings or otherwise in criminal proceedings after having become final and binding (Section 1(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures [Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen – StrEG]). The same applies if a measure of correction and prevention or an ancillary measure has been ordered without a conviction (Section 1(2) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, Section 2(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures provides for compensation for the damage suffered due to the execution of remand detention or temporary arrest. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation may be granted ex bono (Section 3 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures).

The subject of the compensation is the property damage caused by the criminal prosecution measure. In cases of deprivation of liberty on the basis of a court ruling, this can also be immaterial damage (section 7(1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). The current immaterial compensation is €25 for each day of deprivation of liberty commenced. Currently, legislative proceedings are ongoing to raise this amount of compensation up to €75 per day (BT-Drs. 19/17035).

(2018): As a general rule, in the case of excessively long court proceedings, the person concerned has to file a complaint about undue delay (Verzögerungsrüge) with the court at which the proceedings seem excessively long. If necessary, he or she can then file an application for compensation even if the original proceedings have not yet been concluded. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary disadvantages. To the extent that an alternative form of redress would appear insufficient, a fixed amount of €1,200 per year is granted as a general rule for non-pecuniary disadvantages.
The law of state liability is only partly regulated by national law (see below). In addition, there are provisions of Land law, as well as customary and judge-made law.
Provisions of federal law
If the parties to a legal dispute suffer damage because of the excessive length of proceedings, a compensation claim may ensue from section 839 of the Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch, BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law (Grundgesetz, GG) if there is a case of an official being culpable of refusal or delay in exercising a public function in breach of duty (section 839 (2), second sentence, of the Civil Code). However, the manner in which a judge conducts the proceedings within the scope of section 839 (2), second sentence, of the Civil Code may only be examined for its justifiability due to the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
A creditor's first port of call in procedural terms against the non-execution of a court decision by a bailiff is to lodge a reminder in accordance with section 766 (2) of the Code of Civil Procedure. The court responsible for execution rules on the reminder. If a senior judicial officer of the court responsible for execution wholly or partially rejects a creditor's motion to issue a compulsory enforcement measure, the creditor may lodge an immediate complaint (section 567 (1) no. 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure). If the organ responsible for execution has delayed compulsory enforcement culpably and in breach of duty, there may be a compensation claim under section 839 (1) of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law in the case of wrongful arrest if the acting official can be accused of a culpable breach of official duty. As regards rulings by the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as discretionary decisions by the public prosecution office in the investigation proceedings, the decision may only be examined for its justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful judgment, there is an official liability claim under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law if the breach of duty consists of a criminal offence (section 839 (2), first sentence, of the Civil Code).
The claim under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law is to be asserted in the courts of ordinary jurisdiction.
Distinct from these claims are compensation claims under provisions of special statutes, which as a rule are not intended to compensate for the entire damage, but provide lump sums instead.
In cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings, section 2 (1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures (Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen, StrEG) provides for compensation for the damage suffered due to the execution of
remand detention or temporary arrest. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation may be granted ex bono (section 2 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures). The

(2016): As a general rule, in the case of excessively long court proceedings, the person concerned has to file a complaint about undue delay (Verzögerungsrüge) with the court at which the proceedings seem excessively long. If necessary, he can then file a complaint for compensation even if the original proceedings have not yet been concluded. Adequate compensation is granted for pecuniary disadvantages. To the extent that an alternative form of redress would appear insufficient, a fixed amount of € 1,200 per year is granted as a general rule for non-pecuniary disadvantages.
The law of state liability is only partly regulated by national law (see below). There are in addition pro-visions of Land law, as well as common and judges' law.
Provisions of federal law
If the parties to a legal dispute suffer damage because of excessive length of proceedings, a damage claim may ensue from section 839 of the Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch, BGB) in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law (Grundgesetz, GG) if a case of culpable refusal or delay of execution of the office in breach of duty applies, section 839 (2), second sentence, of the Civil Code. However, the manner in which a judge pursues the proceedings within the scope of section 839 (2), second sentence, of the Civil Code may only be examined for justifiability because of the constitutional principle of judicial independence.
A creditor's first port of call in procedural terms against the non-execution of court decisions by a bailiff is to lodge a reminder in accordance with section 766 (2) of the Code of Civil Procedure. The execution court rules on the reminder. If a senior judicial officer of the execution court rejects a creditor's motion completely or in part to issue a compulsory enforcement measure, the creditor may lodge an immediate complaint (section 567 (1) no. 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure). If the execution organ has delayed compulsory enforcement culpably and in breach of duty, there may be a compensation claim under section 839 (1) of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law.
A claim may also exist under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law in the case of wrongful arrest if the acting official can be accused of a culpable breach of official duty. With rulings of the judge responsible for matters of custody, as well as with discretionary decisions of the public prosecution office in the investigation pro-ceedings, the decision may only be examined for its justifiability.
In the case of a wrongful judgment, there is an official liability claim under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law if the breach of duty consists of a criminal offence, section 839 (2), first sentence, of the Civil Code. The claim under section 839 of the Civil Code in conjunction with Article 34 of the Basic Law is to be asserted in the courts of ordinary jurisdiction.
Distinct from these claims are compensation claims under provisions of special statutes, which as a rule are not intended to compensate for the entire damage, but provide lump sums.
Section 2 (1) of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures (Gesetz über die Entschädigung für Strafverfolgungsmaßnahmen, StrEG) provides in cases of acquittal, discontinuation of the proceedings or refusal to initiate the main proceedings for compensation for the damage suffered by
remand detention or temporary arrest that have been carried out. Where the proceedings are discontinued in accordance with a discretional provision, compensation can be granted ex bono, section 3 of the Act on Compensation for Criminal Prosecution Measures. The subject of the compensation is the property damage caused by the criminal prosecution measure, in the case

Greece

(General Comment): The majority of courts have responded unavailable, there is data for a small percentage of them.

(2018): Chapter C L.4055/2012 and Articles 1-7 L.4239/2014 provide for the compensation system for the cases brought before administrative, Civil and Criminal courts.
Furthermore, according to Criminal Procedure Court there is a provisional compensation between 8,804 euro and 29,347 euro per day, for the wrongly convicted, which is granted by a relevant judicial decision.

(2016): Chapter C L.4055/2012 and Articles 1-7 L.4239/2014 provide for the compensation system for the cases brought before administrative, Civil and Criminal courts.
Furthermore, according to Criminal Procedure Court there is a provisional compensation between 8,804 euro and 29,347 euro per day, for the wrongly convicted, which is granted by a relevant judicial decision.

Hungary

(General Comment): Excessive length: If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. Non-execution of court decisions: Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day. Wrongful arrest: The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated. Wrongful condemnation: If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included. Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

(2020): There is no national level database containing the data for the question.

(2019): Excessive length:
If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. The governement given before the Paliament in october 2018 a bill proposal on the financial compensation related to the prolongation of certain court proceedings.
Non-execution of court decisions:
Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day.
Wrongful arrest:
The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated.
Wrongful condemnation:
If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included.
Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

(2018): Excessive length:
If the court is not able to finish the cases within reasonable time a compensation may be awarded to the parties. The court decides about the compensation in a fast tarck procedure. The governement given before the Paliament in october 2018 a bill proposal on the financial compensation related to the prolongation of certain court proceedings.
Non-execution of court decisions:
Usually the court orders a 15 day deadline for fulfilling its final decision. If the party that is obliged to do so does not fulfil this obligation he/she also has to pay an interest from that day.
Wrongful arrest:
The damages occured for wrongful arrest, house arrest or preliminary detention at a psychiatric institution shall be compensated.
Wrongful condemnation:
If the person was convicted, but later - as a result of an extraordinary review procedure - he/she was not found guilty or received a lenient punishment. Any pecuniary punishment or cost of the procedure that was paid by the accused person should be repaid with interest included.
Other: the court awards a compenstaion if the circumstances of the imprisonment of a convicted or arrested person violate his/her fundamental rights.

Italy

(2021): The number of condemnations is higher than the number of requests because the former refers to condemnations in year 2021 and some of them were initiated in previous years.

(2019): Unfortunately, the total amount in € is not available at this stage. This is a figure whose source is external to our administration (Ministry of Economy and Finance), hence we cannot guarantee its reliability.

(2018): Please note that the last two columns at Q.37 (number of condemnations and total amount in euros) refer to those compensating procedures cleared (actually paid) in 2018. Therefore, not necessary they refer to compensation procedures initiated in 2018 (first column).
PS: Given the wide diversity of such procedures we believe that the total doesn't make much sense, hence NA.

Latvia

(2021): The Ministry of Justice informs that it does not have a separate statistic about circumstances mentioned in Article 037.
The Ministry of Justice informs that the total amount of compensation in 2021 consists of non-pecuniary damages 75350 euros, damages 18708,39 euros, state social insurance contributions 2053,21 euros and personal income tax compensation 1100,40 euros.
The Ministry of Justice also informs that the compensation procedure and the calculation method for the compensation is regulated in a Law on compensation for damage caused in criminal proceedings and administrative violations. According to Article 15 the compensation calculation method of non-pecuniary damages for one unjustified detention day is minimum wage for month divided by 30, then the result without decimal places is multiply by 2. For example compensation for one unjustified detention day in 2021 was 32 euros ((500 euros : 30 = 16,66 euros); 16 euro x 2 x 1 day = 32 euros).

(2020): The Ministry of Justice informs that it does not have a separate statistic about circumstances mentioned in Article 037.
The Ministry of Justice informs that the total amount of compensation in 2020 consists of non-pecuniary damages 69 889,70 euros, damages 31 471,31 euros, state social insurance contributions 1867,12 euros and personal income tax compensation 820,09 euros.
The Ministry of Justice also informs that the compensation procedure and the calculation method for the compensation is regulated in a Law on compensation for damage caused in criminal proceedings and administrative violations. According to Article 15 the compensation calculation method of non-pecuniary damages for one unjustified detention day is minimum wage for month divided by 30, then the result without decimal places is multiply by 2. For example compensation for one unjustified detention day in 2020 was 28 euros ((430 euros : 30 = 14,33 euros); 14 euro x 2 x 1 day = 28 euros).
In Latvia, there is no compensation in the categories “Non-execution of court decisions” and “Number of condemnations”.

(2019): For 2019 the number of requests is almost the same than for 2018, while the amount decreased considerably. In 2018, in respect of separate legal proceedings and damages decisions, significant amounts of compensation have been determined compared to other cases. In 5 cases the amount of compensations was bigger than 10 000 euro, representing together 118,687.31 euro. Among those 5 cases, one compensation amount was 50 000 euro. Important compensations are an exception, not a routine, but sometimes they are and have a significant impact on the amount of reimbursement paid.

(2018): Cost increase exist because in 2016 there was less disbursement than in previous five years as well as the lowest expense rate since 2010. It is alleged that there was simply a coincidence in the cost of the claims, where no serious infringement of the rights of the individual could be established to determine a high level of non-pecuniary damage, or the amount of the loss was not high.

(2016): The Law on Compensation for Damages Caused by Unlawful or Unfounded Actions of Investigators, Prosecutors or Judges (Par izziņas izdarītāja, prokurora vai tiesneša nelikumīgas vai nepamatotas rīcības rezultātā nodarīto zaudējumu atlīdzināšanu; hereafter – "the Law on Compensation") determines the extent and the procedure of recovering losses, which as a result of the unlawful or groundless action of an investigator, prosecutor or judge in the course of fulfilling their official duties, are caused to natural
persons, as well as establishes the procedure in which the offended social and employment guarantees of such persons are ensured.
Article 2 of the Law on Compensation determines that legal basis for compensation for losses is: 1) a judgment of acquittal, regardless of the reason for acquittal; 2) termination of a criminal case due to person's exonerating circumstances; 3) recognition of an administrative apprehension as unlawful, and termination of the administrative proceedings.
Paragraph 1 of Article 7 of the Law on Compensation determines that the requests for damages must be submitted to the Ministry of Justice or the Office of the Prosecutor General, depending on the stage in which the proceedings have been terminated.
Parapgraph 3 of Article 5 of the Law on Compensation determines that the in relation to non-pecuniary damages, a person is entitled to submit a civil claim to a court of general jurisdiction. The court of general jurisdiction determines the amount of the compensation in civil cases considering the severity of the non-pecuniary damage and other circumstances, for example, excessive length of proceedings.
The Ministry of Justice collects information only about the total number of requests for compensation and the total paid amount.

Lithuania

(2020): Total - compensation for damage caused by public authorities + compensation for damage caused by public prosecutors and courts;
Other - compensation for damage caused by public authorities;

(2019): In category "other" the data on the number of requests for compensation is from the Ministry of Justice only, and the number of condemnations data is related to the judgements of all the State institutions, thus the number of condemnations is that much higher. The major part of applicants apply against the State to the court directly, thus the Ministry of Justice has information about the claims against the State in cases where it is the representative of the State only. Also the Ministry of Justice has data on satisfied claims in courts as it is responsible for the enforcement of these judgements.
Category "other" includes damage awarded because of the illegal actions of state institutions or officers and damage awarded because of improper imprisonment conditions.

(2018): Under the Civil Code and the Law on the Compensation of the Harm Caused by Illegal Actions of Public Authorities and Representation of the State of the Republic of Lithuania the damage resulting from the unlawful condemnation, unlawful arrest, unlawful detention, unlawful application of procedural coercive measures, illegal application of administrative penalty – arrest has to be reimbursed by the state in full, regardless of pre-trial investigation officers, prosecutors and court officials' fault. Compensations for unlawful arrest and unlawful condemnation are paid from separate budgetary program on compensation of damages operated by the Ministry of Justice. These compensations may be paid according to court decisions on damages as well as through out-of-court procedure.
Damages can be compensated after court trial and without court trial (the property damage cannot exceed 1500 EUR, the moral damage cannot exceed 2900 EUR). Information above has been given on both cases.
N.B. In 2016 there was provided information about out-of-court procedure only. In 2018 in order to disclose the complete situation the data is provided also including situations when applicants take an application to the court directly. This can cause some differencies in two periods (2016 and 2018).

(2016): Under the Civil Code and the Law on the Compensation of the Harm Caused by Illegal Actions of Public Authorities and Representation of the State the damage resulting from the unlawful condemnation, unlawful arrest, unlawful detention, unlawful application of procedural coercive measures, illegal application of administrative penalty – arrest has to be reimbursed by the state in full, regardless of pre-trial investigation officers, prosecutors and court officials' fault. Compensations for unlawful arrest and unlawful condemnation are paid from separate budgetary program on compensation of damages operated by the Ministry of Justice. These compensations may be paid according to court decisions on damages as well as through out-of-court procedure. Damages can be compensated after court trial and without court trial (the property damage can not exceed 1500 EUR, the moral damage can not exceed 2900 EUR).

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The law of 1 September 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a person considers that he or she has been victim of a defective functioning of the judicial bodies. Excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such malfunctioning could be grounds for such an action. These complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints about excessive length of proceedings can also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these last procedural steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes it difficult to identify the claims and decisions on compensation for the different categories and does not allow us to provide figures that reflect reality. However, it was possible to complete the table concerning compensation for wrongful arrest, provided for by the law of 30 December 1981, concerning compensation for inoperative preventive detention. The figures available for compensation for wrongful arrest represent the requests and decisions granting compensation for inoperative preventive detention (IPD) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detentionpreventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. We would like to point out, however, that in the context of the aforementioned law of 30 December 1981, it is not appropriate to speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions that can be appealed before the administrative courts.

(2021): The law of 1 September 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a person considers that he or she has been victim of a defective functioning of the judicial bodies. Excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such malfunctioning could be grounds for such an action. These complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints about excessive length of proceedings can also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these last procedural steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes it difficult to identify the claims and decisions on compensation for the different categories and does not allow us to provide figures that reflect reality. However, it was possible to complete the table concerning compensation for wrongful arrest, provided for by the law of 30 December 1981, concerning compensation for inoperative preventive detention. The figures available for compensation for wrongful arrest represent the requests and decisions granting compensation for inoperative preventive detention (IPD) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detentionpreventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. We would like to point out, however, that in the context of the aforementioned law of 30 December 1981, it is not appropriate to speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions that can be appealed before the administrative courts.

(2020): The law of September 1, 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a person believes that he or she has been the victim of a defective operation of the judicial bodies. Excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such malfunctioning could be grounds for such an action. These complaints are brought before the courts of first instance. However, complaints about excessive length of proceedings can also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of Article 6 of the Convention on Human Rights) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these last approaches do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes it difficult to identify the claims and decisions on compensation for the different categories and does not allow us to provide figures that reflect reality. However, it was possible to complete the table concerning compensation for unjustified arrest, provided for by the law of December 30, 1981, concerning compensation for inoperative preventive detention. The figures available for compensation for wrongful arrest represent the requests and decisions granting compensation for inoperative preventive detention (IPD) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detentionpreventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. We would like to point out, however, that in the context of the aforementioned law of December 30, 1981, it is not appropriate to speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions.

(2019): The law of September 1, 1988 on the civil liability of the State and public authorities allows the State to be held civilly liable before the ordinary courts if a litigant considers that s/he has been the victim of a malfunctioning of the judicial bodies. An excessive length of proceedings or a conviction resulting from such a malfunction could motivate such an action. Such complaints are brought before first instance courts. However, complaints concerning the excessive length of proceedings may also be brought before the European Court of Human Rights (violation of article 6 of the ECHR) or result in a procedural sanction during the proceedings. However, these latter steps do not appear in our systems. Thus, the diversity of the actors involved makes the identification of claims and compensation decisions for the different categories difficult and does not allow for the provision of figures reflecting reality. However, it was possible for us to complete the table concerning compensation for unjustified arrest, provided for by the law of December 30, 1981 on compensation for inoperative pre-trial detention. The figures available for compensation for unjustified arrest represent the claims and decisions granting compensation in the context of inoperative preventive detention (IPR) (https://mj.gouvernement.lu/fr/service-citoyens/detention-preventive.html) as well as the total amount paid. However, we would like to point out that, in the framework of the above-mentioned law of December 30, 1981, we should not speak of convictions, but of administrative decisions.

(2016): In all cases compensation, in particular on the basis of the civil liability of the State, is possible, but there is no data.

Malta

(2021): Under article 3 of the 7th protocol of the European Convention for Human Rights there is the right to compensation for wrongful conviction whilst under article 5(5) of the European Convention of Human Rights (transposed as Chapter 319 of the Laws of Malta), there is the right to compensation for unlawful detention. For the purpose of the evaluation, 'unlawful detention' falls under the category 'Wrongful arrest' even if the difference between the two is being acknowledged.
For both categories, no data is available.

(2020): Under article 3 of the 7th protocol of the European Convention for Human Rights there is the right to compensation for wrongful conviction whilst under article 5(5) of the European Convention of Human Rights (transposed as Chapter 319 of the Laws of Malta), there is the right to compensation for unlawful detention.
However no data is available.

(2018): The items listed at Q37 form the basis of constitutional remedies on the basis of breaches of fundamental human rights. In this respect, such grievances are not covered by our compensation procedure and legislation.

(2016): The above requested data is not available, as in accordance with our system, an individual has to institute constitutional redress proceedings in order for the court to declare that the individual suffered a violation of his fundamental human rights resulting from length of proceedings or arbitrariness through detention. The compensation awarded by the domestic courts depends on the length of proceedings and the gravity of the case, and whilst such cases are instituted in accordance to Maltese law, this data is not available.

Netherlands

(General Comment): Numbers cannot be provided, as compensation may involve people who have been in custody but were not accused or found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or gone missing. Numbers for compensation for wrongful arrest or wrongful conviction used to be generated by the Statistics Bureau (CBS), but that line of research was discontinued after 2016.

(2019): It's not possible to give specific numbers for these categories.
Compensation may involve people who were in custody, but were not accused or found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest, or possessed goods that have been damaged, sold, destroyed or have gone missing.
Numbers for compensation for wrongful arrest or wrongful conviction used to be generated by the Statistics Bureau (CBS), but that line of research was discontinued after 2016.

(2018): Numbers cannot be provided for this question, as the compensation may involve people who have been in custody but where not accused of found guilty, it may involve damages due to an arrest, or posessed goods that have been damaged / sold / destroyed / gone missing. I don't have numbers specific to the categories you ask for. Also, this involves only a restricted group of 'users'.

(2012): In 2012, in 4 783 cases compensation was awarded for wrongful detention.

Poland

(General Comment): The rules for granting a sum of money in case of finding excessive length of proceedings are specified in the Act of 17 June 2004 on complaints of violation of the right of a party to hear a case in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and court proceedings without unreasonable delay. According to art. 12 para. 4 of this Act, having regard to the complaint on (excessive), the court adjudicates from the Treasury, and in the case of complaints about the length of the proceedings conducted by the bailiff - from the bailiff, a sum of PLN 2,000 to PLN 20,000. The amount of the monetary sum, within the limits specified in the first sentence, is not less than PLN 500 for each year of the current duration of the proceedings, regardless of the number of stages of proceedings related to the excessive length of proceedings. The court may award a sum of money higher than PLN 500 for each year of the current duration of the proceedings, if the case is of particular importance to the applicant, who by his attitude did not contribute in a manner to prolonging the proceedings. This sum includes the amounts already awarded 16 to the applicant as a sum of money in the same case. No monetary sum is granted in the event of a complaint filed by the State Treasury or public sector units of the public finance sector.
The accused, who was acquitted or condemned to a more lenient punishment as a result of the resumption of the proceedings or cassation, serves the State Treasury for damages and compensation for the harm suffered resulting from the execution of all or part of the punishment he was not supposed to incur. This provision shall also apply if the proceedings were discontinued after the convicting decision was abrogated as a result of circumstances which were not taken into account in the earlier proceedings. The right to compensation and redress also arises in connection with the application of a safeguard measure under the conditions laid down in those circumstances. Compensation and redress also apply in the event of undoubtedly unjustified detention or detention (Article 552 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

**(2021): ***272- number of persons; *12 - number of persons
The amounts of compensations from chapter 75595 paid in 2021 ordered from the State Treasury are presented below, together with an indication of the legal acts on the basis of which the compensations were ordered.
Specification of damages from chapter 75595 amounts paid in 2021
1. Act of 23 February 1991 on declaring invalid judgments issued against persons repressed for activities in favour of the independent existence of the Polish state = EUR 21,625
2 Article 552 of the Act of 6 June 1997 - Code of Criminal Procedure = €6,707; 3 Act of 17 June 2004 on Complaint for Infringement of the Right of a Party to Investigate a Case in Pre-trial Proceedings Conducted or Supervised by a Public Prosecutor and in Judicial Proceedings without Undue Delay € 1,188
4 other damages: inter alia, compensatory pensions, compensation for property damage, unlawful eviction € 324
5 Act of 7 July 2005 on State compensation to victims of certain criminal acts 71 euro
Total compensation in chapter 75595 137 590 pln 29 915 euro
The amount of funds spent on the payment of compensation to entitled persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the legitimacy of claims and the amount of compensation awarded. Course of implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 in the course of the financial year is therefore independent of the activities of the financial services of individual courts, since the payment of funds by the financial branch of the court occurs only on the basis of a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the entitled person.

**(2020): ***229 - numer of persons
*19 - numer of persons
Regarding the content of question 37, we would like to inform you that the Ministry of Justice , within its jurisdiction has the following data on the amount of compensation payments also from Section 15 of the State Budget, Chapter 75595, adjudged by the State Treasury in 2020
Specification of compensation from Chapter 75595 in 2020 in euro: 1.On the basis of the Act of 23 February 1991 on the recognition of invalidrulings issued against persons repressed for activities for the benefit of the independent state of Poland - EUR 13 123 0002 On the basis of Article 552 of the Act of 6 June 1997 Code of Criminal Procedure (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 1987) 4 552 000 euro3. pursuant to the Act of 17 June 2004 on a complaint for violationof a party's right to examine a case in preparatory proceedings conducted or supervised by a prosecutor and court proceedings without undue delay (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 75) EUR 1 005 0004. other compensations: inter alia, compensatory pensions, compensation in property damage, unlawful eviction 114 000 euro
5. under the Act of 7 July 2005 on State Compensationto victims of certain criminal acts 32 000 euro
Total compensations from chapter 75595 - 18 826 000 euro
The amount of funds spent on compensation payments to entitled persons results directly from the content of judgments of independent courts deciding on the legitimacy of claims and the amount of awarded compensation. The course of implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the budget year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial branch of the court, occurs only on the basis of a final court decision to pay compensation to the entitled person.

(2019): The course of the implementation of the expenditure plan in chapter 75595 during the financial year is therefore independent of the actions of the financial services of individual courts, because the payment of funds by the financial department of the court takes place only on the basis of a final court ruling on the payment of compensation to the entitled person.
*Non execution of decision - 317- number of persons
*Wrongful conviction - 26- number of persons

Portugal

(General Comment): There is no data with these levels of disaggregation in Portugal.

Romania

(General Comment): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as a compensation. In criminal matters, the only possibility to obtain damages in case of procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, based on the provisions of the Civil Code. The new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010) provides for a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, he/she solicits the adoption of legal measures remedying to this situation. Please, refer to the regulations of the NCPC as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and a case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Illegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010). For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, common law rules laid down by the Civil Code apply. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trial, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation. The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile. The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

(2020): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as a compensation. In criminal matters, the only possibility to obtain damages in case of procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, based on the provisions of the Civil Code. The new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010) provides for a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, he/she solicits the adoption of legal measures remedying to this situation. Please, refer to the regulations of the NCPC as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and a case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Illegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code (the Law 135/2010). For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, common law rules laid down by the Civil Code apply. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trial, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation. The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person. The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile. The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

(2019): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Ilegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

(2018): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 para. (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
Ilegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her liberty is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.
Regarding the excessive duration of the criminal procedures, there is a remedy, but it is not compensatory - see art. 488 (index1) and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code.

(2016): There is no mechanism for calculating the compensation. The courts take into consideration the national case law and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in similar cases.
Even if the civil regulations of material and procedural law do not provide special mechanisms for the compensation of individuals in case of excessive duration of procedures and non-enforcement of judgments, there are norms guaranteeing the right to a fair trial and at case settlement within a reasonable time-limit. In such circumstances, there is a possibility to pay certain sums of money as fines or even as compensation. In the criminal matter, the only possibility to obtain damages in the case of the procedural delays is the civil claim for damages, made on the provisions of the Civil Code. In the new Civil Procedure Code (the Law 134/2010), entered into force on the 15th of February 2013), there is stipulated a much more efficient mechanism to this effect, respectively the contestation concerning the protraction of the case settlement. Thus, according to Article 522 paragraph (1) of the NCPC, any party, as well as the prosecutor attending the trial may make contestation by which, invoking the infringement of the right to the settlement of the trial within an optimal and reasonable time-limit, to solicit the taking of the legal measures for the removal of this situation. See, for completion, the regulations stipulated in the civil matter (the NCPC) as concerns the guarantee of the right to a fair trial and at the case settlement within a reasonable time-limit.
The non-observance of judgments is incriminated as offence by Art. 287 of the Criminal Code. Within the criminal trial there may be also formulated the civil claim for damages for the non-enforcement of the judgment. The civil action may be also introduced separately, at the civil court. Both actions shall be judged according to the provisions of the Civil Code, regulating the delictual civil responsibility.
llegal arrest and illegal conviction are situations circumscribed to judicial errors for which the Romanian state is responsible according to Art. 538-539 and the following of the Criminal Procedure Code(the Law 135/2010) For the appreciation in substance of the civil responsibility, there shall apply the common law rules laid down by the Civil Code. According to the provisions of the art. 538 of the Criminal Procedure Code, any person who suffered a wrongful condemnation or was, during a criminal trail, illegally deprived of his/her libery is entitled to receive a compensation.
The compensation should cover both the material and moral prejudices caused to that person.
The amount of the compensation is to be determined by the court (the tribunal) in whose district the entitled person has its domicile.
The entitled person should introduce a civil action against the state (which is represented by the Ministry of Public Finances), action which is exempted of any judicial fees.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can be awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time. The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction, non-execution of court decisions can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.

(2019): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time. The compensation was awarded in the amount of 375 912 eur in 2019.
The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction, non-execution of court decisions can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.
The number of requests for compensation delivered on the Ministry of Justice of the SVK was 214. Out of these only 4 request were satisfied:
one non-execution of court decisions (allocated amount 8.640,65 €),
one wrongful conviction (167,78 €),
two other (administrative mistake of the court, allocated amount 980,16 €).
Some of the unsatisfied request end up on the court in the civil procedure. During 2019 Ministry of Justice of SVK compensated in addition (due the court decision) in 45 cases in the amount of 553 395 euros. In these cases, we do not provide precise information on the reason for compensation, but we can say that in most cases it was compensation for wrongful conviction, in which the applicant was not found guilty.

(2018): The compensations for the excessive length of proceedings can awarded by the Constitutional court in the finding on violation of the right to trial in the reasonable time.
The compensation for wrongful arrest or conviction can be awarded by the court in the civil procedure. The aggrieved person can seek compensation against the state according to the Act on State Liability for Damage in Exercise of the Public Power.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The Protection of Right to Trial without Undue Delay Act gives a party to court proceedings the right to have his rights, duties and any charges brought against him in his case before the court to be decided upon by the court without undue delay, as well as a right to compensation, if the aforementioned right was infringed.
The procedure for compensation in the case of wrongful arrest and wrongful condemnation is regulated by the Criminal Procedure Act.
Before filing the claim for compensation with the court, the injured person has to address his claim to the Office of the State Attorney General to try and reach agreement about the existence of the damage and the type and extent of compensation. If the request for compensation is not granted or the Office of the State Attorney General and the injured person do not reach accord within three months of the filing of the request, the injured person may file a claim for compensation with the court.
The compensation, offered by the State Attorney's Office for wrongful arrest varies from case to case, since circumstances of the individual case (e.g. length of wrongful arrest, effect on the injured person's family life and his closest social circle, effects of media exposure, effect to injured person's health, etc.), as well as court decisions in similar cases, are taken into account.

**(2021): ***The figures above represent cases, closed in 2021, with compensations to be paid in 2021 or later. The figures above represent cases before courts only (court decisions and court settlements).
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2021 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 33;
Number of settlements: 10;
Total amount (in €): 21.715 EUR;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 32;
Number of settlements: 8;
Total amount (in €): 63.174 EUR;
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 0;
Total amount (in €): 0.

**(2020): ***The figures above represent cases, closed in 2020, with compensations to be paid in 2020 or later. The figures above represent cases before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2020 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 60;
Number of settlements: 10;
Total amount (in €): 23.222;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 30;
Number of settlements: 8
Total amount (in €): 140.330
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 8;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 1.260.

**(2019): ***The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed in 2019, with compensations to be paid in 2019 or later. The figures above represent cases
before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2019 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 69;
Number of settlements: 22;
Total amount (in €): 35.956;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 44;
Number of settlements: 16;
Total amount (in €): 99.493;
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 5;
Number of settlements: 1;
Total amount (in €): 36.460.

**(2018): ***The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed in 2018, with compensations to be paid in 2018 or later. The figures above represent cases before courts only.
Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2018 (before filing law-suit at court):
1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 68;
Number of settlements: 17;
Total amount (in €): 31.105;
2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 15;
Number of settlements: 9
Total amount (in €): 36.213,22
3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 9;
Number of settlements: 2;
Total amount (in €): 68.648,98.

**(2016): ***The figures above do not include cases at ECHR.
*The figures above represent cases, closed at the State Attorney in 2016, with compensations to be paid in 2016 or later. *The figures above represent cases before courts only. Before filing the claim for damages with the court, the injured person has to address his claim to the Office of the State Attorney General to try and reach agreement about the existence of the damage and the type and extent of compensation. If the request for recovery of damages is not granted or the Office of the State Attorney General and the injured person do not reach accord within three months of the filing of the request, the injured person may file a claim for damages with the court. The compensation, offered by the State Attorney's Office for wrongful arrest varies from case to case, since circumstances of the individual case (e.g. length of wrongful arrest, effect on the injured person's family life and his closest social circle, effects of media exposure, effect to injured person's health, etc.), as well as court decisions in similar cases, are taken into account.. Data for procedures at the State Attorney for 2016: 1. Excessive length of proceedings - Number of requests for compensation: 71; Number of settlements: 37; Total amount (in €): 430.262; 2. Wrongful arrest - Number of requests for compensation: 50; Number of settlements: 31 Total amount (in €): 144.881 3. Wrongful conviction - Number of requests for compensation: 0; Number of condemnations: 0; Total amount (in €): 0.
The Protection of Right to Trial without Undue Delay Act gives a party to court proceedings the right to have his rights, duties and any charges brought against him in his case before the court to be decided upon by the court without undue delay. For detailed explanation on Excessice length of proceedings see Q40.
The procedure for compensation in the case of wrongful arrest and wrongful condemnation is regulated by the Criminal Procedure Act.

Spain

(2021): In 2021, 368 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 205 for preventive detention, 83 for judicial error. € 802.735 were paid for administrative condemnations and € 1.486.968 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater
than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. SOURCE: La Justicia dato a dato, (document issued by the CGPJ)

(2020): In 2020, 320 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 62 for preventive detention, 223 for judicial error. € 124.367,5 were paid for administrative condemnations and €445.491,3 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater
than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. The answer tries to group the Spanish categories into those of the CEPEJ.

(2019): In 2019, 347 files were initiated for abnormal functioning of the Administration of Justice, 151 for preventive detention, 79 for judicial error. € 3.484.896 were paid for administrative condemnations and €934.491,7 for judicial condemnations.
It is noteworthy that in Spain the causes of civil liability of the Administration of Justice are divided into a number of categories greater than the one proposed by the CEPEJ. The answer tries to group the Spanish categories into those of the CEPEJ. In the section 'wrongful conviction', we give the cases of the Spanish category of 'judicial error'. Possibly, other years these cases have simply been included in 'other'. It is a change of criteria with no effect on the total.

(2018): In 2018, 332 files were initiated for abnormal functioning, 104 for preventive detention, 94 for judicial error. € 722,888.06 were paid for administrative condemnations and € 1,210,585.35 for judicial condemnations

(2016): According Article 293 of the Organic Law of the Judicial Power: The interested party will direct his indemnification petition directly to the Ministry of Justice, processing it according to the regulatory norms of the patrimonial responsibility of the state. A contentious-administrative appeal will be available against the resolution. The right to claim compensation shall expire a year, from the day on which it could be exercised.
The number of requests because of "judicial error" (non exactly the same concept as Wrongful conviction) that were estimated in 2016 was ONE (1).

Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and court users

Table 6.1 Writing assistance tools in 2021 (Q62-7, Q62-7-1)

States	Writing assistance tools			
	General	Civil and/or commercial	Criminal	Administrative
Austria	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Belgium	Yes	50-99%	50-99%	10-49%
Bulgaria	No	-	-	-
Croatia	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Cyprus	No	-	-	-
Czech Republic	Yes	50-99%	50-99%	50-99%
Denmark	Yes	100%	50-99%	50-99%
Estonia	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Finland	Yes	100%	100%	100%
France	Yes	10-49%	50-99%	100%
Germany	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Greece	Yes	10-49%	10-49%	50-99%
Hungary	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Ireland	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Italy	Yes	100%	50-99%	100%
Latvia	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Lithuania	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Luxembourg	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Malta	Yes	10-49%	10-49%	10-49%
Netherlands	Yes	NA	NA	NA
Poland	Yes	50-99%	50-99%	NA
Portugal	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Romania	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Slovak Republic	Yes	50-99%	50-99%	50-99%
Slovenia	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Spain	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Sweden	Yes	100%	100%	100%
Yes	25			
No	2			
100%		17	15	17
50-99%		4	7	4
10-49%		3	2	2
1-9%		0	0	0
NA		1	1	2

Table 6.2 Voice recording tools in 2021 (Q62-8, Q62-8-1)

States	Recording tools	Simple dictation tools			Multiple speakers recording tools			Voice recognition feature		
		Civil and/or commercial	Criminal	Administrative	Civil and/or commercial	Criminal	Administrative	Civil and/or commercial	Criminal	Administrative
Austria	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in most of the courts	in all courts	in most of the courts	Yes	Yes	Yes
Belgium	Yes	in some courts / pilot phases	in some courts / pilot phases	not available	not available	not available	not available	No	No	No
Bulgaria	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in most of the courts	in most of the courts	in most of the courts	No	No	No
Croatia	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	No	No	No
Cyprus	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czech Republic	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in most of the courts	in all courts	in most of the courts	Pilot testing	Pilot testing	Pilot testing
Denmark	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	Yes	Yes	Yes
Estonia	Yes	not available	not available	not available	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	Yes	Yes	Yes
Finland	Yes	not available	not available	not available	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	No	No	No
France	Yes	NA	NA	in some courts / pilot phases	NA	NA	not available	NA	NA	No
Germany	Yes	in most of the courts	in most of the courts	in most of the courts	in some courts / pilot phases	in some courts / pilot phases	in some courts / pilot phases	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	in most of the courts	in most of the courts	not available	in most of the courts	in most of the courts	not available	No	NA	NA
Hungary	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	No	No	No
Italy	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in most of the courts	in all courts	not available	Yes	Yes	No
Latvia	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	Pilot testing	Pilot testing	Pilot testing
Lithuania	Yes	not available	not available	not available	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	No	No	No
Luxembourg	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malta	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	Pilot testing	No	No
Netherlands	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	No	No	No
Poland	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	not available	in all courts	in some courts / pilot phases	in all courts	Yes	Yes	No
Portugal	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	No	No	No
Romania	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	Pilot testing	Pilot testing	Pilot testing
Slovak Republic	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	No	No	No
Slovenia	Yes	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	No	No	No
Spain	Yes	in some courts / pilot phases	in some courts / pilot phases	in some courts / pilot phases	in some courts / pilot phases	in some courts / pilot phases	in some courts / pilot phases	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	not available	not available	not available	in all courts	in all courts	in all courts	No	No	No
Yes	25							8	8	6
No	2							12	12	15
in all courts		15	15	14	15	17	15			
in most of the courts		2	2	1	5	2	3			
not available		4	4	7	1	1	4			
NA		2	2	1	2	2	1			

Table 6.3 Budgetary and financial management systems of courts in 2021 (Q63-6)

States	Budgetary and financial management of courts			Justice expenses management			Other		
	Tool deployment rate	Data consolidated at national level	System communicating with other ministries	Tool deployment rate	Data consolidated at national level	System communicating with other ministries	Tool deployment rate	Data consolidated at national level	System communicating with other ministries
Austria	NA	Yes	No	NA	No	No	NA	Yes	No
Belgium	50-99%	Yes	Yes	50-99%	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	100%	Yes	No	0% (NAP)	No	No	0% (NAP)	No	No
Cyprus	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	0% (NAP)	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	100%	No	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Denmark	1-9%	Yes	No	1-9%	Yes	Yes	NA	No	No
Estonia	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes
Finland	100%	Yes	No	100%	Yes	No	NA	NA	NA
France	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA
Germany	50-99%	Yes	Yes	50-99%	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA
Greece	100%	Yes	No	100%	Yes	No	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes
Ireland	100%	No	No	100%	No	No	NA	No	No
Italy	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	0% (NAP)	NAP	NAP
Latvia	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	0% (NAP)	No	No
Lithuania	100%	Yes	Yes	0% (NAP)	NAP	NAP	0% (NAP)	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	100%	No	No	100%	No	No	NA	NA	NA
Malta	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	100%	Yes	No	0% (NAP)	NAP	NAP	0% (NAP)	NAP	NAP
Poland	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	No	0% (NAP)	No	No
Romania	1-9%	Yes	Yes	1-9%	Yes	Yes	NA	No	No
Slovak Republic	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	0% (NAP)	NAP	NAP
Slovenia	100%	Yes	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes	NA	No	No
Spain	100%	No	Yes	100%	No	Yes	100%	Yes	Yes
Sweden	100%	Yes	No	100%	Yes	No	0% (NAP)	No	No

Yes		23	18		19	16		4	3
No		4	9		7	10		13	14
100%	22			18			3		
50-99%	2			2			0		
10-49%	0			0			0		
1-9%	2			2			0		
NA	1	0	0	2	1	1	15	10	10

Table 6.4 Measurement tools to assess the workload of judges, prosecutors and/or non/judge/non-prosecutor staff in 2021 (Q63-7, Q63-7-1)

States	Existence of measurment tools	Deployment rate			Monitoring at national level			Monitoring at court local level			Integrated with CMS		
		Judges	Prosecutors	Non-judge/non-prosecutor staff	Judges	Prosecutors	Non-judge/non-prosecutor staff	Judges	Prosecutors	Non-judge/non-prosecutor staff	Judges	Prosecutors	Non-judge/non-prosecutor staff
Austria	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Belgium	Yes	0% (NAP)	10-49%	10-49%	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	50-99%	50-99%	0% (NAP)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Croatia	Yes	100%	100%	0% (NAP)	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP
Cyprus	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czech Republic	Yes	50-99%	50-99%	0% (NAP)	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP
Denmark	Yes	10-49%	50-99%	10-49%	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Estonia	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Finland	Yes	100%	50-99%	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
France	Yes	0% (NAP)	0% (NAP)	100%	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Germany	Yes	50-99%	50-99%	50-99%	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Greece	Yes	50-99%	NA	NA	Yes	NA	NA	Yes	NA	NA	Yes	NA	NA
Hungary	Yes	100%	100%	0% (NAP)	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP
Ireland	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Italy	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Latvia	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lithuania	Yes	100%	50-99%	0% (NAP)	Yes	No	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	No	NAP
Luxembourg	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malta	Yes	100%	10-49%	0% (NAP)	Yes	No	NAP	Yes	No	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP
Netherlands	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poland	Yes	100%	100%	10-49%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Portugal	Yes	100%	100%	0% (NAP)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Romania	Yes	100%	0% (NAP)	0% (NAP)	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Slovak Republic	Yes	100%	NA	10-49%	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Slovenia	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Spain	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Sweden	Yes	100%	100%	100%	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yes	23				19	16	11	20	17	13	15	15	11
No and NAP	4				4	6	11	3	5	9	8	7	11
100%		16	11	9									
50-99%		4	6	1									
10-49%		1	2	4									
1-9%		0	0	0									
NA		0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1

Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and for court users

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 062-7. Are there writing assistance tools for which the content is coordinated at national level? (models or templates, paragraphs already pre-written, etc.)
Question 062-7-1. If yes, please specify the following information:

Question 062-8. Are there voice recording tools?

Question 062-8-1. If yes, please specify:

Question 063-6. Budgetary and financial management systems of courts

Question 063-7. Measurement tools to assess the workload of judges, prosecutors and/or non-judge/non-prosecutor staff (tool quantifying the activity of judges, prosecutors and/or non-judge/non-prosecutor staff – for example the number of cases resolved)
Question 063-7-1. If yes, please specify the following information:

Austria

Q063-6 (2021): Monthly controlling reports of the budgetary authorities.

Q063-6 (2020): Monthly controlling reports of the budgetary authorities.

Q063-6 (2019): Monthly Controlling Reports of the budgetary authorities.

Q063-6 (2018): Monthly controlling reports of the budgetary authorities.

Q063-7 (2019): The data for the measurement tools is provided by the CMS, but there is no way get Access to this data directly by using the CMS.
Q063-7 (2018): The data for the measurement tools is provided by the CMS, but there is no way get access to this data directly by using the CMS.

Belgium

Q062-7 (2021): For civil and/or commercial and criminal matters: local modification of models is always possible. As regards the Council of State (the highest administrative court in the country), administrative matters: for each type of procedure, there are templates of judgments which contain certain standardised paragraphs. This standardisation concerns in particular the part relating to the conduct of the proceedings. Constant harmonisation work is carried out under the impetus of the First President and with the help of the Chief Registrar. Some documents are now generated automatically on the basis of information contained in our internal databases (e.g. setting orders and hearing tables). However, there are no writing assistance tools as such.
It should be noted that, following a change initiated in 2007, the Council of State's judgments have all been written in direct style since 2017. This generalisation of the direct style has ensured greater uniformity in the presentation of judgments.
Judges of the Belgian Council of State have a number of tools at their disposal: legal databases are maintained internally and made available to the public as well (Juridict www.juridict.be, refLex www.reflex.be, etc.); access is provided to private, paying legal databases (StradaLex www.stradalex.be, Jurisquare www.jurisquare.be, etc.); an intranet managed by the Council of State also centralises all documents produced by the Council of State (judgments, orders, reports, etc.) - it is called Documap; the Council of State's website also offers numerous search options www.raadvst-consetat.be.

Q062-7 (2020): "For civil and/or commercial and criminal matters: local modification of the models is always possible. As regards the Council of State (the highest administrative court in the country); administrative matters:
1. For each type of procedure, there are models of judgments which include certain standardized paragraphs. This standardization concerns in particular the part relating to the course of the procedure. A constant work of harmonization is carried out under the impulse of the First President and with the help of the Chief Clerk.
Some documents are now generated automatically on the basis of information taken from our internal databases (e.g. setting orders and hearing tables).
However, there are no "judgment drafting tools" as such.
2. It should be noted that, following an evolution initiated in 2007, the judgments of the highest administrative Courts - since 2017 - all written in direct style. This generalization of the direct style has made it possible to ensure greater uniformity in the presentation of judgments.
3. The magistrates of the Belgian highest administrative Courts have many tools at their disposal:
- legal databases are maintained internally and made available to the public as well (Juridict www.juridict.be , refLex www.reflex.be , etc.);
- access is provided to private, paying legal databases (StradaLex www.stradalex.be , Jurisquare www.jurisquare.be , etc.);
- an intranet managed by the Council of State also centralizes all documents produced by the Council of State (judgments, orders, reports, etc.). It is called Documap.
- The website of the highest adminsitrative Courts also offers numerous search possibilities www.raadvst-consetat.be.
"

Q062-7 (2019): Administrative: For each type of procedure, there are models of judgments within the Council of State which include certain standardized paragraphs. This standardization concerns in particular the part relating to the course of the procedure. A constant work of harmonization is carried out under the impetus of the First President and with the help of the chief registrar. Certain documents are now generated automatically on the basis of information contained in our internal databases (fixing orders and audience tables, for example). Strictly speaking, however, there are no "drafting aid tools" for judgments.
2. It should be noted that following a development initiated in 2007, the judgments of the Council of State have - since 2017 - all been drafted in direct style. This generalization of the direct style made it possible to ensure greater uniformity in the presentation of judgments.
3. The magistrates of the Council of State of Belgium have many tools at their disposal:
- legal databases are kept up to date internally and also made available to the public (Juridict www.juridict.be, refLex www.reflex.be, etc.);
- access is offered to private and chargeable legal databases (StradaLex www.stradalex.be, Jurisquare www.jurisquare.be, etc.);
- an intranet managed by the Council of State also centralizes all the documents produced by the Council of State (judgments, ordinances, reports, etc.). It is called Documap.
- the website of the Council of State also offers many search possibilities www.raadvst-consetat.be.

Q062-8 (2021): Comment on Q62-8
The provision of a simple dictation tool is based on an individual online request with a specific and restrictive allocation policy.

Q062-8 (2020): "comments for questions 62-1 through 62-9:
Provision of a simple dictation solution is on an individual online request basis with a specific and limiting allocation policy."

Q063-6 (2019): Budget and financial management: the Fedcom systemhas been launched as a pilot project in the College of Courts and Tribunals.
Since the 1st January 2020, within each judicial district there has been a “court costs office” responsible for processing and paying court costs. The office uses a new system focused on fully digital management.
Other: The court fee (Rolrechten / droit de role) is centralized in one national system and communicated to the department of Finance. The status of the payment is returned from the department of finance to the department of justice

Q063-7 (2019): The Aris tool has been launched as a pilot project by the prosecution to measure workload both at central and local level, both for prosecutors of non-prosecutor staff.
Q063-7 (2018): A pilot project is being launched by the Public Prosecutor's Office for an instrument to measure workload at both central and local levels. The Aris instrument will be tested in pilot courts.

Bulgaria

Q062-7 (2020): Pursuant to Article 55 of the Civil Procedure Code, the Minister of Justice issues an ordinance approving the samples of all papers related to service. The amendment of the samples is done by amending and supplementing the ordinance.

Q063-7 (2020): With a decision of the Prosecutors Chamber with the Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria (SJC) dated 18.12.2019, as of 01.01.2020, Rules for measuring the workload of the prosecutor's offices and the individual workload of each prosecutor and investigator have been adopted. With a decision of the SJC of 16.12.2015, Rules for assessment of the workload of judges have been adopted.
The instruments do not refer to court employees, but only to judges, prosecutors and investigators within the prosecutor's offices and courts in the Republic of Bulgaria.

Q063-7 (2018): By decision of the Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria (SJC) of 11.12.2014, as of 01.01.2015, Rules for measuring the workload of the prosecution offices and the individual workload of each prosecutor and investigator were adopted. By decision of the SJC of 16.12.2015, as of 01.04.2016, Rules for assessment of the workload of judges were adopted. The instruments do not refer to judicial officers, but only to judges, prosecutors and investigators within the prosecutor's offices and courts in the Republic of Bulgaria.

Czech Republic

Q062-7 (2021): It depends on the court agenda. Some information systems for specific agendas can automatically create documents based on the predefine template, data stored in the system and the selected procedural action by a user. Some older information systems have a dedicated external application that allows the creation of the required documents based on user input (application called “APSTR”), and for some court agenda the writing assistance tools are not available at all. Regarding the process of coordinating new templates, the origin of the templates varies. Some are developed by the Ministry of Justice, others are created on the national level in cooperation with experts and court staff. Templates created at the national level can be and are modified in some court agendas at the local level by individual courts or in some cases by individual users.

Q062-7 (2020): The templates are available for all courts but do not cover all matters.

Q062-7-1 (General Comment): The templates are available for all courts but do not cover all matters.

Q062-8 (2021): Most courtrooms have installed specific voice recording tools for recording several separate audio tracks. The project regarding “spoken word-to-text conversion” was realized in the proof-of-concept stage. Based on the results of the project and other factors, the spoken word-to-text project has been included in the National Recovery Plan and will be realized in the upcoming years.

Q063-6 (2021): All Czech courts are using for budgetary and financial management information system called IRES. This system is used to generate and manage payment transactions, record assets, receivables, payables and other related areas. Although the IRES system (in the sense of all local court distributions) communicates with the National Treasury, which could be thought of as a centralized point where data is consolidated at the national level, it is not a tool/system that allows for easy data consolidation or direct analytical activities for the benefit of judicial agendas. The IRES system is not primarily used for the justice expenses management of exclusively judicial items such as court fees, litigation costs, etc. This data is not available to the chiefs judges of the courts from the IRES system in a comprehensive form and on a court-by-court basis. Selected judicial information systems that manage the certain justice agenda are able to report the necessary information on justice expense data. These information systems then use IRES to make and record payments.

Q063-6 (2020): The budgetary information system is called IRES and is used by the Ministry of Justice since 1995.

Q063-7 (2020): The measurement tool is only available to assess the workload of judges and public prosecutors.

Denmark

Q062-7 (2020): For civil/commercial cases the availability rate slightly decreased as we simply went through the different areas of use and the different patterns of uses and found that there were certain areas where we were not covered.

Q062-7 (2019): For civil/commercial cases the availability rate slightly decreased as we simply went through the different areas of use and the different patterns of uses and found that there were certain areas where we were not covered.

Q062-7 (2015): 62.7 assistance tools are also available in criminal cases, probate cases, enforcenemt cases and land registration cases

Q062-8 (2021): In addition to voice recording, the Danish Court administration have implemented speech-recognition in connection with certain court precedings. Further implementation of a wider roll-out of speech-recognition is being evaluated currently.

Q062-8 (2020): We had some testing of the quality of voice recognition and found that the software was unreliable in regards to the Danish language. We are again moving forward with this initiative.

Q062-8 (2019): We had some testing of the quality of voice recognition and found that the software was unreliable in regards to the Danish language. The response is based on the multiple choice fields and by pilot testing, we simply mean light testing and we are not moving forward with this initiative.

Q063-6 (General Comment): We have multiple tools in the various courts available for controlling and managing costs and the degrees to which they are being used varies. This data is relatively unknown by the central organization and this is our best estimate.
Activity in terms of weighted cases is used also in allocation of resources.

Q063-6 (2019): We have multiple tools in the various courts available for controlling and managing costs and the degrees to which they are being used varies. This data is relatively unknown by the central organization and this is our best estimate.
Activity in terms of weighted cases is used also in allocation of resources.

Q063-7 (General Comment): We measure how much time each judge or staff on different categories of work (civil cases, criminal cases, administration etc.). We calculate the activity a court creates in weighted cases. We therefore measure productivity. For prosecutors: There is a well-implemented time recording system where the Prosecution Service´s staff weekly report their time spent on specific tasks, e.g. court work, formal charging, dropping of cases/withdrawal of charges, transport time to and from court, training etc. The time recording system is also used to report work outside normal working hours (overtime), including shifts for which a separate fee is paid. In addition, the number of prosecutions and withdrawal of charges is measures, with each charge weighted according to a specific system. Time recording data is used in calculations of the Prosecution Service´s case production and efficiency – and thus also in the management information in QlickView that is available on the Prosecution Service at national level as well as for the individual police districts and State Prosecutor´s offices.

Q063-7 (2021): Judges above: Danish Court Administration has chosen 10-49 %. It might be higher. The point is that on district courts, all judges either fill out how time is spend on a daily basis, or - for appointed judges - on a half-yearly basis. At some courts, the court has decided that the judges despite Danish Court Administration does not demand it, anyway fill out this daily information. At a High Court and Supreme court level this is not done though. So it is not an absolute. Therefor 10-49 %. Data are used by Danish Court Administration. It is up to the individual court, how they use and how closely they monitor the staff (Judges). The same counts for non-judge staff. Danish Court Administration has no data re prosecutor staff. Overall, there has not been changes to the systems that help assess how the workload is for public prosecutors but due to ongoing interest in how the workload is distributed – not only for the single employee but also the districts between – it is estimated that there has been an increase in the percentage. The workload is monitored in more general terms centrally through the Attorney General's office and locally the districts/local prosecution monitor their prosecutors and the workload more closely. The estimate of 50-99% is therefore not an absolute but an estimate since there has been an increase in the focus on monitoring the workload. For prosecutors: There is a well-implemented time recording system where the Prosecution Service´s staff weekly report their time spent on specific tasks, e.g. court work, formal charging, dropping of cases/withdrawal of charges, transport time to and from court, training etc. The time recording system is also used to report work outside normal working hours (overtime), including shifts for which a separate fee is paid. In addition, the number of prosecutions and withdrawal of charges is measures, with each charge weighted according to a specific system. Time recording data is used in calculations of the Prosecution Service´s case production and efficiency – and thus also in the management information in QlickView that is available on the Prosecution Service at national level as well as for the individual police districts and State Prosecutor´s offices.

Q063-7 (2020): Judges above: Danish Court Administration has chosen 10-49 %. It might be higher. The point is that on district courts, all judges either fill out how time is spend on a daily basis, or - for appointed judges - on a half-yearly basis. At some courts, the court has decided that the judges despite Danish Court Administration does not demand it, anyway fill out this daily information. At a High Court and Supreme court level this is not done though. So it is not an absolute. Therefor 10-49 %. Data are used by Danish Court Administration. It is up to the individual court, how they use and how closely they monitor the staff (Judges). The same counts for non-judge staff. Danish Court Administration has no data re prosecutor staff. Overall, there has not been changes to the systems that help assess how the workload is for public prosecutors but due to ongoing interest in how the workload is distributed – not only for the single employee but also the districts between – it is estimated that there has been an increase in the percentage. The workload is monitored in more general terms centrally through the Attorney General's office and locally the districts/local prosecution monitor their prosecutors and the workload more closely. The estimate of 50-99% is therefore not an absolute but an estimate since there has been an increase in the focus on monitoring the workload.

Q063-7 (2019): Judges above: Danish Court Administration has chosen 10-49 %. It might be higher. The point is that on district courts, all judges either fill out how time is spend on a daily basis, or - for appointed judges - on a half-yearly basis. At some courts, the court has decided that the judges despite Danish Court Administration does not demand it, anyway fill out this daily information. At a High Court and Supreme court level this is not done though. So it is not an absolute. Therefor 10-49 %. Data are used by Danish Court Administration. It is up to the individual court, how they use and how closely they monitor the staff (Judges). The same counts for non-judge staff. Danish Court Administration has no data re prosecutor staff.

Q063-7 (2014): Equipment rate is not really defined in this context. We have defined it as "There is a set up i.e.to measure and calculate number of judges, weighted cases etc. And it is being used"
Q063-7-1 (General Comment): Judges above: Danish Court Administration has chosen 10-49 %. It might be higher. The point is that on district courts, all judges either fill out how time is spend on a daily basis, or - for appointed judges - on a half-yearly basis. At some courts, the court has decided that the judges despite Danish Court Administration does not demand it, anyway fill out this daily information. At a High Court and Supreme court level this is not done though. So it is not an absolute. Therefor 10-49 %. Data are used by Danish Court Administration. It is up to the individual court, how they use and how closely they monitor the staff (Judges). The same counts for non-judge staff. Danish Court Administration has no data re prosecutor staff. Overall, there has not been changes to the systems that help assess how the workload is for public prosecutors but due to ongoing interest in how the workload is distributed – not only for the single employee but also the districts between – it is estimated that there has been an increase in the percentage. The workload is monitored in more general terms centrally through the Attorney General's office and locally the districts/local prosecution monitor their prosecutors and the workload more closely. The estimate of 50-99% is therefore not an absolute but an estimate since there has been an increase in the focus on monitoring the workload.

Estonia

Q062-7 (2018): It's available for everyone, but not everyone uses it.

Q062-8 (2020): Courts have adopted voice recognition software.

Q062-8 (2019): Should be available by the end of 2020.

Q063-6 (2021): "Other": For example, all the costs related to state legal aid.

Q063-6 (2020): "Other": For example, all the costs related to state legal aid.

Finland

Q062-8 (2020): Simple dictation tools are "not available", as the dictation tools are not used to dictate so that someone could type it later. Availability of multiple speakers recording tools: Witness statements are recorded in the courts to a centralized server from which they can be accessed by a higher court handling the appeal.
Q062-8 (2018): Dictation tools are no longer used as they are considered to be old-fashioned technology. Witness statements are recorded in the courts to a centralized server from which they can be accessed by a higher court handling the appeal. Voice recognition tools are tested, but there is not good enough product yet on the market for the Finnish language.

Q063-7 (2021): There is a system for collecting data on handling cases and this is deployed to all courts.
In administrative courts Power BI software is compatible with the new case management system, HAIPA. During the transition period,
the administrative courts also use the Business Objects Board software (BOBI) the cases still pending in the old case management
system.
The general courts are also transitioning to a new case management system, AIPA. However, the number of cases in the new system was much lower than in the administrative courts. Similarly, during the transition period, the general courts also use the Business Objects Board software (BOBI) the cases still pending in the old case management system.
Due to data protection, only the court were the judge / staff member works, looks at the data related to an individual. The heads of courts are able follow the number of cases resolved by the judge. Often, this data is not used on detailed/short term manner. Rather, it may be used at a court level (for example in budget negotiations) and as a long term indicator, or in case of a sudden and radical change in judges output (but even then not as a tool for disciplinary measure). In addition, there is a tool for reporting the working hours is 'deployed' to the courts 100% in the sense that it is available and accessible. We estimated the use to correspond '50-99%'.

Q063-7 (2020): There is a system for collecting data on handling cases and this is deployed to all courts.
In administrative courts Power BI software is compatible with the new case management system, HAIPA. During the transition period, the administrative courts also use the Business Objects Board software (BOBI) the cases still pending in the old case management system.
The general courts are also transitioning to a new case management system, AIPA. However, the number of cases in the new system was much lower than in the administrative courts. Similarly, during the transition period, the general courts also use the Business Objects Board software (BOBI) the cases still pending in the old case management system.
Due to data protection, only the court were the judge / staff member works, looks at the data related to an individual. The heads of courts are able follow the number of cases resolved by the judge. Often, this data is not used on detailed/short term manner. Rather, it may be used at a court level (for example in budget negotiations) and as a long term indicator, or in case of a sudden and radical change in judges output (but even then not as a tool for disciplinary measure). In addition, there is a tool for reporting the working hours is 'deployed' to the courts 100% in the sense that it is available and accessible. We estimated the use to correspond '50-99%'.
For prosecutors: The data is used for monitoring at national level and at local level. The tool used (BOBI) is not connected to the CMS. PowerBI software will be introduced in 2021 for statistical and monitoring purposes, and the preparation were done in 2020. Similarly, the introduction of the new case management system AIPA and the new administrative register HILDA in 2021 were prepared in 2020.

Q063-7 (2019): The courts and the prosecutors' offices use Business Objects XI software (BOXI) which is now updated to Business Objects
Board software (BOB). In administrative courts Power BI software is integrated to case management system.
The tool is 'deployed' 100% in the sense that it is available and accessible. However, judges are not required to use the tool, so it is not used 100%. We estimated the use to correspond '10-49%'. The heads of courts are able follow the number of cases resolved by the judge. However, this is usually not used on detailed/short term manner. Rather, it may be used at a court level (for example in budget negotiations) and as a long term indicator, or in case of a sudden and radical change in judges output (but even then not as a tool for disciplinary measure). Similarly to judges, the process servers record their hours in a different manner, and we estimated the use to correspond '50-99%'.

Q063-7 (2018): The courts and the prosecutors offices use Business Objects XI software (BOXI) which is now updated to Business Objects Board software (BOB). In administrative courts, Power BI software which is integrated to case management system is being tested.

France

Q062-7 (2021): In criminal matters: the templates available in the applications cover a large part of the criminal law field. However, in some cases, it is still necessary for judges and court clerks to make changes.
The new templates or those to be modified as a result of legislative reforms and the templates not present in the application are available on the ministerial intranet before being integrated into the applications in order to facilitate the work of the registry staff during the development phases. Source DSJ and DACS.
Q062-7 (2019): Cassiopée for all « Tribunaux de grande instance »
APPI for execution of sentences services
MINOS for police courts
Q062-7 (2018): Penal: Cassiopeia for all IMTs; APPI for enforcement services; MINOS for police courts

Q062-8 (2021): Source Council of State

Q062-8 (2019): Positive reply only with regard to administrative justice.

Q062-8 (2018): Such tools exist but their use is not generalised

Q063-6 (2021): Data on civil, criminal and administrative justice. Sources: DSJ and Council of State

Q063-6 (2020): "Concerning ""other"", neither of the two orders of jurisdiction has provided an answer.
Answers from the judicial and administrative justice "
Q063-6 (2019): Reply concerning the administrative justice.

Q063-6 (2018): data related to administrative justice

Q063-7 (2021): As regards administrative justice, the answer is no, source: Council of State
Concerning civil and criminal justice: The answer is yes, partially. Yes for non-judge staff. In fact: the Management and Distribution Tool for Civil Servants (OUTILGREF) was created in 1992. It has been online via the private Justice network since 2006. It measures the workload of registry officials (i.e. excluding legal assistants and specialised assistants) and assesses the need for registry staff (FTE) in the courts and regional administrative services (RAS) in relation to the activity of these structures, the need being understood as the volume of staff required to process the annual flow of cases so as not to generate any stock. This is a single tool for all courts and RAS, which exhaustively lists the court and administrative activities of the registry. It also includes an assessment of the workload of the common or support services. It is regularly updated in line with reforms and changes in working methods, in particular, to ensure its reliability and accuracy. A data collection exercise is carried out each year to feed it. See table 63.7.1.
As regards judges and prosecutors, the answer is currently no. However, since December 2019, the Directorate of Judicial Services (DSJ) has been working on a more effective management tool to measure the activity of judges, based on a case weighting system (SPA).
Operational case weighting tables should be available by the end of 2022 for the first instance, once the results of the survey conducted in the pilot courts have been analysed.
This is an ambitious, long-term project, as the quality of the tool developed is a necessary condition for its acceptability within the judicial institution but also for its credibility outside the Ministry of Justice, particularly during budget negotiations. The objectives of this work are as follows: 1) To gain a more rapid and detailed understanding of changes in judicial activity and the national need for judges and prosecutors to deal with them, i.e.: to give greater objectivity to staffing requests made during budget negotiations in the context of the preparation of a finance bill; more accurately assess the impact of reforms or changes in public policy on the national need for magistrates.
2) Promote greater equity in the distribution of staff allocated by the Finance Act among the courts in the country.
At the national level, the DSJ has drawn on previous work carried out on this subject within the directorate, but also on the recommendations made by the Court of Auditors in its December 2018 report entitled "Methodological approach to the costs of justice", asking the Ministry of Justice to build a system for allocating resources associated with a "case weighting system inspired by foreign models based on a typology of court cases allowing for an efficient allocation of resources and better management of justice".
It also drew on the work of the Council of Europe's Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) which, on 2 July 2020, adopted a report on the weighting of court cases, encouraging the member States of this European organisation to adopt a system for measuring the activity of the courts based on a weighting by type of case in order to improve the efficiency of the management of justice.
A weighting table must therefore be drawn up for each judicial function performed within the courts and courts of appeal. This table will be organised around jurisdictional activity but also support activity.
To achieve this, the DSJ has favoured peer-to-peer working meetings (the so-called Delphi method). A working group (WG), made up of representatives of the conferences of heads of court and jurisdiction, professional associations of judges (investigation judges, enforcement judges, juvenile judges, judges specialised in protection litigation, etc.), trade unions and

Q063-7 (2020): "For non-judge staff: the Civil Servant Job Management and Distribution Tool (OUTILGREF) was created in 1992. It has been online via the private Justice network since 2006. It measures the workload of court registrars (i.e., excluding legal assistants and specialized assistants) and evaluates the need for court clerks (etpE) in the courts and regional administrative services (SAR) with respect to the activity of these structures, the need being understood as the volume of agents necessary for the annual processing of the flow of cases in order to not generate any stock. This is a single tool for all the courts and the regional administrative services, which exhaustively lists the court and administrative activities of the registry. It also includes an evaluation of the workload of the common or support services. It is regularly updated according to the reforms and the evolution of working methods in particular, to guarantee its reliability and sincerity. A data collection operation is carried out each year to feed it.
With regard to magistrates (judges and prosecutors), the French Ministry of Justice is currently conducting work to better measure their workload. A system for evaluating their activity, based on the weighting of court cases, is being developed and should, by the end of 2022, provide a better understanding of the activity of courts and tribunals, as well as a more accurate allocation of resources between jurisdictions and within the departments of the same jurisdiction. With this in mind, a working group has been set up and has met more than ten times since December 2019, with the Ministry favouring peer-to-peer meetings (Delphi method), which is based on an estimate of time in order to establish the weighting table.
[2] For non-judge staff, the Outil de Gestion et de Répartition des Emplois de Fonctionnaires (OUTILGREF) was created in 1992. It has been online via the private Justice network since 2006. It measures the workload of court registrars (i.e., excluding legal assistants and specialized assistants) and evaluates the need for court registrars (etpE) in the courts and regional administrative services (SAR) with respect to the activity of these structures, the need being understood as the volume of agents necessary for the annual processing of the flow of cases in order to not generate any stock. This is a single tool for all the courts and the regional administrative services, which exhaustively lists the court and administrative activities of the registry. It also includes an evaluation of the workload of the common or support services. It is regularly updated according to the reforms and the evolution of working methods in particular, to guarantee its reliability and sincerity. A data collection exercise is carried out each year to feed it.
On the other hand, the answer given by the administrative justice is "no".

Q063-7 (2014): As regards the judiciary, the software “Outil de Gestion et de Répartition des Emplois de Fonctionnaires” (OUTILGREF) measures the workload of court clerks, and assesses the specific needs of the jurisdictions. This workload is calculated based on indicators which measure the average flow of new cases filed by a jurisdiction for a period of one year. Evaluations made through the OUTILGREF tool help monitor the localisation of court clerks vacancies in jurisdictions. This monitoring operation takes place once a year, and comparable operations exist for the completion of impact studies of draft legislation and regulation which may affect clerks. OUTILGREF is a tool shared by both the central administration and decentralised departments to analyse the activity of jurisdictions.

As regards the administrative courts, equipment rate of tools used to measure workload is evaluated to 10-49%.

Germany

Q062-8 (2021): Availability of simple dictation tools: The vast majority of the Länder have them available in all courts, the remaining Länder have them available in most courts.
Availability of multiple speaker recording tools:
Availability differs greatly among the Länder. Overall, the answer "in some courts" describes the situation best. Availability in civil and criminal matters seems to be slighty higher than in administrative matters.
Q062-8 (2018): No statistical information available on the prevalence of multiple speakers recording tools and voice recognition features.
Q063-6 (2021): "Budgetary and financial management of courts"
Tool deployment rate: A slight majority of the Länder answered "50-99 %". The remaining Länder have a tool deployment rate of 100%. 2 Länder answered "NA". Data consolidated at national level: The Federal Ministry of Justice has answered this question with "yes" with regard to the courts at federal level. A slight minority of the Länder replied "yes", while the slight majority replied "no". One of the Länder answered "no" for the labour and administrative courts and "yes" for the remaining courts. 3 Länder could not provide an answer. "Justice expenses management"
Tool deployment rate: A slight majority of the Länder answered "100 %". Half of the remaining Länder answered "50-99%" while the other half answered "10-49%". One of the Länder answered "NA".
Data consolidated at national level: The Federal Ministry of Justice has answered this question with "yes" with regard to the courts at federal level. The majority of the Länder answered "no". 2 Länder could not provide an answer.
"Other"
Tool deployment rate: The vast majority of the Länder answered "NA".
"Other" tools that are in use in the remaining Länder are tools for medium term fiscal planning (consolidated on national level: yes; communicating with other ministries: yes) and case management at the finance courts (consolidated at national level: no; communicating with other ministries: no)

Q063-6 (2020): Since "Other" was answered with "NA" by most of the Länder, Tool deployment rate, consolidated data and system communicating were also answered "NA".
Information on "other" budgetary and financial management systems submitted by Baden Württemberg:
Justice budget and budget calculation, medium term fiscal planning
Deployment rate: 100%, System communicating with other ministries: yes

Q063-6 (2018): Name of the tool: HV SAP

Greece

Q062-7 (2019): In the context of the Informational System OSDDY PP there are provided templates for certificates, case files and other documents that are used in the judicial proceedings.
Q062-8 (2021): The system of keeping minutes of court meetings has been extended to criminal proceedings following the signing of a new relevant contract.
Q063-6 (2021): The answer was given by the Directorate of Budget and Financial Management.

Hungary

Q063-6 (2021): NEXON HR - budgetary aspects of human resource management, KIRA - management of wages.

Q063-6 (2020): NEXON HR - budgetary aspects of human resource management, KIRA - management of wages.

Q063-6 (2019): Other: NEXON HR - budgetary aspects of human resource management, KIRA - management of wages.

Q063-6 (2018): NEXON HR - budgetary aspects of human resource management, KIRA - management of wages.

Q063-7 (2021): A methodology to conduct workload assessment was developed at the General Prosecutor's Office; however, it has not yet been finalised. The methodology can be summarized as follows:
I. ACTIVITY INDICATORS ("TM")
- In the system of criminal prosecution indicator, a weight is assigned to each outcome available in the criminal prosecution case management system, between 0 and 5. For instance, 1 is assigned when a decision rejecting a report of crime is ordered to be amended, 3,5 is assigned in case of raising charges.
- The system also allocates a weight to each criminal offense (the most significant offense within a case, and regardless of aggravated circumstances), between 1 and 9. For instance, driving under the influence of alcohol is given 2,8 points, while money laundering is given 8,5. - The system weighs the number of the defendants involved in a case, depending on whether the outcome related to the whole case or a to a person involved. In cases involving not more than 20 defendants, 1 point is given to one defendant, and 0,1 point is given to each additional defendant. The activity indicator is calculated as follows: the system records the weight assigned to the outcome, multiplies it with the weight assigned to the offense, and that result is multiplied again with the weight assigned to the number of defendants. If the outcome is related to a whole case, the weight numbers aligned with the number of defendants are applied. If the outcome concerns one particular person, the calculation is repeated according to the number of defendants, without using the weight numbers aligned with the number of defendants. The organizational activity indicator is an aggregate of all the activity indicators calculated by the above method.
II. STAFF NUMBER ("L")
Staff numbers are calculated on the basis of the weighed staff number of each organizational unit on the last calendar day of a given month, by taking into account actually filled positions, except for chief prosecutors, deputy chief prosecutors and heads of department. Staff numbers are weighed according to the weekly worktime and the field of activity.
III. WORKLOAD INDICATOR ("MT")
Activity indicators are aggregated on a monthly basis at each organizational unit. After that, the aggregate number is divided by the staff number of the month in question. So, the workload indicator of an organizational unit is the result of the division of the aggregated activity indicator by the staff number: MT = TM / L
By adding up the monthly workload indicators, quarterly and yearly figures can be calculated in respect of each unit. Nevertheless, adding up the workload indicators of several organizational units will unduly distort, i.e. multiply the result. So, it is impossible to determine the workload of a high prosecution service by adding up the already calculated workload indicators of the district prosecution services within the area of jurisdiction of the high prosecution service, as well as the workload indicator of the high prosecution service itself. To get the correct result, one must add up the activity indicators (TM), respectively the staff numbers, and then one must carry out the division.
The above system is capable of (1) showing the changing trends of workload in respect of a particular organizational unit, as well as of comparing the workload of several organizational units in respect of the same field of activity.
The system, however, is incapable of measuring a prosecutor's individual workload. The distribution of workload within a unit can be measured still by the detailed examination of case files. Furthermore, the system is not really capable of comparing workloads concerning different fields of activity.

Ireland

Q062-7 (2021): The tools used for administrative are the same as for civil cases since Ireland does not operate administrative courts
Q062-7 (2020): The tools used for administrative are the same as for civil cases since Ireland does not operate administrative courts
Q062-7 (2015): 62.7 - Court Registrars at the various jurisdictional levels have access to template/model court forms (orders, warrants etc.) case tracking systems, staff intranet or shared folders. The Courts Service provides Dragon software, which is a voice recognition application, to all judges on request. "Winscribe" is provided to all High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court judges on request. 62.10 - Information of an educational nature is available to judges via a judges intranet and a sentencing information website. Courts staff can access training materials via the Training and Development Section of courts links on the Courts Service network. The Training Unit is also planning the introduction of a new online video-based training function.

Q062-8 (2021): The tools used for administrative are the same as for civil cases since Ireland does not operate administrative courts
Q062-8 (2020): The tools used for administrative are the same as for civil cases since Ireland does not operate administrative courts
Q063-7 (2021): The Judicial Council was established in 2019 pursuant to the Judicial Council Act 2019. Further information is available on their website.
https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2019/act/33/enacted/en/html?q=judicial+council+act https://judicialcouncil.ie/about-the-judicial-council/

Italy

Q062-8 (2021): As far as civil cases are concerned, multiple speakers recording tools are available in all courts which deal with labour disputes.
Q062-8 (2019): The whole justice personnel is now provided with Office 2016 licences, which have dictation tools integrated.

Q063-7 (2021): The same tool might potentially be used to assess the workload of both magistrates and their staff. The monitoring of the activity of judges/prosecutors is eventually used to assess their evaluation. The same doesn't apply to court staff, hence the answer 0 provided in the previous cycle.

Latvia

Q063-6 (2015): Q63.6. - With both financial management system and system for budget planning and budget performance monitoring works only staff from Court Administration

Lithuania

Q062-7 (General Comment): Templates are prepared and stored in the Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) together with special tools for filling them with metadata. Also, templates are prepared in administrative offence and pretrial cases and are available in Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) and the Integrated Criminal Process Information System (IBPS).
Q062-7 (2019): Templates are prepared and stored in the Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) together with special tools for filling them with metadata. Also, templates are prepared in administrative offence and pretrial cases and are available in Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) and the Integrated Criminal Process Information System (IBPS).

Q062-7 (2018): Templates are prepared and stored in the Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) together with special tools for filling them with metadata. Also, templates are prepared in administrative offence and pretrial cases and are available in Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) and the Integrated Criminal Process Information System (IBPS).

Q062-8 (2020): The courts hearings are recorded in all courts and cases, the record substitutes the written protocol except the criminal case and is made in all cases with some specific exceptions, when the protocol is not required (e.g. some administrative offence cases or when the case is dealt with by written procedure).
Q062-8 (2019): The courts hearings are recorded in all courts and cases, the record substitutes the written protocol except the criminal case and is made in all cases with some specific exceptions, when the protocol is not required (e.g. some administrative offence cases).
Q062-8 (2018): The courts hearings are recorded in all courts and cases, the record substitutes the written protocol except the criminal case and is made in all cases with some specific exceptions, when the protocol is not required (e.g. some administrative offence cases).

Luxembourg

Q062-7 (2021): All magistrates and clerks have access to these assistants, however not the entire scope of documents is covered, as the possibility to use free text is essential to the work of the judiciary. Administrative courts have been provided with a new application in 2018.
Q062-7 (2020): All magistrates and clerks have access to these assistants, however not the entire scope of documents is covered, as the possibility to use free text is essential to the work of the judiciary. Administrative courts have been provided with a new application in 2018.
Q062-7 (2019): All magistrates and clerks have access to these assistants, however not the entire scope of documents is covered, as the possibility to use free text is essential to the work of the judiciary. Administrative courts have been provided with a new application in 2018.
Q062-7 (2018): All magistrates and clerks have access to these assistants, however not the entire scope of documents is covered, as the possibility to use free text is essential to the work of the judiciary. Administrative courts have been provided with a new application in 2018.
Q062-8 (2021): The use of private dictation applications is tolerated, but they are not in general used.
Q062-8 (2020):
The use of private dictation applications is tolerated, but is not in general use.
Q062-8 (2019): The use of private dictation applications is tolerated, but is not in general use.
Q062-8 (2018): The use of private dictation applications is tolerated, but is not in general use.
Q063-7 (2014): Luxembourg does not use tools to measure the workload of magistrates to monitor their activity, but merely for statistical purposes.

Malta

Q062-7 (2018): Reference is being made to the Case Management System

Q062-8 (2021): The Courts Services Agency were piloting new software that recognises voices in Maltese and translates speech to text. The software is currently being piloted in other courts as well with the intention of implementing it across all courts by 2023.

Netherlands

Q062-7 (General Comment): The tool ‘Schrijfhulp’ (‘Writing Assistance’) e.g. helps people write a response to a summons. Templates for the courts are approved centrally, so if they are available, they would be available for all courts, but no specific information is available.

Q062-7 (2020): There is a tool, called 'Schrijfhulp' (writing assistance), which is a tool that helps people e.g. write a letter to respond to a summons.
https://formulieren.rechtspraak.nl/formulier/SchrijfhulpKanton_Dagvaarding_004.aspx/Benodigdheden_Dagvaarding_004
Templates for the courts are approved centrally, so if they are available they would be available for all courts, but no specific information is available.

Q062-7 (2019): There is a tool, which is called 'Schrijfhulp'. It is a tool that helps people e.g. write a letter to respond to a summons:
https://formulieren.rechtspraak.nl/formulier/SchrijfhulpKanton_Dagvaarding_004.aspx/Benodigdheden_Dagvaarding_004

Q062-8 (General Comment): In some courtrooms, sound is recorded to an SD-card. This is solely to assist in reporting, it is not a product in itself. The level of automation/comperization differs betwee courts and types of courts, which makes it difficult to report on how often and how much voice-recording tools are used. Voice recognition is not used.

Q062-8 (2020): In some courtrooms, sound is recorded to an SD-card. This is solely to assist in reporting, it is not a product in itself. The level of automation / computerization differs between courts and types of courts, which makes it difficult to report on how often and how much voice recording tools are used. Voice recognition is not used.

Q062-8 (2019): There are some court rooms with sound recordings to an SD-card. This is solely to assist in the reporting. It is not product in itself.
The level of automisation differs between courts and types of courts, which makes it difficult to report how much voice recording tools are used. Voice recognition is not used.
Q062-8 (2018): A value must be entered for each question !
I am unable to answer yes or no, because I don't know.

Poland

Q062-7 (2020): So called e-Protocol system – financed from EU funds
Registration form for notification of erroneous activities of IT systems, information from the National Court Register, Application form for access to public information, Civil complaint forms, Forms of bankruptcy complaints - "consumers", National Court Registry forms, formulas for reserve management services and forwarded to Central Information on Registered Pledges, Information request forms with the National Criminal Register, Application form for execution and reporting bailiff operations, inventory configuration list, toolkit form for central information on registered sets, formula for court and economic judgment.
It is difficult to assess it due to the different degree of computerization of litigation and non-litigious proceedings, as well as the uneven use of various tools, starting with ZEUS.

Q062-7 (2019): So called e-Protocol system – financed from EU funds
Registration form for notification of erroneous activities of IT systems, information from the National Court Register, Application form for access to public information, Civil complaint forms, Forms of bankruptcy complaints - "consumers", National Court Registry forms, formulas for reserve management services and forwarded to Central Information on Registered Pledges, Information request forms with the National Criminal Register, Application form for execution and reporting bailiff operations, inventory configuration list, toolkit form for central information on registered sets, formula for court and economic judgment.
It is difficult to assess it due to the different degree of computerization of litigation and non-litigious proceedings, as well as the uneven use of various tools, starting with ZEUS.

Q062-8 (2020): 1.Civil and criminal cases : So called e-Protocol system – financed from EU funds/ Tzw. system e-Protokół - finansowany z funduszy UE.
2.The videoconference system used to conduct online hearings enables the recording of image and sound. The provisions of the act of August 30, 2002 v- law on proceedings before administrative courts do not provide for electronic casebooks protocol.

Q063-6 (2020): 1. The ZSRK system (Integrated Accounting and Personnel System) was implemented in common courts, which is a key system supporting all common court units in the field of keeping broadly understood accounting, personnel records, budget reporting and statistical reporting.
2. IT System for the Handling of the State Budget (TREZOR) facilitating the flow of information between the holders of budget funds and the Ministry of Finance in the implementation of the following budget processes: budget planning and execution.
In relation to the "system of communication with other ministries (including the Ministry of Finance)", the basis for giving a positive answer is the functioning TREZOR system, which improves the flow of information between the administrators of budget funds and the Ministry of Finance in the implementation of the following budget processes: planning and budget execution. Justice expenses managment. With reference to "Data Consolidated at National Level" in scope "Court budget and finance management systems" the basis for giving a positive answer is the implementation of the ZSRK system (Integrated Accounting and Personnel System) in common courts, which is a key system supporting all common court units in the field of keeping broadly understood accounting, personnel records, budget reporting and statistical reporting.

Q063-6 (2019): 1. The ZSRK system (Integrated Accounting and Personnel System) was implemented in common courts, which is a key system supporting all common court units in the field of keeping broadly understood accounting, personnel records, budget reporting and statistical reporting.
2. IT System for the Handling of the State Budget (TREZOR) facilitating the flow of information between the holders of budget funds and the Ministry of Finance in the implementation of the following budget processes: budget planning and execution.
In relation to the "system of communication with other ministries (including the Ministry of Finance)", the basis for giving a positive answer is the functioning TREZOR system, which improves the flow of information between the administrators of budget funds and the Ministry of Finance in the implementation of the following budget processes: planning and budget execution. Justice expenses managment. With reference to "Data Consolidated at National Level" in scope "Court budget and finance management systems" the basis for giving a positive answer is the implementation of the ZSRK system (Integrated Accounting and Personnel System) in common courts, which is a key system supporting all common court units in the field of keeping broadly understood accounting, personnel records, budget reporting and statistical reporting.

Q063-6 (2018): There is a special system called ZSRK.

Q063-7 (2019): This kind of tools exist only for prosecutors. For judges and in courts there is only software used for registering judicial proceedings and their management. ZSRK system does not cover: units of the prosecutor's office, administrative judiciary, military judiciary, Supreme Court, Tribunal Constitutional and the National Council of the Judiciary.

Portugal

Q062-7 (2018): It also exists in labour courts and maritime courts.

Q062-8 (2020): Concerning the voice recognition feauture, there was a pilot projetct ongoing in the previous evaluation cicle, but it still wasn't implemented. We are working to implement tools for Automatic Speech Recognition

Q062-8 (2018): The voice recognition features are to be implemented in all courts.

Q063-7 (2021): There is no specific general management tool to access the workload of non-judge staff/non prosecutor staff. The information is collected directly from the case management system and then it is organized by the General Directorate of Administration of Justice/Ministry of Justice.

Q063-7 (2020): There is no specific general management tool to access the workload of non-judge staff/non prosecutor staff. The information is collected directly from the case management system and then it is organized by the General Directorate of Administration of Justice/Ministry of Justice.

Romania

Q062-7 (2018): ECRIS, REGISTRY

Q063-7 (2015): STATIS – tool for statistical measurements and analysis both local and national

Slovak Republic

Q062-7 (2020): There are different types of templates when creating documents in the CMS, which can be also pre-filled with data from databases.

Q062-8 (2018): Voice recognition feature is in preparing phase.

Q063-6 (2020): The SAP (human resources) system is deployed at the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic and regional level.
The SUP (accounting system) system is deployed at the district court level.

Q063-6 (2015): We are still in phase of implementing new complex economic system (SAP). We have several partial systems implemented within the Ministry which operate individually-payroll system for budget, etc.
Q063-7 (2020): Application/tool collecting the time information about the activities of the judges, can be used for senior judicial officials in the future as well. The tool is part of the project Case weighting analyses (CWA) and the result should be used to assess the workload of the judges in the future. In 2020 the cellecting data for the CWA project was stoped becuase of covid pandemic situation.

Q063-7 (2019): Still in development. Application/tool collecting the time information about the activities of the judges, can be used for senior judicial officials as well. The tool is part of the project Case weighting analyses and the result should be used to assess the workload of the judges in the future. The tool is not connected to CMS and was still not developed at the full scale in 2019 (hence the deployment rate is 50-99%).

Slovenia

Q062-7 (General Comment): The writing assistance tools are included in the CMSs, provided by the Project mamagement Service at the Supreme Court. The templates (including pre-written texts) are verified by the judges.

Q062-7 (2020): Other: civil enforcement on the basis of the authentic document procedure.

Q062-7 (2018): Other: civil enforcement on the basis of the authentic document procedure.

Q062-7 (2015): Q 62.7
Model writings (templates) are available on the intranet or through the case management system. In some types of procedures, such as civil enforcement (iVpisnik), land registry (eZK) etc. some documents can be generated automatically.
Other: civil enforcement on basis of authentic document (iVpisnik) and insolvency cases (eINS).

Q062-8 (General Comment): All courts are equpped by voice recording tools, maintained by courts.

Spain

Q062-7 (General Comment): The systems for procedures management have different names in the different Autonomous Regions. Minerva is the name of the system of the regions that depend of the Ministry of Justice.
Q062-7 (2015): There are also writing assistance tools for labour and penal courts and, in general, all courts in Spain no matter the jusridiction they deal with are provided with writing assistance tools.
(62.7), writing assistance tools have been available for the huge majority of the judges and courts since long time ago. In 2014 the availability was already really very near to 100% and in 2015 it was developed to the 100%.

Q062-8 (2019): There are audio visual recording systems for hearings.

Q062-8 (2018): There are audio visual recordings tools for hearings.

Q063-6 (General Comment): - There is the electronic system to manage the bank account of the Court. The system includes an application for the
management of judicial auctions. - Public Administrations are subject to an electronic invoice system. Legal persons are obliged to use it. It imposes a structured format, and they must be signed with an advanced electronic signature. - The General Subdirectorate for Programming and Economic Management of the Public Justice Service (and similar bodies of the Autonomous Regions) manage other applications for salaries and other payments.

Q063-6 (2020): - There is an electronic system to manage the bank account of the Court. The system includes an application for the
management of judicial auctions. - Public Administrations are subject to an electronic invoice system. Legal persons are obliged to use it. It imposes a structured format, and they must be signed with an advanced electronic signature. - The General Subdirectorate for Programming and Economic Management of the Public Justice Service (and similar bodies of the Autonomous Regions) manage other applications for salaries and other payments.

Q063-6 (2019): There is an electronic system to manage the bank account of the Court. The system includes an application for the
management of judicial auctions. This system is under the responsibility of the 'Letrado de la Administración de Justicia'.
The General Subdirectorate for Programming and Economic Management of the Public Justice Service (and similar bodies of the Autonomous Regions) manage other applications for sallaries and other payments.

Q063-6 (2018): There is an electronic system to manage the bank account of the Court, and in this system has an application for the management of judicial auctions, this system is responsibility of the Judicial Counsellor.
The Sub-Directorate General of Economic Resources of the Administration of Justice (and similar bodies of the Autonomous Regions) manage other applications for sallaries and other payments.

Indicator 6: The ICT tools of courts and for court users

Comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

Question 062-7. Are there writing assistance tools for which the content is coordinated at national level? (models or templates, paragraphs already pre-written, etc.)
Question 062-7-1. If yes, please specify the following information:

Question 062-8. Are there voice recording tools?

Question 062-8-1. If yes, please specify:

Question 063-6. Budgetary and financial management systems of courts

Question 063-7. Measurement tools to assess the workload of judges, prosecutors and/or non-judge/non-prosecutor staff (tool quantifying the activity of judges, prosecutors and/or non-judge/non-prosecutor staff – for example the number of cases resolved)
Question 063-7-1. If yes, please specify the following information:

Question 062-7

Belgium

(2021): For civil and/or commercial and criminal matters: local modification of models is always possible. As regards the Council of State (the highest administrative court in the country), administrative matters: for each type of procedure, there are templates of judgments which contain certain standardised paragraphs. This standardisation concerns in particular the part relating to the conduct of the proceedings. Constant harmonisation work is carried out under the impetus of the First President and with the help of the Chief Registrar. Some documents are now generated automatically on the basis of information contained in our internal databases (e.g. setting orders and hearing tables). However, there are no writing assistance tools as such.
It should be noted that, following a change initiated in 2007, the Council of State's judgments have all been written in direct style since 2017. This generalisation of the direct style has ensured greater uniformity in the presentation of judgments.
Judges of the Belgian Council of State have a number of tools at their disposal: legal databases are maintained internally and made available to the public as well (Juridict www.juridict.be, refLex www.reflex.be, etc.); access is provided to private, paying legal databases (StradaLex www.stradalex.be, Jurisquare www.jurisquare.be, etc.); an intranet managed by the Council of State also centralises all documents produced by the Council of State (judgments, orders, reports, etc.) - it is called Documap; the Council of State's website also offers numerous search options www.raadvst-consetat.be.

(2020): "For civil and/or commercial and criminal matters: local modification of the models is always possible. As regards the Council of State (the highest administrative court in the country); administrative matters:
1. For each type of procedure, there are models of judgments which include certain standardized paragraphs. This standardization concerns in particular the part relating to the course of the procedure. A constant work of harmonization is carried out under the impulse of the First President and with the help of the Chief Clerk.
Some documents are now generated automatically on the basis of information taken from our internal databases (e.g. setting orders and hearing tables).
However, there are no "judgment drafting tools" as such.
2. It should be noted that, following an evolution initiated in 2007, the judgments of the highest administrative Courts - since 2017 - all written in direct style. This generalization of the direct style has made it possible to ensure greater uniformity in the presentation of judgments.
3. The magistrates of the Belgian highest administrative Courts have many tools at their disposal:
- legal databases are maintained internally and made available to the public as well (Juridict www.juridict.be , refLex www.reflex.be , etc.);
- access is provided to private, paying legal databases (StradaLex www.stradalex.be , Jurisquare www.jurisquare.be , etc.);
- an intranet managed by the Council of State also centralizes all documents produced by the Council of State (judgments, orders, reports, etc.). It is called Documap.
- The website of the highest adminsitrative Courts also offers numerous search possibilities www.raadvst-consetat.be.
"

(2019): Administrative: For each type of procedure, there are models of judgments within the Council of State which include certain standardized paragraphs. This standardization concerns in particular the part relating to the course of the procedure. A constant work of harmonization is carried out under the impetus of the First President and with the help of the chief registrar.
Certain documents are now generated automatically on the basis of information contained in our internal databases (fixing orders and audience tables, for example). Strictly speaking, however, there are no "drafting aid tools" for judgments.
2. It should be noted that following a development initiated in 2007, the judgments of the Council of State have - since 2017 - all been drafted in direct style. This generalization of the direct style made it possible to ensure greater uniformity in the presentation of judgments.
3. The magistrates of the Council of State of Belgium have many tools at their disposal:
- legal databases are kept up to date internally and also made available to the public (Juridict www.juridict.be, refLex www.reflex.be, etc.);
- access is offered to private and chargeable legal databases (StradaLex www.stradalex.be, Jurisquare www.jurisquare.be, etc.);
- an intranet managed by the Council of State also centralizes all the documents produced by the Council of State (judgments, ordinances, reports, etc.). It is called Documap.
- the website of the Council of State also offers many search possibilities www.raadvst-consetat.be.

Bulgaria

(2020): Pursuant to Article 55 of the Civil Procedure Code, the Minister of Justice issues an ordinance approving the samples of all papers related to service. The amendment of the samples is done by amending and supplementing the ordinance.

Czech Republic

(2021): It depends on the court agenda. Some information systems for specific agendas can automatically create documents based on the predefine template, data stored in the system and the selected procedural action by a user. Some older information systems have a dedicated external application that allows the creation of the required documents based on user input (application called “APSTR”), and for some court agenda the writing assistance tools are not available at all.
Regarding the process of coordinating new templates, the origin of the templates varies. Some are developed by the Ministry of Justice, others are created on the national level in cooperation with experts and court staff. Templates created at the national level can be and are modified in some court agendas at the local level by individual courts or in some cases by individual users.

(2020): The templates are available for all courts but do not cover all matters.

Denmark

(2020): For civil/commercial cases the availability rate slightly decreased as we simply went through the different areas of use and the different patterns of uses and found that there were certain areas where we were not covered.

(2019): For civil/commercial cases the availability rate slightly decreased as we simply went through the different areas of use and the different patterns of uses and found that there were certain areas where we were not covered.

(2015): 62.7 assistance tools are also available in criminal cases, probate cases, enforcenemt cases and land registration cases

Estonia

(2018): It's available for everyone, but not everyone uses it.

France

(2021): In criminal matters: the templates available in the applications cover a large part of the criminal law field. However, in some cases, it is still necessary for judges and court clerks to make changes.
The new templates or those to be modified as a result of legislative reforms and the templates not present in the application are available on the ministerial intranet before being integrated into the applications in order to facilitate the work of the registry staff during the development phases. Source DSJ and DACS.

(2019): Cassiopée for all « Tribunaux de grande instance »
APPI for execution of sentences services
MINOS for police courts

(2018): Penal: Cassiopeia for all IMTs; APPI for enforcement services; MINOS for police courts

Greece

(2019): In the context of the Informational System OSDDY PP there are provided templates for certificates, case files and other documents that are used in the judicial proceedings.

Ireland

(2021): The tools used for administrative are the same as for civil cases since Ireland does not operate administrative courts

(2020): The tools used for administrative are the same as for civil cases since Ireland does not operate administrative courts

(2015): 62.7 - Court Registrars at the various jurisdictional levels have access to template/model court forms (orders, warrants etc.) case tracking systems, staff intranet or shared folders. The Courts Service provides Dragon software, which is a voice recognition application, to all judges on request. "Winscribe" is provided to all High Court, Court of Appeal and Supreme Court judges on request. 62.10 - Information of an educational nature is available to judges via a judges intranet and a sentencing information website. Courts staff can access training materials via the Training and Development Section of courts links on the Courts Service network. The Training Unit is also planning the introduction of a new online video-based training function.

Lithuania

(General Comment): Templates are prepared and stored in the Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) together with special tools for filling them with metadata. Also, templates are prepared in administrative offence and pretrial cases and are available in Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) and the Integrated Criminal Process Information System (IBPS).

(2019): Templates are prepared and stored in the Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) together with special tools for filling them with metadata. Also, templates are prepared in administrative offence and pretrial cases and are available in Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) and the Integrated Criminal Process Information System (IBPS).

(2018): Templates are prepared and stored in the Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) together with special tools for filling them with metadata. Also, templates are prepared in administrative offence and pretrial cases and are available in Lithuanian Courts Information System (LITEKO) and the Integrated Criminal Process Information System (IBPS).

Luxembourg

(2021): All magistrates and clerks have access to these assistants, however not the entire scope of documents is covered, as the possibility to use free text is essential to the work of the judiciary. Administrative courts have been provided with a new application in 2018.

(2020): All magistrates and clerks have access to these assistants, however not the entire scope of documents is covered, as the possibility to use free text is essential to the work of the judiciary. Administrative courts have been provided with a new application in 2018.

(2019): All magistrates and clerks have access to these assistants, however not the entire scope of documents is covered, as the possibility to use free text is essential to the work of the judiciary. Administrative courts have been provided with a new application in 2018.

(2018): All magistrates and clerks have access to these assistants, however not the entire scope of documents is covered, as the possibility to use free text is essential to the work of the judiciary. Administrative courts have been provided with a new application in 2018.

Malta

(2018): Reference is being made to the Case Management System

Netherlands

(General Comment): The tool ‘Schrijfhulp’ (‘Writing Assistance’) e.g. helps people write a response to a summons. Templates for the courts are approved centrally, so if they are available, they would be available for all courts, but no specific information is available.

(2020): There is a tool, called 'Schrijfhulp' (writing assistance), which is a tool that helps people e.g. write a letter to respond to a summons.
https://formulieren.rechtspraak.nl/formulier/SchrijfhulpKanton_Dagvaarding_004.aspx/Benodigdheden_Dagvaarding_004
Templates for the courts are approved centrally, so if they are available they would be available for all courts, but no specific information is available.

(2019): There is a tool, which is called 'Schrijfhulp'. It is a tool that helps people e.g. write a letter to respond to a summons:
https://formulieren.rechtspraak.nl/formulier/SchrijfhulpKanton_Dagvaarding_004.aspx/Benodigdheden_Dagvaarding_004

Poland

(2020): So called e-Protocol system – financed from EU funds
Registration form for notification of erroneous activities of IT systems, information from the National Court Register, Application form for access to public information, Civil complaint forms, Forms of bankruptcy complaints - "consumers", National Court Registry forms, formulas for reserve management services and forwarded to Central Information on Registered Pledges, Information request forms with the National Criminal Register, Application form for execution and reporting bailiff operations, inventory configuration list, toolkit form for central information on registered sets, formula for court and economic judgment.
It is difficult to assess it due to the different degree of computerization of litigation and non-litigious proceedings, as well as the uneven use of various tools, starting with ZEUS.

(2019): So called e-Protocol system – financed from EU funds
Registration form for notification of erroneous activities of IT systems, information from the National Court Register, Application form for access to public information, Civil complaint forms, Forms of bankruptcy complaints - "consumers", National Court Registry forms, formulas for reserve management services and forwarded to Central Information on Registered Pledges, Information request forms with the National Criminal Register, Application form for execution and reporting bailiff operations, inventory configuration list, toolkit form for central information on registered sets, formula for court and economic judgment.
It is difficult to assess it due to the different degree of computerization of litigation and non-litigious proceedings, as well as the uneven use of various tools, starting with ZEUS.

Portugal

(2018): It also exists in labour courts and maritime courts.

Romania

(2018): ECRIS, REGISTRY

Slovak Republic

(2020): There are different types of templates when creating documents in the CMS, which can be also pre-filled with data from databases.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The writing assistance tools are included in the CMSs, provided by the Project mamagement Service at the Supreme Court. The templates (including pre-written texts) are verified by the judges.

(2020): Other: civil enforcement on the basis of the authentic document procedure.

(2018): Other: civil enforcement on the basis of the authentic document procedure.

(2015): Q 62.7
Model writings (templates) are available on the intranet or through the case management system. In some types of procedures, such as civil enforcement (iVpisnik), land registry (eZK) etc. some documents can be generated automatically.
Other: civil enforcement on basis of authentic document (iVpisnik) and insolvency cases (eINS).

Spain

(General Comment): The systems for procedures management have different names in the different Autonomous Regions. Minerva is the name of the system of the regions that depend of the Ministry of Justice.

(2015): There are also writing assistance tools for labour and penal courts and, in general, all courts in Spain no matter the jusridiction they deal with are provided with writing assistance tools.
(62.7), writing assistance tools have been available for the huge majority of the judges and courts since long time ago. In 2014 the availability was already really very near to 100% and in 2015 it was developed to the 100%.

Question 062-7-1

Czech Republic

(General Comment): The templates are available for all courts but do not cover all matters.

Question 062-8

Belgium

(2021): Comment on Q62-8
The provision of a simple dictation tool is based on an individual online request with a specific and restrictive allocation policy.

(2020): "comments for questions 62-1 through 62-9:
Provision of a simple dictation solution is on an individual online request basis with a specific and limiting allocation policy."

Czech Republic

(2021): Most courtrooms have installed specific voice recording tools for recording several separate audio tracks. The project regarding “spoken word-to-text conversion” was realized in the proof-of-concept stage. Based on the results of the project and other factors, the spoken word-to-text project has been included in the National Recovery Plan and will be realized in the upcoming years.

Denmark

(2021): In addition to voice recording, the Danish Court administration have implemented speech-recognition in connection with certain court precedings. Further implementation of a wider roll-out of speech-recognition is being evaluated currently.

(2020): We had some testing of the quality of voice recognition and found that the software was unreliable in regards to the Danish language. We are again moving forward with this initiative.

(2019): We had some testing of the quality of voice recognition and found that the software was unreliable in regards to the Danish language. The response is based on the multiple choice fields and by pilot testing, we simply mean light testing and we are not moving forward with this initiative.

Estonia

(2020): Courts have adopted voice recognition software.

(2019): Should be available by the end of 2020.

Finland

(2020): Simple dictation tools are "not available", as the dictation tools are not used to dictate so that someone could type it later. Availability of multiple speakers recording tools: Witness statements are recorded in the courts to a centralized server from which they can be accessed by a higher court handling the appeal.

(2018): Dictation tools are no longer used as they are considered to be old-fashioned technology. Witness statements are recorded in the courts to a centralized server from which they can be accessed by a higher court handling the appeal. Voice recognition tools are tested, but there is not good enough product yet on the market for the Finnish language.

France

(2021): Source Council of State

(2019): Positive reply only with regard to administrative justice.

(2018): Such tools exist but their use is not generalised

Germany

(2021): Availability of simple dictation tools: The vast majority of the Länder have them available in all courts, the remaining Länder have them available in most courts.
Availability of multiple speaker recording tools:
Availability differs greatly among the Länder. Overall, the answer "in some courts" describes the situation best. Availability in civil and criminal matters seems to be slighty higher than in administrative matters.

(2018): No statistical information available on the prevalence of multiple speakers recording tools and voice recognition features.

Greece

(2021): The system of keeping minutes of court meetings has been extended to criminal proceedings following the signing of a new relevant contract.

Ireland

(2021): The tools used for administrative are the same as for civil cases since Ireland does not operate administrative courts

(2020): The tools used for administrative are the same as for civil cases since Ireland does not operate administrative courts

Italy

(2021): As far as civil cases are concerned, multiple speakers recording tools are available in all courts which deal with labour disputes.

(2019): The whole justice personnel is now provided with Office 2016 licences, which have dictation tools integrated.

Lithuania

(2020): The courts hearings are recorded in all courts and cases, the record substitutes the written protocol except the criminal case and is made in all cases with some specific exceptions, when the protocol is not required (e.g. some administrative offence cases or when the case is dealt with by written procedure).

(2019): The courts hearings are recorded in all courts and cases, the record substitutes the written protocol except the criminal case and is made in all cases with some specific exceptions, when the protocol is not required (e.g. some administrative offence cases).

(2018): The courts hearings are recorded in all courts and cases, the record substitutes the written protocol except the criminal case and is made in all cases with some specific exceptions, when the protocol is not required (e.g. some administrative offence cases).

Luxembourg

(2021): The use of private dictation applications is tolerated, but they are not in general used.

(2020):
The use of private dictation applications is tolerated, but is not in general use.

(2019): The use of private dictation applications is tolerated, but is not in general use.

(2018): The use of private dictation applications is tolerated, but is not in general use.

Malta

(2021): The Courts Services Agency were piloting new software that recognises voices in Maltese and translates speech to text. The software is currently being piloted in other courts as well with the intention of implementing it across all courts by 2023.

Netherlands

(General Comment): In some courtrooms, sound is recorded to an SD-card. This is solely to assist in reporting, it is not a product in itself. The level of automation/comperization differs betwee courts and types of courts, which makes it difficult to report on how often and how much voice-recording tools are used. Voice recognition is not used.

(2020): In some courtrooms, sound is recorded to an SD-card. This is solely to assist in reporting, it is not a product in itself. The level of automation / computerization differs between courts and types of courts, which makes it difficult to report on how often and how much voice recording tools are used. Voice recognition is not used.

(2019): There are some court rooms with sound recordings to an SD-card. This is solely to assist in the reporting. It is not product in itself.
The level of automisation differs between courts and types of courts, which makes it difficult to report how much voice recording tools are used. Voice recognition is not used.

(2018): A value must be entered for each question !
I am unable to answer yes or no, because I don't know.

Poland

(2020): 1.Civil and criminal cases : So called e-Protocol system – financed from EU funds/ Tzw. system e-Protokół - finansowany z funduszy UE.
2.The videoconference system used to conduct online hearings enables the recording of image and sound. The provisions of the act of August 30, 2002 v- law on proceedings before administrative courts do not provide for electronic casebooks protocol.

Portugal

(2020): Concerning the voice recognition feauture, there was a pilot projetct ongoing in the previous evaluation cicle, but it still wasn't implemented. We are working to implement tools for Automatic Speech Recognition

(2018): The voice recognition features are to be implemented in all courts.

Slovak Republic

(2018): Voice recognition feature is in preparing phase.

Slovenia

(General Comment): All courts are equpped by voice recording tools, maintained by courts.

Spain

(2019): There are audio visual recording systems for hearings.

(2018): There are audio visual recordings tools for hearings.

Question 063-6

Austria

(2021): Monthly controlling reports of the budgetary authorities.

(2020): Monthly controlling reports of the budgetary authorities.

(2019): Monthly Controlling Reports of the budgetary authorities.

(2018): Monthly controlling reports of the budgetary authorities.

Belgium

(2019): Budget and financial management: the Fedcom systemhas been launched as a pilot project in the College of Courts and Tribunals.
Since the 1st January 2020, within each judicial district there has been a “court costs office” responsible for processing and paying court costs. The office uses a new system focused on fully digital management.
Other: The court fee (Rolrechten / droit de role) is centralized in one national system and communicated to the department of Finance. The status of the payment is returned from the department of finance to the department of justice

Czech Republic

(2021): All Czech courts are using for budgetary and financial management information system called IRES. This system is used to generate and manage payment transactions, record assets, receivables, payables and other related areas. Although the IRES system (in the sense of all local court distributions) communicates with the National Treasury, which could be thought of as a centralized point where data is consolidated at the national level, it is not a tool/system that allows for easy data consolidation or direct analytical activities for the benefit of judicial agendas. The IRES system is not primarily used for the justice expenses management of exclusively judicial items such as court fees, litigation costs, etc. This data is not available to the chiefs judges of the courts from the IRES system in a comprehensive form and on a court-by-court basis. Selected judicial information systems that manage the certain justice agenda are able to report the necessary information on justice expense data. These information systems then use IRES to make and record payments.

(2020): The budgetary information system is called IRES and is used by the Ministry of Justice since 1995.

Denmark

(General Comment): We have multiple tools in the various courts available for controlling and managing costs and the degrees to which they are being used varies. This data is relatively unknown by the central organization and this is our best estimate.
Activity in terms of weighted cases is used also in allocation of resources.

(2019): We have multiple tools in the various courts available for controlling and managing costs and the degrees to which they are being used varies. This data is relatively unknown by the central organization and this is our best estimate.
Activity in terms of weighted cases is used also in allocation of resources.

Estonia

(2021): "Other": For example, all the costs related to state legal aid.

(2020): "Other": For example, all the costs related to state legal aid.

France

(2021): Data on civil, criminal and administrative justice. Sources: DSJ and Council of State

(2020): "Concerning ""other"", neither of the two orders of jurisdiction has provided an answer.
Answers from the judicial and administrative justice "

(2019): Reply concerning the administrative justice.

(2018): data related to administrative justice

Germany

(2021): "Budgetary and financial management of courts"
Tool deployment rate: A slight majority of the Länder answered "50-99 %". The remaining Länder have a tool deployment rate of 100%. 2 Länder answered "NA". Data consolidated at national level: The Federal Ministry of Justice has answered this question with "yes" with regard to the courts at federal level. A slight minority of the Länder replied "yes", while the slight majority replied "no". One of the Länder answered "no" for the labour and administrative courts and "yes" for the remaining courts. 3 Länder could not provide an answer. "Justice expenses management"
Tool deployment rate: A slight majority of the Länder answered "100 %". Half of the remaining Länder answered "50-99%" while the other half answered "10-49%". One of the Länder answered "NA".
Data consolidated at national level: The Federal Ministry of Justice has answered this question with "yes" with regard to the courts at federal level. The majority of the Länder answered "no". 2 Länder could not provide an answer.
"Other"
Tool deployment rate: The vast majority of the Länder answered "NA".
"Other" tools that are in use in the remaining Länder are tools for medium term fiscal planning (consolidated on national level: yes; communicating with other ministries: yes) and case management at the finance courts (consolidated at national level: no; communicating with other ministries: no)

(2020): Since "Other" was answered with "NA" by most of the Länder, Tool deployment rate, consolidated data and system communicating were also answered "NA".
Information on "other" budgetary and financial management systems submitted by Baden Württemberg:
Justice budget and budget calculation, medium term fiscal planning
Deployment rate: 100%, System communicating with other ministries: yes

(2018): Name of the tool: HV SAP

Greece

(2021): The answer was given by the Directorate of Budget and Financial Management.

Hungary

(2021): NEXON HR - budgetary aspects of human resource management, KIRA - management of wages.

(2020): NEXON HR - budgetary aspects of human resource management, KIRA - management of wages.

(2019): Other: NEXON HR - budgetary aspects of human resource management, KIRA - management of wages.

(2018): NEXON HR - budgetary aspects of human resource management, KIRA - management of wages.

Latvia

(2015): Q63.6. - With both financial management system and system for budget planning and budget performance monitoring works only staff from Court Administration

Poland

(2020): 1. The ZSRK system (Integrated Accounting and Personnel System) was implemented in common courts, which is a key system supporting all common court units in the field of keeping broadly understood accounting, personnel records, budget reporting and statistical reporting.
2. IT System for the Handling of the State Budget (TREZOR) facilitating the flow of information between the holders of budget funds and the Ministry of Finance in the implementation of the following budget processes: budget planning and execution.
In relation to the "system of communication with other ministries (including the Ministry of Finance)", the basis for giving a positive answer is the functioning TREZOR system, which improves the flow of information between the administrators of budget funds and the Ministry of Finance in the implementation of the following budget processes: planning and budget execution. Justice expenses managment. With reference to "Data Consolidated at National Level" in scope "Court budget and finance management systems" the basis for giving a positive answer is the implementation of the ZSRK system (Integrated Accounting and Personnel System) in common courts, which is a key system supporting all common court units in the field of keeping broadly understood accounting, personnel records, budget reporting and statistical reporting.

(2019): 1. The ZSRK system (Integrated Accounting and Personnel System) was implemented in common courts, which is a key system supporting all common court units in the field of keeping broadly understood accounting, personnel records, budget reporting and statistical reporting.
2. IT System for the Handling of the State Budget (TREZOR) facilitating the flow of information between the holders of budget funds and the Ministry of Finance in the implementation of the following budget processes: budget planning and execution.
In relation to the "system of communication with other ministries (including the Ministry of Finance)", the basis for giving a positive answer is the functioning TREZOR system, which improves the flow of information between the administrators of budget funds and the Ministry of Finance in the implementation of the following budget processes: planning and budget execution. Justice expenses managment. With reference to "Data Consolidated at National Level" in scope "Court budget and finance management systems" the basis for giving a positive answer is the implementation of the ZSRK system (Integrated Accounting and Personnel System) in common courts, which is a key system supporting all common court units in the field of keeping broadly understood accounting, personnel records, budget reporting and statistical reporting.

(2018): There is a special system called ZSRK.

Slovak Republic

(2020): The SAP (human resources) system is deployed at the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic and regional level. The SUP (accounting system) system is deployed at the district court level.

(2015): We are still in phase of implementing new complex economic system (SAP). We have several partial systems implemented within the Ministry which operate individually-payroll system for budget, etc.

Spain

(General Comment): - There is the electronic system to manage the bank account of the Court. The system includes an application for the
management of judicial auctions. - Public Administrations are subject to an electronic invoice system. Legal persons are obliged to use it. It imposes a structured format, and they must be signed with an advanced electronic signature. - The General Subdirectorate for Programming and Economic Management of the Public Justice Service (and similar bodies of the Autonomous Regions) manage other applications for salaries and other payments.

(2020): - There is an electronic system to manage the bank account of the Court. The system includes an application for the management of judicial auctions. - Public Administrations are subject to an electronic invoice system. Legal persons are obliged to use it. It imposes a structured format, and they must be signed with an advanced electronic signature. - The General Subdirectorate for Programming and Economic Management of the Public Justice Service (and similar bodies of the Autonomous Regions) manage other applications for salaries and other payments.

(2019): There is an electronic system to manage the bank account of the Court. The system includes an application for the management of judicial auctions. This system is under the responsibility of the 'Letrado de la Administración de Justicia'.
The General Subdirectorate for Programming and Economic Management of the Public Justice Service (and similar bodies of the Autonomous Regions) manage other applications for sallaries and other payments.

(2018): There is an electronic system to manage the bank account of the Court, and in this system has an application for the management of judicial auctions, this system is responsibility of the Judicial Counsellor.
The Sub-Directorate General of Economic Resources of the Administration of Justice (and similar bodies of the Autonomous Regions) manage other applications for sallaries and other payments.

Question 063-7

Austria

(2019): The data for the measurement tools is provided by the CMS, but there is no way get Access to this data directly by using the CMS.

(2018): The data for the measurement tools is provided by the CMS, but there is no way get access to this data directly by using the CMS.

Belgium

(2019): The Aris tool has been launched as a pilot project by the prosecution to measure workload both at central and local level, both for prosecutors of non-prosecutor staff.

(2018): A pilot project is being launched by the Public Prosecutor's Office for an instrument to measure workload at both central and local levels. The Aris instrument will be tested in pilot courts.

Bulgaria

(2020): With a decision of the Prosecutors Chamber with the Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria (SJC) dated 18.12.2019, as of 01.01.2020, Rules for measuring the workload of the prosecutor's offices and the individual workload of each prosecutor and investigator have been adopted. With a decision of the SJC of 16.12.2015, Rules for assessment of the workload of judges have been adopted.
The instruments do not refer to court employees, but only to judges, prosecutors and investigators within the prosecutor's offices and courts in the Republic of Bulgaria.

(2018): By decision of the Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria (SJC) of 11.12.2014, as of 01.01.2015, Rules for measuring the workload of the prosecution offices and the individual workload of each prosecutor and investigator were adopted. By decision of the SJC of 16.12.2015, as of 01.04.2016, Rules for assessment of the workload of judges were adopted. The instruments do not refer to judicial officers, but only to judges, prosecutors and investigators within the prosecutor's offices and courts in the Republic of Bulgaria.

Czech Republic

(2020): The measurement tool is only available to assess the workload of judges and public prosecutors.

Denmark

(General Comment): We measure how much time each judge or staff on different categories of work (civil cases, criminal cases, administration etc.). We calculate the activity a court creates in weighted cases. We therefore measure productivity. For prosecutors: There is a well-implemented time recording system where the Prosecution Service´s staff weekly report their time spent on specific tasks, e.g. court work, formal charging, dropping of cases/withdrawal of charges, transport time to and from court, training etc. The time recording system is also used to report work outside normal working hours (overtime), including shifts for which a separate fee is paid. In addition, the number of prosecutions and withdrawal of charges is measures, with each charge weighted according to a specific system. Time recording data is used in calculations of the Prosecution Service´s case production and efficiency – and thus also in the management information in QlickView that is available on the Prosecution Service at national level as well as for the individual police districts and State Prosecutor´s offices.

(2021): Judges above: Danish Court Administration has chosen 10-49 %. It might be higher. The point is that on district courts, all judges either fill out how time is spend on a daily basis, or - for appointed judges - on a half-yearly basis. At some courts, the court has decided that the judges despite Danish Court Administration does not demand it, anyway fill out this daily information. At a High Court and Supreme court level this is not done though. So it is not an absolute. Therefor 10-49 %. Data are used by Danish Court Administration. It is up to the individual court, how they use and how closely they monitor the staff (Judges). The same counts for non-judge staff. Danish Court Administration has no data re prosecutor staff. Overall, there has not been changes to the systems that help assess how the workload is for public prosecutors but due to ongoing interest in how the workload is distributed – not only for the single employee but also the districts between – it is estimated that there has been an increase in the percentage. The workload is monitored in more general terms centrally through the Attorney General's office and locally the districts/local prosecution monitor their prosecutors and the workload more closely. The estimate of 50-99% is therefore not an absolute but an estimate since there has been an increase in the focus on monitoring the workload. For prosecutors: There is a well-implemented time recording system where the Prosecution Service´s staff weekly report their time spent on specific tasks, e.g. court work, formal charging, dropping of cases/withdrawal of charges, transport time to and from court, training etc. The time recording system is also used to report work outside normal working hours (overtime), including shifts for which a separate fee is paid. In addition, the number of prosecutions and withdrawal of charges is measures, with each charge weighted according to a specific system. Time recording data is used in calculations of the Prosecution Service´s case production and efficiency – and thus also in the management information in QlickView that is available on the Prosecution Service at national level as well as for the individual police districts and State Prosecutor´s offices.

(2020): Judges above: Danish Court Administration has chosen 10-49 %. It might be higher. The point is that on district courts, all judges either fill out how time is spend on a daily basis, or - for appointed judges - on a half-yearly basis. At some courts, the court has decided that the judges despite Danish Court Administration does not demand it, anyway fill out this daily information. At a High Court and Supreme court level this is not done though. So it is not an absolute. Therefor 10-49 %. Data are used by Danish Court Administration. It is up to the individual court, how they use and how closely they monitor the staff (Judges). The same counts for non-judge staff. Danish Court Administration has no data re prosecutor staff. Overall, there has not been changes to the systems that help assess how the workload is for public prosecutors but due to ongoing interest in how the workload is distributed – not only for the single employee but also the districts between – it is estimated that there has been an increase in the percentage. The workload is monitored in more general terms centrally through the Attorney General's office and locally the districts/local prosecution monitor their prosecutors and the workload more closely. The estimate of 50-99% is therefore not an absolute but an estimate since there has been an increase in the focus on monitoring the workload.

(2019): Judges above: Danish Court Administration has chosen 10-49 %. It might be higher. The point is that on district courts, all judges either fill out how time is spend on a daily basis, or - for appointed judges - on a half-yearly basis. At some courts, the court has decided that the judges despite Danish Court Administration does not demand it, anyway fill out this daily information. At a High Court and Supreme court level this is not done though. So it is not an absolute. Therefor 10-49 %. Data are used by Danish Court Administration. It is up to the individual court, how they use and how closely they monitor the staff (Judges). The same counts for non-judge staff. Danish Court Administration has no data re prosecutor staff.

(2014): Equipment rate is not really defined in this context. We have defined it as "There is a set up i.e.to measure and calculate number of judges, weighted cases etc. And it is being used"

Finland

(2021): There is a system for collecting data on handling cases and this is deployed to all courts.
In administrative courts Power BI software is compatible with the new case management system, HAIPA. During the transition period,
the administrative courts also use the Business Objects Board software (BOBI) the cases still pending in the old case management
system.
The general courts are also transitioning to a new case management system, AIPA. However, the number of cases in the new system was much lower than in the administrative courts. Similarly, during the transition period, the general courts also use the Business Objects Board software (BOBI) the cases still pending in the old case management system.
Due to data protection, only the court were the judge / staff member works, looks at the data related to an individual. The heads of courts are able follow the number of cases resolved by the judge. Often, this data is not used on detailed/short term manner. Rather, it may be used at a court level (for example in budget negotiations) and as a long term indicator, or in case of a sudden and radical change in judges output (but even then not as a tool for disciplinary measure). In addition, there is a tool for reporting the working hours is 'deployed' to the courts 100% in the sense that it is available and accessible. We estimated the use to correspond '50-99%'.

(2020): There is a system for collecting data on handling cases and this is deployed to all courts.
In administrative courts Power BI software is compatible with the new case management system, HAIPA. During the transition period, the administrative courts also use the Business Objects Board software (BOBI) the cases still pending in the old case management system.
The general courts are also transitioning to a new case management system, AIPA. However, the number of cases in the new system was much lower than in the administrative courts. Similarly, during the transition period, the general courts also use the Business Objects Board software (BOBI) the cases still pending in the old case management system.
Due to data protection, only the court were the judge / staff member works, looks at the data related to an individual. The heads of courts are able follow the number of cases resolved by the judge. Often, this data is not used on detailed/short term manner. Rather, it may be used at a court level (for example in budget negotiations) and as a long term indicator, or in case of a sudden and radical change in judges output (but even then not as a tool for disciplinary measure). In addition, there is a tool for reporting the working hours is 'deployed' to the courts 100% in the sense that it is available and accessible. We estimated the use to correspond '50-99%'.
For prosecutors: The data is used for monitoring at national level and at local level. The tool used (BOBI) is not connected to the CMS. PowerBI software will be introduced in 2021 for statistical and monitoring purposes, and the preparation were done in 2020. Similarly, the introduction of the new case management system AIPA and the new administrative register HILDA in 2021 were prepared in 2020.

(2019): The courts and the prosecutors' offices use Business Objects XI software (BOXI) which is now updated to Business Objects
Board software (BOB). In administrative courts Power BI software is integrated to case management system.
The tool is 'deployed' 100% in the sense that it is available and accessible. However, judges are not required to use the tool, so it is not used 100%. We estimated the use to correspond '10-49%'. The heads of courts are able follow the number of cases resolved by the judge. However, this is usually not used on detailed/short term manner. Rather, it may be used at a court level (for example in budget negotiations) and as a long term indicator, or in case of a sudden and radical change in judges output (but even then not as a tool for disciplinary measure). Similarly to judges, the process servers record their hours in a different manner, and we estimated the use to correspond '50-99%'.

(2018): The courts and the prosecutors offices use Business Objects XI software (BOXI) which is now updated to Business Objects Board software (BOB). In administrative courts, Power BI software which is integrated to case management system is being tested.

France

(2021): As regards administrative justice, the answer is no, source: Council of State
Concerning civil and criminal justice: The answer is yes, partially. Yes for non-judge staff. In fact: the Management and Distribution Tool for Civil Servants (OUTILGREF) was created in 1992. It has been online via the private Justice network since 2006. It measures the workload of registry officials (i.e. excluding legal assistants and specialised assistants) and assesses the need for registry staff (FTE) in the courts and regional administrative services (RAS) in relation to the activity of these structures, the need being understood as the volume of staff required to process the annual flow of cases so as not to generate any stock. This is a single tool for all courts and RAS, which exhaustively lists the court and administrative activities of the registry. It also includes an assessment of the workload of the common or support services. It is regularly updated in line with reforms and changes in working methods, in particular, to ensure its reliability and accuracy. A data collection exercise is carried out each year to feed it. See table 63.7.1.
As regards judges and prosecutors, the answer is currently no. However, since December 2019, the Directorate of Judicial Services (DSJ) has been working on a more effective management tool to measure the activity of judges, based on a case weighting system (SPA).
Operational case weighting tables should be available by the end of 2022 for the first instance, once the results of the survey conducted in the pilot courts have been analysed.
This is an ambitious, long-term project, as the quality of the tool developed is a necessary condition for its acceptability within the judicial institution but also for its credibility outside the Ministry of Justice, particularly during budget negotiations. The objectives of this work are as follows: 1) To gain a more rapid and detailed understanding of changes in judicial activity and the national need for judges and prosecutors to deal with them, i.e.: to give greater objectivity to staffing requests made during budget negotiations in the context of the preparation of a finance bill; more accurately assess the impact of reforms or changes in public policy on the national need for magistrates.
2) Promote greater equity in the distribution of staff allocated by the Finance Act among the courts in the country.
At the national level, the DSJ has drawn on previous work carried out on this subject within the directorate, but also on the recommendations made by the Court of Auditors in its December 2018 report entitled "Methodological approach to the costs of justice", asking the Ministry of Justice to build a system for allocating resources associated with a "case weighting system inspired by foreign models based on a typology of court cases allowing for an efficient allocation of resources and better management of justice".
It also drew on the work of the Council of Europe's Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) which, on 2 July 2020, adopted a report on the weighting of court cases, encouraging the member States of this European organisation to adopt a system for measuring the activity of the courts based on a weighting by type of case in order to improve the efficiency of the management of justice.
A weighting table must therefore be drawn up for each judicial function performed within the courts and courts of appeal. This table will be organised around jurisdictional activity but also support activity.
To achieve this, the DSJ has favoured peer-to-peer working meetings (the so-called Delphi method). A working group (WG), made up of representatives of the conferences of heads of court and jurisdiction, professional associations of judges (investigation judges, enforcement judges, juvenile judges, judges specialised in protection litigation, etc.), trade unions and

(2020): "For non-judge staff: the Civil Servant Job Management and Distribution Tool (OUTILGREF) was created in 1992. It has been online via the private Justice network since 2006. It measures the workload of court registrars (i.e., excluding legal assistants and specialized assistants) and evaluates the need for court clerks (etpE) in the courts and regional administrative services (SAR) with respect to the activity of these structures, the need being understood as the volume of agents necessary for the annual processing of the flow of cases in order to not generate any stock. This is a single tool for all the courts and the regional administrative services, which exhaustively lists the court and administrative activities of the registry. It also includes an evaluation of the workload of the common or support services. It is regularly updated according to the reforms and the evolution of working methods in particular, to guarantee its reliability and sincerity. A data collection operation is carried out each year to feed it.
With regard to magistrates (judges and prosecutors), the French Ministry of Justice is currently conducting work to better measure their workload. A system for evaluating their activity, based on the weighting of court cases, is being developed and should, by the end of 2022, provide a better understanding of the activity of courts and tribunals, as well as a more accurate allocation of resources between jurisdictions and within the departments of the same jurisdiction. With this in mind, a working group has been set up and has met more than ten times since December 2019, with the Ministry favouring peer-to-peer meetings (Delphi method), which is based on an estimate of time in order to establish the weighting table.
[2] For non-judge staff, the Outil de Gestion et de Répartition des Emplois de Fonctionnaires (OUTILGREF) was created in 1992. It has been online via the private Justice network since 2006. It measures the workload of court registrars (i.e., excluding legal assistants and specialized assistants) and evaluates the need for court registrars (etpE) in the courts and regional administrative services (SAR) with respect to the activity of these structures, the need being understood as the volume of agents necessary for the annual processing of the flow of cases in order to not generate any stock. This is a single tool for all the courts and the regional administrative services, which exhaustively lists the court and administrative activities of the registry. It also includes an evaluation of the workload of the common or support services. It is regularly updated according to the reforms and the evolution of working methods in particular, to guarantee its reliability and sincerity. A data collection exercise is carried out each year to feed it.
On the other hand, the answer given by the administrative justice is "no".

(2014): As regards the judiciary, the software “Outil de Gestion et de Répartition des Emplois de Fonctionnaires” (OUTILGREF) measures the workload of court clerks, and assesses the specific needs of the jurisdictions. This workload is calculated based on indicators which measure the average flow of new cases filed by a jurisdiction for a period of one year. Evaluations made through the OUTILGREF tool help monitor the localisation of court clerks vacancies in jurisdictions. This monitoring operation takes place once a year, and comparable operations exist for the completion of impact studies of draft legislation and regulation which may affect clerks. OUTILGREF is a tool shared by both the central administration and decentralised departments to analyse the activity of jurisdictions.

As regards the administrative courts, equipment rate of tools used to measure workload is evaluated to 10-49%.

Hungary

(2021): A methodology to conduct workload assessment was developed at the General Prosecutor's Office; however, it has not yet been finalised. The methodology can be summarized as follows:
I. ACTIVITY INDICATORS ("TM")
- In the system of criminal prosecution indicator, a weight is assigned to each outcome available in the criminal prosecution case management system, between 0 and 5. For instance, 1 is assigned when a decision rejecting a report of crime is ordered to be amended, 3,5 is assigned in case of raising charges.
- The system also allocates a weight to each criminal offense (the most significant offense within a case, and regardless of aggravated circumstances), between 1 and 9. For instance, driving under the influence of alcohol is given 2,8 points, while money laundering is given 8,5. - The system weighs the number of the defendants involved in a case, depending on whether the outcome related to the whole case or a to a person involved. In cases involving not more than 20 defendants, 1 point is given to one defendant, and 0,1 point is given to each additional defendant. The activity indicator is calculated as follows: the system records the weight assigned to the outcome, multiplies it with the weight assigned to the offense, and that result is multiplied again with the weight assigned to the number of defendants. If the outcome is related to a whole case, the weight numbers aligned with the number of defendants are applied. If the outcome concerns one particular person, the calculation is repeated according to the number of defendants, without using the weight numbers aligned with the number of defendants. The organizational activity indicator is an aggregate of all the activity indicators calculated by the above method.
II. STAFF NUMBER ("L")
Staff numbers are calculated on the basis of the weighed staff number of each organizational unit on the last calendar day of a given month, by taking into account actually filled positions, except for chief prosecutors, deputy chief prosecutors and heads of department. Staff numbers are weighed according to the weekly worktime and the field of activity.
III. WORKLOAD INDICATOR ("MT")
Activity indicators are aggregated on a monthly basis at each organizational unit. After that, the aggregate number is divided by the staff number of the month in question. So, the workload indicator of an organizational unit is the result of the division of the aggregated activity indicator by the staff number: MT = TM / L
By adding up the monthly workload indicators, quarterly and yearly figures can be calculated in respect of each unit. Nevertheless, adding up the workload indicators of several organizational units will unduly distort, i.e. multiply the result. So, it is impossible to determine the workload of a high prosecution service by adding up the already calculated workload indicators of the district prosecution services within the area of jurisdiction of the high prosecution service, as well as the workload indicator of the high prosecution service itself. To get the correct result, one must add up the activity indicators (TM), respectively the staff numbers, and then one must carry out the division.
The above system is capable of (1) showing the changing trends of workload in respect of a particular organizational unit, as well as of comparing the workload of several organizational units in respect of the same field of activity.
The system, however, is incapable of measuring a prosecutor's individual workload. The distribution of workload within a unit can be measured still by the detailed examination of case files. Furthermore, the system is not really capable of comparing workloads concerning different fields of activity.

Ireland

(2021): The Judicial Council was established in 2019 pursuant to the Judicial Council Act 2019. Further information is available on their website.
https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2019/act/33/enacted/en/html?q=judicial+council+act https://judicialcouncil.ie/about-the-judicial-council/

Italy

(2021): The same tool might potentially be used to assess the workload of both magistrates and their staff. The monitoring of the activity of judges/prosecutors is eventually used to assess their evaluation. The same doesn’t apply to court staff, hence the answer 0 provided in the previous cycle.

Luxembourg

(2014): Luxembourg does not use tools to measure the workload of magistrates to monitor their activity, but merely for statistical purposes.

Poland

(2019): This kind of tools exist only for prosecutors. For judges and in courts there is only software used for registering judicial proceedings and their management. ZSRK system does not cover: units of the prosecutor's office, administrative judiciary, military judiciary, Supreme Court, Tribunal Constitutional and the National Council of the Judiciary.

Portugal

(2021): There is no specific general management tool to access the workload of non-judge staff/non prosecutor staff. The information is collected directly from the case management system and then it is organized by the General Directorate of Administration of Justice/Ministry of Justice.

(2020): There is no specific general management tool to access the workload of non-judge staff/non prosecutor staff. The information is collected directly from the case management system and then it is organized by the General Directorate of Administration of Justice/Ministry of Justice.

Romania

(2015): STATIS – tool for statistical measurements and analysis both local and national

Slovak Republic

(2020): Application/tool collecting the time information about the activities of the judges, can be used for senior judicial officials in the future as well. The tool is part of the project Case weighting analyses (CWA) and the result should be used to assess the workload of the judges in the future. In 2020 the cellecting data for the CWA project was stoped becuase of covid pandemic situation.

(2019): Still in development. Application/tool collecting the time information about the activities of the judges, can be used for senior judicial officials as well. The tool is part of the project Case weighting analyses and the result should be used to assess the workload of the judges in the future. The tool is not connected to CMS and was still not developed at the full scale in 2019 (hence the deployment rate is 50-99%).

Question 063-7-1

Denmark

(General Comment): Judges above: Danish Court Administration has chosen 10-49 %. It might be higher. The point is that on district courts, all judges either fill out how time is spend on a daily basis, or - for appointed judges - on a half-yearly basis. At some courts, the court has decided that the judges despite Danish Court Administration does not demand it, anyway fill out this daily information. At a High Court and Supreme court level this is not done though. So it is not an absolute. Therefor 10-49 %. Data are used by Danish Court Administration. It is up to the individual court, how they use and how closely they monitor the staff (Judges). The same counts for non-judge staff. Danish Court Administration has no data re prosecutor staff. Overall, there has not been changes to the systems that help assess how the workload is for public prosecutors but due to ongoing interest in how the workload is distributed – not only for the single employee but also the districts between – it is estimated that there has been an increase in the percentage. The workload is monitored in more general terms centrally through the Attorney General's office and locally the districts/local prosecution monitor their prosecutors and the workload more closely. The estimate of 50-99% is therefore not an absolute but an estimate since there has been an increase in the focus on monitoring the workload.

Indicator 7: Professionals of justice

- Professional Judges and Non-judge staff

- Public prosecutors and Non-prosecutor staff

- Salaries of judges and public prosecutors

- Disciplinary proceedings against judges and prosecutors

- Lawyers

- EC Templates

Professional judges and non-judge staff

Table 7.1.1 Total number of professional judges from 2012 to 2021
All instances - absolute number (Q46)

States	Total number of professional judges									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	1 547	1 565	1 620	1 621	2 397	2 478	2 411	2 625	2 589	2 387
Belgium	1 598	1 604	1 602	1 614	1 600	1 566	1 523	1 526	1 524	1 669
Bulgaria	2 239	2 191	2 220	2 225	2 255	2 235	2 223	2 215	2 184	2 192
Croatia	1 932	1 912	1 875	1 864	1 797	1 775	1 660	1 682	1 643	1 643
Cyprus	103	101	97	113	111	119	118	115	126	129
Czech Republic	3 055	3 054	3 028	3 018	3 005	3 012	3 029	3 006	3 007	2 990
Denmark	372	355	377	374	372	377	375	375	388	388
Estonia	228	226	231	234	232	227	233	229	234	236
Finland	981	986	988	991	1 068	1 045	1 081	1 087	1 077	1 158
France	7 033	7 054	6 935	6 967	6 995	7 066	7 277	7 427	7 522	7 574
Germany	19 832	19 323	19 323	19 282	19 867	20 069	20 323	20 570	20 793	20 998
Greece	2 574	3 877	2 231	2 206	2 780	2 861	2 874	2 884	3 861	4 018
Hungary	2 767	2 807	2 813	2 813	2 811	2 828	2 892	2 878	2 789	2 710
Ireland	144	148	160	159	162	160	160	167	163	170
Italy	6 347	6 579	6 939	6 590	6 395	6 508	7 015	7 127	7 027	7 154
Latvia	439	481	488	493	503	490	559	521	550	545
Lithuania	768	772	754	762	778	767	758	750	740	718
Luxembourg	179	180	184	183	187	198	222	226	229	230
Malta	40	42	41	42	45	43	45	43	42	47
Netherlands	2 410	2 378	2 359	2 357	2 331	2 538	2 522	2 523	2 597	2 644
Poland	10 114	-	10 096	-	9 980	10 047	9 776	9 736	9 650	9 815
Portugal	2 009	2 025	1 990	1 990	1 986	2 059	1 979	1 999	1 999	2 021
Romania	4 310	4 511	4 577	4 608	4 628	4 664	4 677	4 753	4 600	4 590
Slovak Republic	1 307	1 342	1 322	1 292	1 311	1 376	1 378	1 370	1 306	1 386
Slovenia	970	951	924	897	880	859	867	873	875	860
Spain	5 155	-	5 353	5 367	5 367	5 377	5 419	5 341	5 320	5 408
Sweden	1 123	1 132	1 150	1 159	1 179	1 199	1 217	1 184	1 200	1 240
Average	2 947	2 624	2 951	2 662	3 001	3 035	3 060	3 083	3 112	3 145
Median	1 598	1 565	1 620	1 618	1 797	1 775	1 660	1 682	1 643	1 669
Minimum	40	42	41	42	45	43	45	43	42	47
Maximum	19 832	19 323	19 323	19 282	19 867	20 069	20 323	20 570	20 793	20 998
Nb of values	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: The administrative courts' judges have been included since 2018.

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.1.1a Total number of professional judges from 2012 to 2021
All instances - per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)

States	Total number of professional judges per 100 000 inhabitants									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	18,3	18,4	18,9	18,6	27,4	28,2	27,3	29,5	29,0	26,6
Belgium	14,3	14,4	14,3	14,3	14,1	13,8	13,3	13,3	13,2	14,4
Bulgaria	30,7	30,2	30,8	31,1	31,8	31,7	31,8	31,9	31,6	32,1
Croatia	45,3	45,0	44,4	44,5	43,3	43,2	40,7	41,4	40,7	42,4
Cyprus	11,9	11,8	11,3	13,3	13,1	13,9	13,5	13,0	14,1	14,3
Czech Republic	29,1	29,1	28,8	28,6	28,4	28,4	28,4	28,2	28,1	28,4
Denmark	6,6	6,3	6,7	6,6	6,5	6,5	6,5	6,4	6,6	6,6
Estonia	17,7	17,2	17,6	17,8	17,6	17,3	17,7	17,3	17,6	17,7
Finland	18,1	18,1	18,1	18,1	19,4	19,0	19,6	19,7	19,5	20,9
France	10,7	10,7	10,5	10,5	10,4	10,5	10,9	11,1	11,2	11,2
Germany	24,7	23,9	23,9	23,6	24,2	24,3	24,5	24,7	25,0	25,2
Greece	23,3	35,0	20,6	20,3	25,8	26,6	26,8	26,9	36,0	37,6
Hungary	27,9	28,4	28,5	28,6	28,7	28,6	30,2	29,5	28,2	28,0
Ireland	3,1	3,2	3,5	3,4	3,5	3,3	3,3	3,4	3,3	3,3
Italy	10,6	11,0	11,4	10,9	10,6	10,8	11,6	11,8	11,9	12,1
Latvia	21,5	23,8	24,4	25,0	25,5	25,1	29,1	27,3	29,1	29,1
Lithuania	25,6	26,2	25,8	26,4	27,3	27,3	27,1	26,8	26,5	25,6
Luxembourg	34,1	32,7	32,7	32,5	31,7	32,9	36,2	36,1	36,1	35,6
Malta	9,5	9,8	9,3	9,3	9,8	9,0	9,5	8,7	8,2	9,1
Netherlands	14,4	14,1	14,0	13,9	13,6	14,8	14,6	14,5	14,9	15,1
Poland	26,2	-	26,2	-	26,0	26,1	25,5	25,3	25,2	25,8
Portugal	19,2	19,4	19,2	19,2	19,3	20,0	19,3	19,4	19,4	19,5
Romania	20,2	22,6	20,5	23,3	23,6	23,9	24,1	24,5	24,0	24,1
Slovak Republic	24,2	24,8	24,4	23,8	24,1	25,3	25,3	25,1	23,9	25,5
Slovenia	47,1	46,1	44,8	43,5	42,6	41,6	41,7	41,7	41,5	40,8
Spain	11,2	-	11,5	11,6	11,5	11,5	11,5	11,3	11,2	11,4
Sweden	11,8	11,7	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,9	11,5	11,6	11,9
Average	21	21,4	21	20,4	21	21,3	22	21,5	22	22,0
Median	19	19,4	19	18,9	24	23,9	24	24,5	24	24,1
Minimum	3	3,2	3	3,4	3	3,3	3	3,4	3	3,3
Maximum	47	46,1	45	44,5	43	43,2	42	41,7	41	42,4
Nb of values	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: The administrative courts' judges have been included since 2018

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.1.2 Variations of the total number of professional judges (between 2012 and 2021 and between 2020 and 2021) (Q46)

States	Variation of the number of professional judges	
	2012-2021	2020-2021
Austria	54,3%	-7,8%
Belgium	4,4%	9,5%
Bulgaria	-2,1%	0,4%
Croatia	-15,0%	0,0%
Cyprus	25,2%	2,4%
Czech Republic	-2,1%	-0,6%
Denmark	4,3%	0,0%
Estonia	3,5%	0,9%
Finland	18,0%	7,5%
France	7,7%	0,7%
Germany	5,9%	1,0%
Greece	56,1%	4,1%
Hungary	-2,1%	-2,8%
Ireland	18,1%	4,3%
Italy	12,7%	1,8%
Latvia	24,1%	-0,9%
Lithuania	-6,5%	-3,0%
Luxembourg	28,5%	0,4%
Malta	17,5%	11,9%
Netherlands	9,7%	1,8%
Poland	-3,0%	1,7%
Portugal	0,6%	1,1%
Romania	6,5%	-0,2%
Slovak Republic	6,0%	6,1%
Slovenia	-11,3%	-1,7%
Spain	4,9%	1,7%
Sweden	10,4%	3,3%
Average	12,0%	2,7%
Median	6,0%	1,0%
Minimum	-15,0%	-7,8%
Maximum	56,1%	11,9%
Nb of values	27	27

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: The administrative courts' judges have been included since 2018.

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.1.3 Total number of professional judges by instance in 2012, 2020 and 2021 (abosolute number) and their variations(Q46)

States	Total Professional judges by instance																	
	2012				2020				2021				Variations 2012-2021			Variation 2020-2021		
	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court
Austria	1 547	1 325	157	65	2 589	2 153	305	131	2 387	1 946	310	131	46,9%	97,3%	101,8%	-9,6%	1,6%	0,0%
Belgium	1 598	1 293	305	30	1 524	1 193	301	30	1 669	1 331	310	28	2,9%	1,6%	-6,7%	11,6%	3,0%	-6,7%
Bulgaria	2 239	1 188	859	192	2 184	1 246	760	178	2 192	1 258	750	184	5,9%	-12,7%	-4,2%	1,0%	-1,3%	3,4%
Croatia	1 932	1 378	514	40	1 643	1 158	449	36	1 643	1 159	449	35	-15,9%	-12,6%	-12,5%	0,1%	0,0%	-2,8%
Cyprus	103	90	NAP	13	126	113	NAP	13	129	116	NAP	13	28,9%	NAP	0,0%	2,7%	NAP	0,0%
Czech Republic	3 055	1 857	964	234	3 007	1 814	1 088	105	2 990	1 819	1 065	106	-2,0%	10,5%	-54,7%	0,3%	-2,1%	1,0%
Denmark	372	259	94	19	388	264	106	18	388	258	112	18	-0,4%	19,1%	-5,3%	-2,3%	5,7%	0,0%
Estonia	228	167	42	19	234	169	46	19	236	171	46	19	2,4%	9,5%	0,0%	1,2%	0,0%	0,0%
Finland	981	744	194	43	1 077	854	178	45	1 158	901	209	48	21,1%	7,7%	11,6%	5,5%	17,4%	6,7%
France	7 033	4 962	1 695	376	7 522	5 288	1 880	354	7 574	5 354	1 868	352	7,9%	10,2%	-6,4%	1,2%	-0,6%	-0,6%
Germany	19 832	14 861	4 056	457	20 793	16 207	4 125	461	20 998	16 373	4 164	461	10,2%	2,7%	0,8%	1,0%	0,9%	0,0%
Greece	2 574	1 518	812	244	3 861	2 676	934	251	4 018	2 690	927	401	77,2%	14,2%	64,3%	0,5%	-0,7%	59,8%
Hungary	2 767	1 672	1 021	74	2 789	1 420	1 283	86	2 710	1 391	1 226	93	-16,8%	20,1%	25,7%	-2,0%	-4,4%	8,1%
Ireland	144	136	NAP	8	163	138	16	9	170	145	17	8	6,6%	NAP	0,0%	5,1%	6,3%	-11,1%
Italy	6 347	4 929	1 118	300	7 027	5 356	1 174	497	7 154	5 479	1 191	484	11,2%	6,5%	61,3%	2,3%	1,4%	-2,6%
Latvia	439	263	126	50	550	380	135	35	545	376	133	36	43,0%	5,6%	-28,0%	-1,1%	-1,5%	2,9%
Lithuania	768	684	51	33	740	662	48	30	718	643	45	30	-6,0%	-11,8%	-9,1%	-2,9%	-6,3%	0,0%
Luxembourg	179	139	NA	40	229	171	53	5	230	174	51	5	25,2%	NA	-87,5%	1,8%	-3,8%	0,0%
Malta	40	34	6	NAP	42	33	9	NAP	47	39	8	NAP	14,7%	33,3%	NAP	18,2%	-11,1%	NAP
Netherlands	2 410	1 855	519	36	2 597	1 882	680	35	2 644	1 921	688	35	3,6%	32,6%	-2,8%	2,1%	1,2%	0,0%
Poland	10 114	9 441	497	86	9 650	9 034	417	199	9 815	9 161	459	195	-3,0%	-7,6%	126,7%	1,4%	10,1%	-2,0%
Portugal	2 009	1 480	445	84	1 999	1 447	472	80	2 021	1 472	467	82	-0,5%	4,9%	-2,4%	1,7%	-1,1%	2,5%
Romania	4 310	1 998	2 217	95	4 600	2 103	2 387	110	4 590	2 202	2 285	103	10,2%	3,1%	8,4%	4,7%	-4,3%	-6,4%
Slovak Republic	1 307	871	352	84	1 306	862	367	77	1 386	921	402	63	5,7%	14,2%	-25,0%	6,8%	9,5%	-18,2%
Slovenia	970	753	183	34	875	638	208	29	860	694	136	30	-7,8%	-25,7%	-11,8%	8,8%	-34,6%	3,4%
Spain	5 155	3 647	1 431	77	5 320	3 752	1 495	73	5 408	3 817	1 523	68	4,7%	6,4%	-11,7%	1,7%	1,9%	-6,8%
Sweden	1 123	766	324	33	1 200	809	359	32	1 240	833	376	31	8,7%	16,0%	-6,1%	3,0%	4,7%	-3,1%
Average	2 947	2 160	749	106	3 112	2 290	741	113	3 145	2 320	739	118	10,5%	10,2%	4,9%	2,4%	-0,3%	1,1%
Median	1 598	1 293	471	57	1 643	1 193	392	59	1 669	1 258	426	56	5,9%	7,1%	-3,5%	1,7%	0,0%	0,0%
Minimum	40	34	6	8	42	33	9	5	47	39	8	5	-16,8%	-25,7%	-87,5%	-9,6%	-34,6%	-18,2%
Maximum	19 832	14 861	4 056	457	20 793	16 207	4 125	497	20 998	16 373	4 164	484	77,2%	97,3%	126,7%	18,2%	17,4%	59,8%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	2700%	2700%	2700%	2700%	2700%	2700%
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	7%	4%	0%	4%	4%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Bulgaria: For 2020, judges who administer judges in the appelate panels of regional and administrative courts are counted as second instance judges.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.1.3 Total number of professional judges by instance in 2012, 2020 and 2021 (abosolute number) and their variations(Q46)

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.3a Professional judges by instance in 2012, 2020 and 2021
Per 100 000 inhabitants (Q1, Q46)

States	Professional judges by instance per 100 000 inhabitants											
	2012				2020				2021			
	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court
Austria	18,3	15,7	1,9	0,8	29,0	24,1	3,4	1,5	26,6	21,7	3,5	1,5
Belgium	14,3	11,6	2,7	0,3	13,2	10,4	2,6	0,3	14,4	11,5	2,7	0,2
Bulgaria	30,7	16,3	11,8	2,6	31,6	18,0	11,0	2,6	32,1	18,4	11,0	2,7
Croatia	45,3	32,3	12,1	0,9	40,7	28,7	11,1	0,9	42,4	29,9	11,6	0,9
Cyprus	11,9	10,4	NAP	1,5	14,1	12,6	NAP	1,5	14,3	12,8	NAP	1,4
Czech Republic	29,1	17,7	9,2	2,2	28,1	17,0	10,2	1,0	28,4	17,3	10,1	1,0
Denmark	6,6	4,6	1,7	0,3	6,6	4,5	1,8	0,3	6,6	4,4	1,9	0,3
Estonia	17,7	13,0	3,3	1,5	17,6	12,7	3,5	1,4	17,7	12,9	3,5	1,4
Finland	18,1	13,7	3,6	0,8	19,5	15,4	3,2	0,8	20,9	16,2	3,8	0,9
France	10,7	7,6	2,6	0,6	11,2	7,8	2,8	0,5	11,2	7,9	2,8	0,5
Germany	24,7	18,5	5,1	0,6	25,0	19,5	5,0	0,6	25,2	19,7	5,0	0,6
Greece	23,3	13,7	7,3	2,2	36,0	25,0	8,7	2,3	37,6	25,2	8,7	3,8
Hungary	27,9	16,9	10,3	0,7	28,2	14,4	13,0	0,9	28,0	14,4	12,7	1,0
Ireland	3,1	3,0	NAP	0,2	3,3	2,8	0,3	0,2	3,3	2,8	0,3	0,2
Italy	10,6	8,3	1,9	0,5	11,9	9,0	2,0	0,8	12,1	9,3	2,0	0,8
Latvia	21,5	12,9	6,2	2,4	29,1	20,1	7,1	1,8	29,1	20,0	7,1	1,9
Lithuania	25,6	22,8	1,7	1,1	26,5	23,7	1,7	1,1	25,6	22,9	1,6	1,1
Luxembourg	34,1	26,5	NA	7,6	36,1	26,9	8,4	0,8	35,6	27,0	7,9	0,8
Malta	9,5	8,0	1,4	NAP	8,2	6,4	1,7	NAP	9,1	7,6	1,6	NAP
Netherlands	14,4	11,1	3,1	0,2	14,9	10,8	3,9	0,2	15,1	11,0	3,9	0,2
Poland	26,2	24,5	1,3	0,2	25,2	23,6	1,1	0,5	25,8	24,1	1,2	0,5
Portugal	19,2	14,1	4,2	0,8	19,4	14,1	4,6	0,8	19,5	14,2	4,5	0,8
Romania	20,2	9,4	10,4	0,4	24,0	11,0	12,4	0,6	24,1	11,6	12,0	0,5
Slovak Republic	24,2	16,1	6,5	1,6	23,9	15,8	6,7	1,4	25,5	16,9	7,4	1,2
Slovenia	47,1	36,6	8,9	1,7	41,5	30,3	9,9	1,4	40,8	32,9	6,5	1,4
Spain	11,2	7,9	3,1	0,2	11,2	7,9	3,2	0,2	11,4	8,0	3,2	0,1
Sweden	11,8	8,0	3,4	0,3	11,6	7,8	3,5	0,3	11,9	8,0	3,6	0,3
Average	20,6	14,9	5,1	1,2	21,8	15,6	5,5	0,9	22,0	15,9	5,4	1,0
Median	19,2	13,7	3,5	0,8	23,9	14,4	3,7	0,8	24,1	14,4	3,8	0,8
Minimum	3,1	3,0	1,3	0,2	3,3	2,8	0,3	0,2	3,3	2,8	0,3	0,1
Maximum	47,1	36,6	12,1	7,6	41,5	30,3	13,0	2,6	42,4	32,9	12,7	3,8
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	7%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%	4%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Bulgaria: For 2019, only magistrates working in the 7 courts of appeal are counted as 2nd instance judges, while all judges in regional courts (sitting in both 1st and 2nd instance departments) are listed as first instance judges

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.4 Total number of judges (FTE) by case category in 2021 (Q46-2)

States	Number of judges (FTE) by case category																			
	Total				Civil and/or commercial				Criminal				Administrative				Other			
	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court	Total	1st instance	2nd instance	Supreme court
Austria	2 387	1 946	310	131	1 197	918	233	46	403	309	77	17	787	719	NAP	68	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Belgium	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2 192	1 258	750	184	NA	NA	432	62	NA	NA	254	27	330	236	NAP	94	15	10	5	NAP
Croatia	1 643	1 159	449	35	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	129	116	NAP	13	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	7	7	NAP	NAP	25	25	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	2 990	1 819	1 065	106	1 542	987	507	48	743	432	288	23	154	0	119	35	551	400	151	0
Denmark	388	258	112	18	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	236	171	46	19	NA	NA	24	8	NA	NA	11	6	38	22	11	5	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	1 158	901	209	48	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	310	282	NAP	28	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	7 574	5 354	1 868	352	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 313	912	273	128	NA	NA	NA	NA
Germany	20 998	16 373	4 164	461	NA	5 620	1 482	NA	NA	4 183	575	NA	2 280	1 888	340	52	NA	4 682	1 767	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ireland	170	145	17	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	7 154	5 479	1 191	484	3 548	2 709	641	198	3 156	2 442	550	164	450	328	NAP	122	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	545	380	129	36	NA	NA	61	13	NA	NA	48	8	73	39	20	14	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	718	643	45	30	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	64	43	21	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	230	174	51	5	144	108	36	NAP	60	50	10	NAP	21	16	5	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Malta	47	39	8	NAP	22	17	5	NAP	22	19	3	NAP	3	3	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	2 644	1 921	688	35	NA	NA	NA	13	NA	NA	NA	11	NA	NA	NA	11	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Poland	NA	NA	NA	195	NA	NA	NA	26	NA	NA	NA	28	533	431	NA	102	NA	NA	NA	39
Portugal	2 021	1 472	467	82	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	286	203	58	25	1 735	1 269	409	57
Romania	4 590	2 202	2 285	103	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	1 386	921	402	63	938	669	223	46	284	196	71	17	77	0	77	NAP	87	56	31	NAP
Slovenia	802	644	129	29	469	370	84	15	250	208	36	6	34	27	NAP	7	50	39	9	2
Spain	5 408	3 817	1 523	68	1 361	946	406	9	1 595	1 107	472	16	552	236	289	27	1 900	1 528	356	16
Sweden	1 240	833	376	31	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	354	218	121	15	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Average	2 898	2 088	740	110	1 153	1 372	345	44	814	994	200	29	403	295	121	49	623	1 001	390	23
Median	1 386	921	389	48	1 068	918	228	26	344	309	74	17	286	203	77	28	87	228	151	16
Minimum	47	39	8	5	22	17	5	8	22	19	3	6	3	0	5	5	15	10	5	0
Maximum	20 998	16 373	4 164	484	3 548	5 620	1 482	198	3 156	4 183	575	164	2 280	1 888	340	128	1 900	4 682	1 767	57
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	15%	15%	15%	11%	63%	59%	44%	41%	63%	59%	44%	41%	22%	22%	30%	19%	33%	30%	30%	26%
% of NAP	0%	0%	4%	4%	7%	7%	11%	19%	7%	7%	11%	19%	7%	7%	30%	26%	41%	41%	44%	56%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Bulgaria: For 2019, only magistrates working in the 7 courts of appeal are counted as 2nd instance judges, while all judges in regional courts (sitting in both 1st and 2nd instance departments) are listed as first instance judges

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Malta: The number of second instance judges for administrative cases is included in the number of second instance judges for civil and/or commercial cases.

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.5 Total professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2012, 2020 and 2021 (Q46)

States	Total professional judges: distribution of males and females											
	2012		2020		2021		Variation 2012-2021 in % points			Variation 2020-2021 in %points		
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male	% points	Female	Male	% points	Female
Austria	51,2%	48,8%	48,7%	51,3%	45,5%	54,5%	▼	5,7	▲	▼	3,2	▲
Belgium	51,3%	48,7%	42,0%	58,0%	40,5%	59,5%	▼	10,7	▲	▼	1,5	▲
Bulgaria	NA	NA	33,5%	66,5%	33,9%	66,1%	NA	NA	NA	▲	0,3	▼
Croatia	31,2%	68,8%	28,8%	71,2%	28,2%	71,8%	▼	3,0	▲	▼	0,6	▲
Cyprus	54,4%	45,6%	47,6%	52,4%	45,7%	54,3%	▼	8,6	▲	▼	1,9	▲
Czech Republic	39,1%	60,9%	39,6%	60,4%	39,9%	60,1%	▲	0,8	▼	▲	0,2	▼
Denmark	49,2%	50,8%	45,6%	54,4%	47,4%	52,6%	▼	1,8	▲	▲	1,8	▼
Estonia	36,4%	63,6%	36,3%	63,7%	33,9%	66,1%	▼	2,5	▲	▼	2,4	▲
Finland	49,1%	50,9%	40,2%	59,8%	39,9%	60,1%	▼	9,2	▲	▼	0,3	▲
France	40,2%	59,8%	32,5%	67,5%	31,4%	68,6%	▼	8,8	▲	▼	1,1	▲
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	32,3%	67,7%	NA	NA	25,3%	74,7%	▼	7,0	▲	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	30,9%	69,1%	31,1%	68,9%	31,1%	68,9%	▲	0,2	▼	▲	0,0	▼
Ireland	73,6%	26,4%	60,7%	39,3%	58,2%	41,8%	▼	15,4	▲	▼	2,5	▲
Italy	48,8%	51,2%	44,4%	55,6%	44,4%	55,6%	▼	4,4	▲	▼	0,0	▲
Latvia	23,0%	77,0%	19,1%	80,9%	19,3%	80,7%	▼	3,7	▲	▲	0,2	▼
Lithuania	41,0%	59,0%	35,0%	65,0%	35,5%	64,5%	▼	5,5	▲	▲	0,5	▼
Luxembourg	NA	NA	30,6%	69,4%	27,8%	72,2%	NA	NA	NA	▼	2,7	▲
Malta	65,0%	35,0%	42,9%	57,1%	46,8%	53,2%	▼	18,2	▲	▲	4,0	▼
Netherlands	46,6%	53,4%	39,7%	60,3%	39,8%	60,2%	▼	6,8	▲	▲	0,1	▼
Poland	36,6%	63,4%	38,4%	61,6%	38,6%	61,4%	▲	2,0	▼	▲	0,2	▼
Portugal	43,0%	57,0%	38,0%	62,0%	37,0%	63,0%	▼	6,0	▲	▼	1,0	▲
Romania	27,5%	72,5%	26,6%	73,4%	27,7%	72,3%	▲	0,2	▼	▲	1,1	▼
Slovak Republic	37,4%	62,6%	37,7%	62,3%	36,0%	64,0%	▼	1,4	▲	▼	1,7	▲
Slovenia	22,4%	77,6%	20,1%	79,9%	20,1%	79,9%	▼	2,3	▲	▲	0,0	▼
Spain	49,8%	50,2%	45,2%	54,8%	44,0%	56,0%	▼	5,8	▲	▼	1,2	▲
Sweden	53,4%	46,6%	44,6%	55,4%	44,4%	55,6%	▼	9,0	▲	▼	0,1	▲
Average	43,1%	56,9%	38,0%	62,0%	37,0%	63,0%		5,79			1,15	
Median	42,0%	58,0%	38,4%	61,6%	37,8%	62,2%		5,59			1,01	
Minimum	22,4%	26,4%	19,1%	39,3%	19,3%	41,8%		0,15			0,00	
Maximum	73,6%	77,6%	60,7%	80,9%	58,2%	80,7%		18,19			3,95	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27		27,00			27,00	
% of NA	11%	11%	7%	7%	4%	4%		0,11			0,07	

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.6 First instance professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2012, 2020 and 2021 (Q46)

States	First instance professional judges: distribution of males and female											
	2012		2020		2021		Variation 2012-2021 in % points			Variation 2020-2021 in %points		
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male	% points	Female	Male	% points	Female
Austria	49,3%	50,7%	47,0%	53,0%	43,5%	56,5%	▼	5,8	▲	▼	3,5	▲
Belgium	48,1%	49,6%	40,6%	59,4%	39,0%	61,0%	▼	9,1	▲	▼	1,6	▲
Bulgaria	NA	NA	34,9%	65,1%	35,0%	65,0%	NA	NA	NA	▲	0,1	▼
Croatia	28,2%	71,8%	26,1%	73,9%	25,4%	74,6%	▼	2,9	▲	▼	0,7	▲
Cyprus	52,2%	47,8%	46,9%	53,1%	44,8%	55,2%	▼	7,4	▲	▼	2,1	▲
Czech Republic	34,7%	65,3%	33,1%	66,9%	33,3%	66,7%	▼	1,4	▲	▲	0,2	▼
Denmark	42,9%	57,1%	40,5%	59,5%	41,9%	58,1%	▼	1,0	▲	▲	1,3	▼
Estonia	29,3%	70,7%	29,6%	70,4%	26,9%	73,1%	▼	2,4	▲	▼	2,7	▲
Finland	47,0%	53,0%	37,8%	62,2%	37,6%	62,4%	▼	9,4	▲	▼	0,2	▲
France	36,7%	63,3%	30,5%	69,5%	29,6%	70,4%	▼	7,0	▲	▼	0,9	▲
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	27,1%	72,9%	NA	NA	24,1%	75,9%	▼	3,0	▲	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	29,7%	70,3%	28,1%	71,9%	27,9%	72,1%	▼	1,8	▲	▼	0,2	▲
Ireland	72,8%	27,2%	61,6%	38,4%	58,6%	41,4%	▼	14,2	▲	▼	3,0	▲
Italy	45,8%	54,2%	42,3%	57,7%	42,5%	57,5%	▼	3,3	▲	▲	0,2	▼
Latvia	17,9%	82,1%	16,6%	83,4%	17,0%	83,0%	▼	0,8	▲	▲	0,4	▼
Lithuania	37,9%	62,1%	32,6%	67,4%	33,1%	66,9%	▼	4,7	▲	▲	0,5	▼
Luxembourg	NA	NA	28,7%	71,3%	25,3%	74,7%	NA	NA	NA	▼	3,4	▲
Malta	58,8%	41,2%	33,3%	66,7%	38,5%	61,5%	▼	20,4	▲	▲	5,1	▼
Netherlands	42,3%	57,7%	37,1%	62,9%	37,6%	62,4%	▼	4,6	▲	▲	0,5	▼
Poland	35,7%	64,3%	37,5%	62,5%	37,5%	62,5%	▲	1,8	▼	▼	0,0	▲
Portugal	34,3%	65,7%	31,7%	68,3%	31,1%	68,9%	▼	3,1	▲	▼	0,6	▲
Romania	31,0%	69,0%	26,8%	73,2%	28,2%	71,8%	▼	2,7	▲	▲	1,5	▼
Slovak Republic	35,6%	64,4%	37,0%	63,0%	34,6%	65,4%	▼	1,0	▲	▼	2,4	▲
Slovenia	19,7%	80,3%	17,2%	82,8%	18,2%	81,8%	▼	1,5	▲	▲	0,9	▼
Spain	42,0%	58,0%	38,2%	61,8%	37,3%	62,7%	▼	4,8	▲	▼	1,0	▲
Sweden	55,9%	44,1%	46,2%	53,8%	46,0%	54,0%	▼	9,9	▲	▼	0,3	▲
Average	39,8%	60,1%	35,3%	64,7%	34,4%	65,6%		5,2			1,3	
Median	37,3%	62,7%	34,9%	65,1%	34,8%	65,2%		3,2			0,9	
Minimum	17,9%	27,2%	16,6%	38,4%	17,0%	41,4%		0,8			0,0	
Maximum	72,8%	82,1%	61,6%	83,4%	58,6%	83,0%		20,4			5,1	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27		27			27	
% of NA	11%	11%	7%	7%	4%	4%		11%			7%	

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Belgium: Starting from 2021, data include also administrative judges (judges of the Council of State and the Aliens Litigation Council). The latter are counted as first instance judges, even though the Council of State intervenes also as last instance court.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.7 Second instance professional judges: distribution of males and females in 2012, 2020 and 2021 (Q46)

States	Second instance professional judges: distribution of males and female											
	2012		2020		2021		Variation 2012-2021 in % points			Variation 2020-2021 in %points		
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male	% points	Female	Male	% points	Female
Austria	59,5%	40,5%	54,1%	45,9%	51,3%	48,7%	▼	8,2	▲	▼	2,8	▲
Belgium	56,7%	43,3%	44,9%	55,1%	44,2%	55,8%	▼	12,5	▲	▼	0,7	▲
Bulgaria	NA	NA	33,6%	66,4%	33,9%	66,1%	NA	NA	NA	▲	0,3	▼
Croatia	37,4%	62,6%	33,2%	66,8%	32,5%	67,5%	▼	4,8	▲	▼	0,7	▲
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	42,2%	57,8%	47,1%	52,9%	47,4%	52,6%	▲	5,2	▼	▲	0,4	▼
Denmark	62,8%	37,2%	53,8%	46,2%	55,4%	44,6%	▼	7,4	▲	▲	1,6	▼
Estonia	40,5%	59,5%	43,5%	56,5%	43,5%	56,5%	▲	3,0	▼	▬	0,0	▬
Finland	54,1%	45,9%	45,5%	54,5%	45,5%	54,5%	▼	8,7	▲	▼	0,1	▲
France	46,4%	53,6%	35,0%	65,0%	33,5%	66,5%	▼	13,0	▲	▼	1,5	▲
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	35,8%	64,2%	NA	NA	25,7%	74,3%	▼	10,2	▲	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	31,9%	68,1%	33,8%	66,2%	34,3%	65,7%	▲	2,3	▼	▲	0,4	▼
Ireland	NAP	NAP	50,0%	50,0%	52,9%	47,1%	NAP	NAP	NAP	▲	2,9	▼
Italy	54,5%	45,5%	44,2%	55,8%	43,9%	56,1%	▼	10,6	▲	▼	0,3	▲
Latvia	24,6%	75,4%	23,0%	77,0%	22,6%	77,4%	▼	2,0	▲	▼	0,4	▲
Lithuania	60,8%	39,2%	54,2%	45,8%	55,6%	44,4%	▼	5,2	▲	▲	1,4	▼
Luxembourg	NA	NA	34,0%	66,0%	35,3%	64,7%	NA	NA	NA	▲	1,3	▼
Malta	100,0%	0,0%	77,8%	22,2%	87,5%	12,5%	▼	12,5	▲	▲	9,7	▼
Netherlands	59,0%	41,0%	45,9%	54,1%	44,8%	55,2%	▼	14,2	▲	▼	1,1	▲
Poland	44,5%	55,5%	47,2%	52,8%	47,9%	52,1%	▲	3,5	▼	▲	0,7	▼
Portugal	63,4%	36,6%	52,1%	47,9%	51,0%	49,0%	▼	12,4	▲	▼	1,2	▲
Romania	25,0%	75,0%	26,6%	73,4%	27,4%	72,6%	▲	2,4	▼	▲	0,8	▼
Slovak Republic	39,8%	60,2%	39,0%	61,0%	37,6%	62,4%	▼	2,2	▲	▼	1,4	▲
Slovenia	26,2%	73,8%	23,1%	76,9%	20,6%	79,4%	▼	5,6	▲	▼	2,5	▲
Spain	67,4%	32,6%	60,9%	39,1%	59,4%	40,6%	▼	8,0	▲	▼	1,6	▲
Sweden	46,9%	53,1%	39,6%	60,4%	39,9%	60,1%	▼	7,0	▲	▲	0,3	▼
Average	49,1%	50,9%	43,4%	56,6%	42,9%	57,1%		5,2			1,3	
Median	46,7%	53,3%	44,5%	55,5%	43,9%	56,1%		3,2			0,9	
Minimum	24,6%	0,0%	23,0%	22,2%	20,6%	12,5%		0,8			0,0	
Maximum	100,0%	75,4%	77,8%	77,0%	87,5%	79,4%		20,4			5,1	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27		27			27	
% of NA	11%	11%	7%	7%	4%	4%		11%			7%	
% of NAP	7%	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%		0%			0%	

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Bulgaria: For 2020, judges who administer judges in the appelate panels of regional and administrative courts are counted as second instance judges.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.1.8 Supreme Court professional judge: distribution of males and females in 2012, 2020 and 2021 (Q46)

States	Supreme Court professional judge: distribution of males and females											
	2012		2020		2021		Variation 2012-2021 in % points			Variation 2020-2021 in %points		
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	Male	% points	Female	Male	% points	Female
Austria	69,4%	30,6%	64,1%	35,9%	61,1%	38,9%	▼	8,3	▲	▼	3,1	▲
Belgium	80,0%	20,0%	70,0%	30,0%	71,4%	28,6%	▼	8,6	▲	▲	1,4	▼
Bulgaria	NA	NA	23,6%	76,4%	26,1%	73,9%	NA	NA	NA	▲	2,5	▼
Croatia	55,0%	45,0%	61,1%	38,9%	65,7%	34,3%	▲	10,7	▼	▲	4,6	▼
Cyprus	69,2%	30,8%	53,8%	46,2%	53,8%	46,2%	▼	15,4	▲	▬	0,0	▬
Czech Republic	60,7%	39,3%	75,2%	24,8%	76,4%	23,6%	▲	15,7	▼	▲	1,2	▼
Denmark	73,7%	26,3%	72,2%	27,8%	77,8%	22,2%	▲	4,1	▼	▲	5,6	▼
Estonia	89,5%	10,5%	78,9%	21,1%	73,7%	26,3%	▼	15,8	▲	▼	5,3	▲
Finland	62,8%	37,2%	64,4%	35,6%	58,3%	41,7%	▼	4,5	▲	▼	6,1	▲
France	59,3%	40,7%	48,9%	51,1%	48,3%	51,7%	▼	11,0	▲	▼	0,6	▲
Germany	NA	NA	65,9%	34,1%	65,9%	34,1%	NA	NA	NA	▬	0,0	▬
Greece	52,9%	47,1%	NA	NA	32,9%	67,1%	▼	20,0	▲	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	45,9%	54,1%	40,7%	59,3%	38,7%	61,3%	▼	7,2	▲	▼	2,0	▲
Ireland	87,5%	12,5%	66,7%	33,3%	62,5%	37,5%	▼	25,0	▲	▼	4,2	▲
Italy	77,3%	22,7%	67,6%	32,4%	66,9%	33,1%	▼	10,4	▲	▼	0,7	▲
Latvia	46,0%	54,0%	31,4%	68,6%	30,6%	69,4%	▼	15,4	▲	▼	0,9	▲
Lithuania	75,8%	24,2%	56,7%	43,3%	56,7%	43,3%	▼	19,1	▲	▬	0,0	▬
Luxembourg	NA	NA	60,0%	40,0%	40,0%	60,0%	NA	NA	NA	▼	20,0	▲
Malta	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	88,9%	11,1%	60,0%	40,0%	60,0%	40,0%	▼	28,9	▲	▬	0,0	▬
Poland	NA	NA	68,8%	31,2%	69,2%	30,8%	NA	NA	NA	▲	0,4	▼
Portugal	89,3%	10,7%	67,5%	32,5%	62,2%	37,8%	▼	27,1	▲	▼	5,3	▲
Romania	14,7%	85,3%	23,6%	76,4%	22,3%	77,7%	▲	7,6	▼	▼	1,3	▲
Slovak Republic	46,4%	53,6%	39,0%	61,0%	46,0%	54,0%	▼	0,4	▲	▲	7,1	▼
Slovenia	61,8%	38,2%	62,1%	37,9%	63,3%	36,7%	▲	1,6	▼	▲	1,3	▼
Spain	88,3%	11,7%	78,1%	21,9%	77,9%	22,1%	▼	10,4	▲	▼	0,1	▲
Sweden	60,6%	39,4%	59,4%	40,6%	58,1%	41,9%	▼	2,5	▲	▼	1,3	▲
Average	66,1%	33,9%	58,4%	41,6%	56,4%	43,6%		5,2			1,3	
Median	66,0%	34,0%	62,1%	37,9%	60,5%	39,5%		3,2			0,9	
Minimum	14,7%	10,5%	23,6%	21,1%	22,3%	22,1%		0,8			0,0	
Maximum	89,5%	85,3%	78,9%	76,4%	77,9%	77,7%		20,4			5,1	
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27		27			27	
% of NA	15%	15%	4%	4%	0%	0%		11%			7%	

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2013, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Table 7.2.1 Total number of non-judge staff (absolute number and per 100 000 inhabitants) and their distribution by category in 2021 (Q1, Q52)

States	Total number of non-judge staff in 2021		Distribution of non-judge staff by category in 2021				
	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Rechtspfleger or similar bodies	Staff Assisting the judge	Staff in charge of administrative tasks	Technical staff	Other non-judge staff
Austria	4 997	55,7	736	450	3 364	108	339
Belgium	5 097	44,1	NAP	1 966	2 410	722	0
Bulgaria	6 475	94,7	NAP	4 840	970	627	38
Croatia	6 027	155,7	586	4 241	542	658	NAP
Cyprus	496	54,8	NAP	147	154	149	46
Czech Republic	9 914	94,3	2 538	4 505	2 169	649	53
Denmark	1 799	30,6	338	10	1 353	89	9
Estonia	799	60,1	54	576	68	68	33
Finland	2 208	39,8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	22 115	32,7	NAP	18 311	2 391	816	597
Germany	54 117	65,0	8 594	27 963	6 812	2 384	8 364
Greece	4 774	44,7	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NAP
Hungary	8 638	89,2	990	881	NA	NA	6 767
Ireland	1 145	22,3	23	892	196	0	34
Italy	22 222	37,7	NAP	14 328	5 020	378	2 496
Latvia	1 615	86,1	NAP	1 007	491	102	15
Lithuania	2 646	94,3	NAP	1 432	868	263	83
Luxembourg	239	37,0	NAP	224	3	3	9
Malta	449	87,0	NAP	277	57	8	107
Netherlands	7 653	43,7	NAP	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	42 854	112,5	2 622	24 306	8 127	2 331	5 468
Portugal	5 732	55,4	NAP	5 307	109	307	9
Romania	11 144	58,5	NAP	6 665	1 701	1 723	1 055
Slovak Republic	4 361	80,2	1 104	2 029	1 228	NA	NA
Slovenia	3 455	164,0	469	1 119	1 680	187	NAP
Spain	49 137	103,6	4 486	NAP	NAP	NAP	44 651
Sweden	4 989	47,7	NAP	3 364	694	174	757
Average	10 559	70,0	1 878	5 428	1 837	559	3 378
Median	4 997	58,5	863	1 966	1 099	263	83
Minimum	239	22,3	23	10	3	0	0
Maximum	54 117	164,0	8 594	27 963	8 127	2 384	44 651
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	11%	15%	19%	11%
% of NAP	0%	0%	52%	4%	4%	4%	11%

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.2 Total number of non-judge staff (absolute number) from 2012 to 2021 and their variations (Q52)

States	Total number of non-judge staff										Variations	
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2012-2021	2020-2021
Austria	4 631	4 698	4 705	4 735	5 544	5 544	4 966	5 117	5 270	4 997	7,9%	-5,2%
Belgium	5 458	5 307	5 290	5 204	5 054	4 940	4 974	5 614	5 064	5 097	-6,6%	0,7%
Bulgaria	6 014	5 958	6 014	6 143	6 174	6 212	6 262	6 323	6 329	6 475	7,7%	2,3%
Croatia	6 234	6 222	6 061	5 929	5 827	5 900	5 828	5 929	5 886	6 027	-3,3%	2,4%
Cyprus	424	427	448	424	437	441	427	475	449	496	17,0%	10,5%
Czech Republic	9 135	9 107	9 309	9 409	9 714	9 887	9 857	9 989	9 921	9 914	8,5%	-0,1%
Denmark	1 823	1 751	1 754	1 529	1 642	1 634	1 656	1 775	1 816	1 799	-1,3%	-0,9%
Estonia	957	990	1 017	965	877	846	819	802	825	799	-16,5%	-3,2%
Finland	2 214	2 196	2 161	2 145	2 170	2 137	2 131	2 128	2 162	2 208	-0,3%	2,1%
France	21 758	21 946	22 360	22 326	22 712	22 714	22 844	23 396	24 062	22 115	1,6%	-8,1%
Germany	53 649	53 302	53 302	53 292	53 181	53 178	54 072	54 434	54 107	54 117	0,9%	0,0%
Greece	5 327	5 376	5 474	5 572	4 236	4 145	4 179	4 284	4 198	4 774	-10,4%	13,7%
Hungary	8 142	8 000	8 022	7 979	8 003	8 379	8 528	8 538	8 576	8 638	6,1%	0,7%
Ireland	945	927	927	942	975	1 023	1 049	1 080	1 089	1 145	21,2%	5,1%
Italy	23 672	22 991	21 903	21 360	21 182	20 664	22 401	21 808	21 193	22 222	-6,1%	4,9%
Latvia	1 608	1 594	1 578	1 519	1 582	1 536	1 715	1 678	1 666	1 615	0,4%	-3,1%
Lithuania	2 619	2 602	2 608	2 729	2 740	2 722	2 664	2 684	2 709	2 646	1,0%	-2,3%
Luxembourg	NA	198	196	197	200	200	220	225	223	239	NA	7,2%
Malta	360	451	389	393	383	394	413	412	396	449	24,7%	13,4%
Netherlands	6 252	7 287	7 422	7 265	7 317	7 523	7 492	7 699	7 435	7 653	22,4%	2,9%
Poland	40 844	-	41 534	-	43 176	46 807	40 662	41 927	41 973	42 854	4,9%	2,1%
Portugal	6 110	6 005	5 698	5 799	5 652	5 789	5 818	5 829	5 779	5 732	-6,2%	-0,8%
Romania	9 283	9 639	10 147	10 251	10 297	10 638	10 662	10 700	10 512	11 144	20,0%	6,0%
Slovak Republic	4 482	4 497	4 468	4 390	4 482	4 616	4 710	4 731	4 912	4 361	-2,7%	-11,2%
Slovenia	3 330	3 239	3 355	3 300	3 330	3 328	3 391	3 427	3 427	3 455	3,8%	0,8%
Spain	44 748	-	48 563	49 746	49 186	46 871	47 645	47 816	48 620	49 137	9,8%	1,1%
Sweden	5 173	4 716	4 797	4 800	4 859	5 088	5 208	4 921	4 996	4 989	-3,6%	-0,1%
Average	10 584	7 577	10 352	9 167	10 405	10 487	10 392	10 509	10 504	10 559	3,9%	1,5%
Median	5 392	4 716	5 290	5 002	5 054	5 088	4 974	5 117	5 064	4 997	1,3%	0,8%
Minimum	360	198	196	197	200	200	220	225	223	239	-16,5%	-11,2%
Maximum	53 649	53 302	53 302	53 292	53 181	53 178	54 072	54 434	54 107	54 117	24,7%	13,7%
Nb of values	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018.

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.2a Total number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q52)

States	Total number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	54,8	55,4	54,8	54,4	63,4	63,0	56,3	57,5	59,0	55,7
Belgium	48,9	47,6	47,2	46,2	44,6	43,4	43,5	49,1	44,0	44,1
Bulgaria	82,6	82,2	83,5	85,9	86,9	88,1	89,5	91,0	91,5	94,7
Croatia	146,3	146,5	143,4	141,5	140,3	143,7	143,0	146,1	145,8	155,7
Cyprus	49,0	49,8	52,2	50,0	51,5	51,6	48,7	53,5	50,1	54,8
Czech Republic	86,9	86,6	88,4	89,2	91,8	93,4	92,6	93,6	92,7	94,3
Denmark	32,5	31,1	31,0	26,8	28,6	28,3	28,5	30,5	31,1	30,6
Estonia	74,4	75,2	77,4	73,3	66,7	64,3	62,1	60,5	62,1	60,1
Finland	40,8	40,3	39,5	39,1	39,4	38,8	38,6	38,5	39,1	39,8
France	33,2	33,3	33,7	33,5	33,9	33,8	34,1	34,9	35,7	32,7
Germany	66,9	66,0	66,0	65,2	64,7	64,3	65,1	65,5	65,1	65,0
Greece	48,2	48,6	50,5	51,3	39,3	38,5	38,9	39,9	39,2	44,7
Hungary	82,2	81,0	81,4	81,2	81,7	84,8	88,9	87,4	86,7	89,2
Ireland	20,6	20,1	20,0	20,2	20,9	21,3	21,6	21,9	21,9	22,3
Italy	39,7	38,5	36,0	35,2	35,0	34,2	37,1	36,2	35,8	37,7
Latvia	78,6	78,8	78,8	77,1	80,3	78,8	89,3	88,0	88,0	86,1
Lithuania	87,2	88,4	89,3	94,5	96,2	96,9	95,3	96,1	96,9	94,3
Luxembourg	NA	36,0	34,8	35,0	33,9	33,2	35,8	35,9	35,1	37,0
Malta	85,2	105,0	88,5	87,3	83,2	82,8	86,8	83,5	77,0	87,0
Netherlands	37,3	43,3	43,9	42,8	42,8	43,8	43,4	44,2	42,5	43,7
Poland	106,0	-	107,9	-	112,3	121,8	105,9	109,2	109,8	112,5
Portugal	58,3	57,6	54,9	56,1	54,8	56,3	56,6	56,6	56,1	55,4
Romania	43,6	48,3	45,5	51,9	52,4	54,5	54,9	55,1	54,8	58,5
Slovak Republic	82,8	83,0	82,4	80,9	82,5	84,8	86,4	86,7	90,0	80,2
Slovenia	161,7	157,2	162,8	159,9	161,2	161,0	163,0	163,5	162,5	164,0
Spain	97,3	-	104,6	107,1	105,7	100,4	101,4	100,8	102,7	103,6
Sweden	54,1	48,9	49,2	48,7	48,6	50,3	50,9	47,6	48,1	47,7
Average	69,2	66,0	68,4	66,7	68,2	68,7	68,8	69,4	69,0	70,0
Median	62,6	55,4	54,9	55,2	63,4	63,0	56,6	57,5	59,0	58,5
Minimum	20,6	20,1	20,0	20,2	20,9	21,3	21,6	21,9	21,9	22,3
Maximum	161,7	157,2	162,8	159,9	161,2	161,0	163,0	163,5	162,5	164,0
Nb of values	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018.

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.3 Number of non-judge staff by instance in 2021 (Q52-1)

States	Distribution of non-judge staff by instance					
	Absolute number			As percentage of the total		
	First instance	Second instance	Supreme court	First instance	Second instance	Supreme court
Austria	4 347	486	164	87,0%	9,7%	3,3%
Belgium	4 306	591	201	84,5%	11,6%	3,9%
Bulgaria	4 176	1 875	424	64,5%	29,0%	6,5%
Croatia	5 016	927	84	83,2%	15,4%	1,4%
Cyprus	413	NAP	83	83,3%	NAP	16,7%
Czech Republic	6 586	2 916	412	66,4%	29,4%	4,2%
Denmark	1 566	202	31	87,0%	11,2%	1,7%
Estonia	635	84	80	79,5%	10,5%	10,0%
Finland	1 822	237	149	82,5%	10,7%	6,7%
France	17 929	2 483	296	86,6%	12,0%	1,4%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	3 399	612	763	71,2%	12,8%	16,0%
Hungary	4 293	4 091	254	49,7%	47,4%	2,9%
Ireland	1 117	14	14	97,6%	1,2%	1,2%
Italy	18 180	3 147	895	81,8%	14,2%	4,0%
Latvia	1 205	292	118	74,6%	18,1%	7,3%
Lithuania	1 864	690	92	70,4%	26,1%	3,5%
Luxembourg	209	28	2	87,4%	11,7%	0,8%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	6 409	986	258	83,7%	12,9%	3,4%
Poland	NA	NA	692	NA	NA	1,6%
Portugal	5 381	206	101	94,6%	3,6%	1,8%
Romania	4 815	5 891	438	43,2%	52,9%	3,9%
Slovak Republic	3 433	716	212	78,7%	16,4%	4,9%
Slovenia	3 041	280	134	88,0%	8,1%	3,9%
Spain	44 244	4 413	480	90,0%	9,0%	1,0%
Sweden	3 940	909	140	79,0%	18,2%	2,8%
Average	6 180	1 395	261	78,9%	17,0%	4,6%
Median	4 058	690	164	82,9%	12,8%	3,5%
Minimum	209	14	2	43,2%	1,2%	0,8%
Maximum	44 244	5 891	895	97,6%	52,9%	16,7%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	11%	11%	7%	11%	11%	7%
% of NAP	0%	4%	0%	0%	4%	0%

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.4 Non-judge staff: distribution of males and females by instance in 2021 (Q52-1)

States	Distribution of male and female non-judge staff by instance							
	Total		First instance		Second instance		Supreme Court	
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female
Austria	28,1%	71,9%	27,6%	72,4%	33,5%	66,5%	26,8%	73,2%
Belgium	24,9%	75,1%	25,2%	74,8%	23,4%	76,6%	23,4%	76,6%
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	13,7%	86,3%	13,2%	86,8%	15,7%	84,3%	22,6%	77,4%
Cyprus	35,3%	64,7%	36,8%	63,2%	NAP	NAP	27,7%	72,3%
Czech Republic	12,8%	87,2%	10,7%	89,3%	14,3%	85,7%	35,2%	64,8%
Denmark	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	14,0%	86,0%	11,2%	88,8%	14,3%	85,7%	36,3%	63,8%
Finland	23,6%	76,4%	23,2%	76,8%	25,3%	74,7%	25,5%	74,5%
France	17,1%	82,9%	16,1%	83,9%	23,0%	77,0%	29,1%	70,9%
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	27,2%	72,8%	25,6%	74,4%	27,5%	72,5%	34,1%	65,9%
Hungary	16,0%	84,0%	11,1%	88,9%	20,5%	79,5%	26,0%	74,0%
Ireland	39,9%	60,1%	39,7%	60,3%	64,3%	35,7%	35,7%	64,3%
Italy	32,7%	67,3%	32,9%	67,1%	32,0%	68,0%	30,6%	69,4%
Latvia	6,7%	93,3%	5,5%	94,5%	7,9%	92,1%	16,1%	83,9%
Lithuania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Luxembourg	36,4%	63,6%	36,8%	63,2%	32,1%	67,9%	50,0%	50,0%
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Poland	15,8%	84,2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	32,5%	67,5%
Portugal	33,1%	66,9%	33,0%	67,0%	41,3%	58,7%	23,8%	76,2%
Romania	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	16,6%	83,4%	13,5%	86,5%	27,8%	72,2%	30,2%	69,8%
Slovenia	12,4%	87,6%	11,1%	88,9%	19,6%	80,4%	25,4%	74,6%
Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	24,8%	75,2%	25,0%	75,0%	24,2%	75,8%	22,1%	77,9%
Average	22,7%	77,3%	22,1%	77,9%	26,3%	73,7%	29,1%	70,9%
Median	23,6%	76,4%	24,1%	75,9%	24,2%	75,8%	27,7%	72,3%
Minimum	6,7%	60,1%	5,5%	60,3%	7,9%	35,7%	16,1%	50,0%
Maximum	39,9%	93,3%	39,7%	94,5%	64,3%	92,1%	50,0%	83,9%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	30%	30%	33%	33%	33%	33%	30%	30%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Czech Republic: The country has a four-tier system and since 2013 have included the number of judges of the high courts in the number of the second instance judges.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Romania: Since there are 4 level of courts in Romania, judges of 2nd instance are the sum up of the judges from tribunal and of court of appeals. The variation between first instance and second instance courts is the result of different methods of calculation. In 2103, in first instance judges from 1st instance courts and from tribunals were summed up together.

Poland: Starting from 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.5 Number of professional judges and number of non-judge staff per 100 000 inhabitants, from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q46, Q52)

States	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021	
	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff	Professional judges	Non-judge staff
Austria	18,3	54,8	18,4	55,4	18,9	54,8	18,6	54,4	27,4	63,4	28,2	63,0	27,3	56,3	29,5	57,5	29,0	59,0	26,6	55,7
Belgium	14,3	48,9	14,4	47,6	14,3	47,2	14,3	46,2	14,1	44,6	13,8	43,4	13,3	43,5	13,3	49,1	13,2	44,0	14,4	44,1
Bulgaria	30,7	82,6	30,2	82,2	30,8	83,5	31,1	85,9	31,8	86,9	31,7	88,1	31,8	89,5	31,9	91,0	31,6	91,5	32,1	94,7
Croatia	45,3	146,3	45,0	146,5	44,4	143,4	44,5	141,5	43,3	140,3	43,2	143,7	40,7	143,0	41,4	146,1	40,7	145,8	42,4	155,7
Cyprus	11,9	49,0	11,8	49,8	11,3	52,2	13,3	50,0	13,1	51,5	13,9	51,6	13,5	48,7	13,0	53,5	14,1	50,1	14,3	54,8
Czech Republic	29,1	86,9	29,1	86,6	28,8	88,4	28,6	89,2	28,4	91,8	28,4	93,4	28,4	92,6	28,2	93,6	28,1	92,7	28,4	94,3
Denmark	6,6	32,5	6,3	31,1	6,7	31,0	6,6	26,8	6,5	28,6	6,5	28,3	6,5	28,5	6,4	30,5	6,6	31,1	6,6	30,6
Estonia	17,7	74,4	17,2	75,2	17,6	77,4	17,8	73,3	17,6	66,7	17,3	64,3	17,7	62,1	17,3	60,5	17,6	62,1	17,7	60,1
Finland	18,1	40,8	18,1	40,3	18,1	39,5	18,1	39,1	19,4	39,4	19,0	38,8	19,6	38,6	19,7	38,5	19,5	39,1	20,9	39,8
France	10,7	33,2	10,7	33,3	10,5	33,7	10,5	33,5	10,4	33,9	10,5	33,8	10,9	34,1	11,1	34,9	11,2	35,7	11,2	32,7
Germany	24,7	66,9	23,9	66,0	23,9	66,0	23,6	65,2	24,2	64,7	24,3	64,3	24,5	65,1	24,7	65,5	25,0	65,1	25,2	65,0
Greece	23,3	48,2	35,0	48,6	20,6	50,5	20,3	51,3	25,8	39,3	26,6	38,5	26,8	38,9	26,9	39,9	36,0	39,2	37,6	44,7
Hungary	27,9	82,2	28,4	81,0	28,5	81,4	28,6	81,2	28,7	81,7	28,6	84,8	30,2	88,9	29,5	87,4	28,2	86,7	28,0	89,2
Ireland	3,1	20,6	3,2	20,1	3,5	20,0	3,4	20,2	3,5	20,9	3,3	21,3	3,3	21,6	3,4	21,9	3,3	21,9	3,3	22,3
Italy	10,6	39,7	11,0	38,5	11,4	36,0	10,9	35,2	10,6	35,0	10,8	34,2	11,6	37,1	11,8	36,2	11,9	35,8	12,1	37,7
Latvia	21,5	78,6	23,8	78,8	24,4	78,8	25,0	77,1	25,5	80,3	25,1	78,8	29,1	89,3	27,3	88,0	29,1	88,0	29,1	86,1
Lithuania	25,6	87,2	26,2	88,4	25,8	89,3	26,4	94,5	27,3	96,2	27,3	96,9	27,1	95,3	26,8	96,1	26,5	96,9	25,6	94,3
Luxembourg	34,1	NA	32,7	36,0	32,7	34,8	32,5	35,0	31,7	33,9	32,9	33,2	36,2	35,8	36,1	35,9	36,1	35,1	35,6	37,0
Malta	9,5	85,2	9,8	105,0	9,3	88,5	9,3	87,3	9,8	83,2	9,0	82,8	9,5	86,8	8,7	83,5	8,2	77,0	9,1	87,0
Netherlands	14,4	37,3	14,1	43,3	14,0	43,9	13,9	42,8	13,6	42,8	14,8	43,8	14,6	43,4	14,5	44,2	14,9	42,5	15,1	43,7
Poland	26,2	106,0	-	-	26,2	107,9	-	-	26,0	112,3	26,1	121,8	25,5	105,9	25,3	109,2	25,2	109,8	25,8	112,5
Portugal	19,2	58,3	19,4	57,6	19,2	54,9	19,2	56,1	19,3	54,8	20,0	56,3	19,3	56,6	19,4	56,6	19,4	56,1	19,5	55,4
Romania	20,2	43,6	22,6	48,3	20,5	45,5	23,3	51,9	23,6	52,4	23,9	54,5	24,1	54,9	24,5	55,1	24,0	54,8	24,1	58,5
Slovak Republic	24,2	82,8	24,8	83,0	24,4	82,4	23,8	80,9	24,1	82,5	25,3	84,8	25,3	86,4	25,1	86,7	23,9	90,0	25,5	80,2
Slovenia	47,1	161,7	46,1	157,2	44,8	162,8	43,5	159,9	42,6	161,2	41,6	161,0	41,7	163,0	41,7	163,5	41,5	162,5	40,8	164,0
Spain	11,2	97,3	-	-	11,5	104,6	11,6	107,1	11,5	105,7	11,5	100,4	11,5	101,4	11,3	100,8	11,2	102,7	11,4	103,6
Sweden	11,8	54,1	11,7	48,9	11,8	49,2	11,8	48,7	11,8	48,6	11,8	50,3	11,9	50,9	11,5	47,6	11,6	48,1	11,9	47,7
Average	20,6	69,2	21,4	66,0	20,5	66,0	20,4	66,7	21,2	68,2	21,3	68,7	21,5	68,8	21,5	69,4	21,8	69,0	22,0	70,0
Median	19,2	62,6	19,4	55,4	19,2	55,4	18,9	55,2	23,6	63,4	23,9	63,0	24,1	56,6	24,5	57,5	23,9	59,0	24,1	58,5
Minimum	3,1	20,6	3,2	20,1	3,5	20,1	3,4	20,2	3,5	20,9	3,3	21,3	3,3	21,6	3,4	21,9	3,3	21,9	3,3	22,3
Maximum	47,1	161,7	46,1	157,2	44,8	157,2	44,5	159,9	43,3	161,2	43,2	161,0	41,7	163,0	41,7	163,5	41,5	162,5	42,4	164,0
Nb of values	27	27	25	25	27	27	26	26	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018.

Poland: In 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.2.6 Ratio between non-judge staff and judges from 2012 to 2021 (Q46, Q52)

States	Ratio between non-judge staff and judges									
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	3,0	3,0	2,9	2,9	2,3	2,2	2,1	1,9	2,0	2,1
Belgium	3,4	3,3	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,7	3,3	3,1
Bulgaria	2,7	2,7	2,7	2,8	2,7	2,8	2,8	2,9	2,9	3,0
Croatia	3,2	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,5	3,5	3,6	3,7
Cyprus	4,1	4,2	4,6	3,8	3,9	3,7	3,6	4,1	3,6	3,8
Czech Republic	3,0	3,0	3,1	3,1	3,2	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,3
Denmark	4,9	4,9	4,7	4,1	4,4	4,3	4,4	4,7	4,7	4,6
Estonia	4,2	4,4	4,4	4,1	3,8	3,7	3,5	3,5	3,5	3,4
Finland	2,3	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	1,9
France	3,1	3,1	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,1	3,2	3,2	2,9
Germany	2,7	2,8	2,8	2,8	2,7	2,6	2,7	2,6	2,6	2,6
Greece	2,1	1,4	2,5	2,5	1,5	1,4	1,5	1,5	1,1	1,2
Hungary	2,9	2,9	2,9	2,8	2,8	3,0	2,9	3,0	3,1	3,2
Ireland	6,6	6,3	5,8	5,9	6,0	6,4	6,6	6,5	6,7	6,7
Italy	3,7	3,5	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,1	3,0	3,1
Latvia	3,7	3,3	3,2	3,1	3,1	3,1	3,1	3,2	3,0	3,0
Lithuania	3,4	3,4	3,5	3,6	3,5	3,5	3,5	3,6	3,7	3,7
Luxembourg	NA	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0
Malta	9,0	10,7	9,5	9,4	8,5	9,2	9,2	9,6	9,4	9,6
Netherlands	2,6	3,1	3,1	3,1	3,1	3,0	3,0	3,1	2,9	2,9
Poland	4,0	-	4,1	-	4,3	4,7	4,2	4,3	4,3	4,4
Portugal	3,0	3,0	2,9	2,9	2,8	2,8	2,9	2,9	2,9	2,8
Romania	2,2	2,1	2,2	2,2	2,2	2,3	2,3	2,3	2,3	2,4
Slovak Republic	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,4	3,5	3,8	3,1
Slovenia	3,4	3,4	3,6	3,7	3,8	3,9	3,9	3,9	3,9	4,0
Spain	8,7	-	9,1	9,3	9,2	8,7	8,8	9,0	9,1	9,1
Sweden	4,6	4,2	4,2	4,1	4,1	4,2	4,3	4,2	4,2	4,0
Average	3,8	3,5	3,7	3,7	3,7	3,6	3,6	3,7	3,7	3,7
Median	3,4	3,3	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,2	3,3	3,3	3,3	3,1
Minimum	2,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,1	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,0
Maximum	9,0	10,7	9,5	9,4	9,5	9,2	9,2	9,6	9,4	9,6
Nb of values	27	25	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

France: There is no differenciation between non-judge staff attached to judges and prosecutors, except for the subcategory "Other".

Italy: Administrative justice is taken into account since 2018.

Poland: In 2020, data includes also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Public prosecutors and non-prosecutor staff

Table 7.3.1 Total number of prosecutors (absolute number and per 100 000 inhabitants) and their distribution by instance in 2021 (Q1, Q55)

States	Total number of prosecutors		Distribution of prosecutors by instance					
			Absolute number			As percentage of the total		
	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	First instance	Second instance	Supreme court	First instance	Second instance	Supreme court
Austria	395	4,4		26	16	0,0%	6,6%	4,1%
Belgium	919	7,9	735	169	15	80,0%	18,4%	1,6%
Bulgaria	1 527	22,3	904	507	116	59,2%	33,2%	7,6%
Croatia	615	15,9	434	159	22	70,6%	25,9%	3,6%
Cyprus	146	16,1	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	1 233	11,7	834	343	56	67,6%	27,8%	4,5%
Denmark	764	13,0	594	170	6	77,7%	22,3%	0,8%
Estonia	177	13,3	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	424	7,6	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	2 143	3,2	1 596	490	57	74,5%	22,9%	2,7%
Germany	6 320	7,6	5 668	509	143	89,7%	8,1%	2,3%
Greece	611	5,7	388	196	27	63,5%	32,1%	4,4%
Hungary	1 873	19,3	1 730	29	112	92,4%	1,5%	6,0%
Ireland	123	2,4	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	2 231	3,8	1 924	241	66	86,2%	10,8%	3,0%
Latvia	449	23,9	295	90	64	65,7%	20,0%	14,3%
Lithuania	622	22,2	556	NAP	66	89,4%	NAP	10,6%
Luxembourg	63	9,8	48	NAP	15	76,2%	NAP	23,8%
Malta	37	7,2	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	976	5,6	873	103	NAP	89,4%	10,6%	NAP
Poland	5 898	15,5	3 775	1 631	90	64,0%	27,7%	1,5%
Portugal	1 480	14,3	1 389	75	16	93,9%	5,1%	1,1%
Romania	2 370	12,4	1 153	707	510	48,6%	29,8%	21,5%
Slovak Republic	976	18,0	651	206	119	66,7%	21,1%	12,2%
Slovenia	201	9,5	144	45	12	71,6%	22,4%	6,0%
Spain	2 631	5,5	NAP	NAP	32	NAP	NAP	1,2%
Sweden	1 133	10,8	NA	NA	12	NA	NA	1,1%
Average	1346	11,4	1247	316	75	71,3%	19,2%	6,4%
Median	919	10,8	834	183	56	73,1%	21,7%	4,1%
Minimum	37	2,4	48	26	6	0,0%	1,5%	0,8%
Maximum	6320	23,9	5668	1631	510	93,9%	33,2%	23,8%
Nb of values	27	27	25	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	4%	0%	4%	4%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	24%	30%	22%	22%	30%	22%

Table 7.3.2 Public prosecutors: distribution of males and females by instance in 2021 (Q55)

States	Total		First instance		Second instance		Supreme Court	
	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female	% Male	% Female
Austria	47,8%	52,2%	46,2%	53,8%	57,7%	42,3%	68,8%	31,3%
Belgium	40,4%	59,6%	35,9%	64,1%	56,2%	43,8%	80,0%	20,0%
Bulgaria	48,3%	51,7%	43,5%	56,5%	57,6%	42,4%	45,7%	54,3%
Croatia	30,7%	69,3%	28,6%	71,4%	37,1%	62,9%	27,3%	72,7%
Cyprus	20,5%	79,5%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	46,1%	53,9%	41,6%	58,4%	53,4%	46,6%	69,6%	30,4%
Denmark	33,1%	67,0%	31,0%	69,0%	40,6%	59,4%	33,3%	66,7%
Estonia	28,2%	71,8%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	37,3%	62,7%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	41,2%	58,8%	37,8%	62,3%	50,8%	49,0%	52,6%	47,4%
Germany	49,6%	50,4%	48,3%	51,7%	61,3%	38,7%	60,8%	39,2%
Greece	38,1%	61,9%	34,5%	65,5%	42,3%	57,7%	59,3%	40,7%
Hungary	39,6%	60,4%	38,4%	61,6%	55,2%	44,8%	52,7%	47,3%
Ireland	37,4%	62,6%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	52,5%	47,5%	50,9%	49,1%	62,2%	37,8%	63,6%	36,4%
Latvia	41,0%	59,0%	36,6%	63,4%	47,8%	52,2%	51,6%	48,4%
Lithuania	49,5%	50,5%	48,0%	52,0%	NAP	NAP	62,1%	37,9%
Luxembourg	52,4%	47,6%	56,3%	43,8%	NAP	NAP	40,0%	60,0%
Malta	56,8%	43,2%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	39,8%	60,2%	38,8%	61,2%	47,6%	52,4%	NAP	NAP
Poland	47,6%	52,4%	42,8%	57,2%	54,2%	45,8%	67,8%	32,2%
Portugal	34,3%	65,7%	32,1%	67,9%	70,7%	29,3%	50,0%	50,0%
Romania	48,4%	51,6%	48,0%	52,0%	46,1%	53,9%	52,5%	47,5%
Slovak Republic	47,1%	52,9%	46,5%	53,5%	51,9%	48,1%	58,0%	42,0%
Slovenia	30,8%	69,2%	27,8%	72,2%	35,6%	64,4%	50,0%	50,0%
Spain	34,2%	65,8%	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	65,6%	34,4%
Sweden	30,0%	70,0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	33,3%	66,7%
Average	40,8%	59,2%	40,7%	59,3%	51,6%	48,4%	54,5%	45,5%
Median	40,4%	59,6%	40,2%	59,8%	52,6%	47,4%	52,7%	47,3%
Minimum	20,5%	43,2%	27,8%	43,8%	35,6%	29,3%	27,3%	20,0%
Maximum	56,8%	79,5%	56,3%	72,2%	70,7%	64,4%	80,0%	72,7%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	22%	22%	30%	30%	22%	22%

Table 7.4.1 Total number of non-prosecutor staff and the distribution of males and females in 2021 (Q1, Q60)

States	Total number of staff (non-public prosecutors)		% Male	% Female
	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants		
Austria	369	4,1	20,9%	79,1%
Belgium	2 711	23,4	30,4%	69,6%
Bulgaria	2 887	42,2	NA	NA
Croatia	1 137	29,4	13,6%	86,4%
Cyprus	146	16,1	20,5%	79,5%
Czech Republic	1 454	13,8	16,7%	83,3%
Denmark	747	12,7	26,2%	73,8%
Estonia	102	7,7	29,4%	70,6%
Finland	169	3,0	8,3%	91,7%
France	359	0,5	25,9%	74,1%
Germany	12 197	14,7	25,0%	75,0%
Greece	1 508	14,1	27,1%	72,9%
Hungary	2 411	24,9	19,9%	80,1%
Ireland	103	2,0	NA	NA
Italy	8 958	15,2	34,6%	65,4%
Latvia	357	19,0	28,9%	71,1%
Lithuania	476	17,0	19,3%	80,7%
Luxembourg	172	26,7	51,7%	48,3%
Malta	21	4,1	52,4%	47,6%
Netherlands	4 412	25,2	32,4%	67,6%
Poland	9 063	23,8	20,1%	79,9%
Portugal	1 674	16,2	33,9%	66,1%
Romania	2 413	12,7	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	900	16,6	28,0%	72,0%
Slovenia	302	14,3	17,5%	82,5%
Spain	2 312	4,9	NA	NA
Sweden	580	5,5	20,0%	80,0%
Average	2146	15,2	26,2%	73,8%
Median	900	14,7	25,9%	74,1%
Minimum	21	0,5	8,3%	47,6%
Maximum	12197	42,2	52,4%	91,7%
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	15%	15%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 7.4.2 Total number of public prosecutors and non-prosecutor staff and their ratio 2020 and 2021 (Q55, Q60)

States	Prosecutors		Non-prosecutor staff		Number of non-prosecutor staff per public prosecutor	
	2020	2021	2020	2021	2020	2021
Austria	398	395	364	369	0,9	0,9
Belgium	876	919	2 424	2 711	2,8	2,9
Bulgaria	1 520	1 527	3 021	2 887	2,0	1,9
Croatia	622	615	1 058	1 137	1,7	1,8
Cyprus	137	146	73	146	0,5	1,0
Czech Republic	1 224	1 233	1 474	1 454	1,2	1,2
Denmark	NA	764	1 670	747	NA	1,0
Estonia	169	177	89	102	0,5	0,6
Finland	390	424	139	169	0,4	0,4
France	2 151	2 143	NA	359	NA	0,2
Germany	6 197	6 320	12 204	12 197	2,0	1,9
Greece	595	611	1 631	1 508	2,7	2,5
Hungary	1 876	1 873	2 425	2 411	1,3	1,3
Ireland	128	123	90	103	0,7	0,8
Italy	2 269	2 231	7 858	8 958	3,5	4,0
Latvia	461	449	397	357	0,9	0,8
Lithuania	644	622	585	476	0,9	0,8
Luxembourg	62	63	150	172	2,4	2,7
Malta	38	37	21	21	0,6	0,6
Netherlands	945	976	3 998	4 412	4,2	4,5
Poland	5 843	5 898	9 073	9 063	1,6	1,5
Portugal	1 416	1 480	1 657	1 674	1,2	1,1
Romania	2 446	2 370	2 408	2 413	1,0	1,0
Slovak Republic	922	976	977	900	1,1	0,9
Slovenia	206	201	321	302	1,6	1,5
Spain	2 544	2 631	2 280	2 312	0,9	0,9
Sweden	1 044	1 133	522	580	0,5	0,5
Average	1351	1346	2189	2146	1,47	1,46
Median	899	919	1266	900	1,17	1,02
Minimum	38	37	21	21	0,36	0,17
Maximum	6197	6320	12204	12197	4,23	4,52
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	0%	4%	0%	7%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Salaries of judges and public prosecutors

Table 7.5.1 Annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors in 2021 (Q4 and Q132)

States	National average gross annual salary in €	Professional Judges				Public Prosecutors (PP)			
		At the beginning of career (Gross in €)	At the beginning of career (Net in €)	Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (Gross in €)	Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (Net in €)	At the beginning of career (Gross in €)	At the beginning of career (Net in €)	PP of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (Gross in €)	PP of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (Net in €)
Austria	36 283 €	57 460 €	NA	139 581 €	NA	60 955 €	NA	139 581 €	NA
Belgium	44 023 €	73 069 €	41 432 €	133 608 €	65 167 €	73 069 €	41 432 €	136 054 €	66 188 €
Bulgaria	9 514 €	27 867 €	25 080 €	48 222 €	43 400 €	27 867 €	25 080 €	48 222 €	43 400 €
Croatia	15 309 €	29 020 €	19 244 €	57 318 €	36 539 €	29 020 €	19 244 €	57 318 €	36 539 €
Cyprus	25 116 €	77 916 €	56 069 €	138 494 €	105 500 €	35 010 €	NA	NAP	NAP
Czech Republic	18 296 €	42 485 €	NA	96 492 €	NA	38 564 €	NA	79 813 €	NA
Denmark	42 403 €	118 377 €	NA	221 226 €	NA	49 058 €	NA	89 407 €	NA
Estonia	18 576 €	56 952 €	43 929 €	74 484 €	57 444 €	52 140 €	40 212 €	59 592 €	45 960 €
Finland	47 516 €	68 900 €	NA	141 720 €	NA	50 880 €	NA	NAP	NAP
France	37 742 €	46 149 €	37 716 €	123 213 €	101 922 €	46 738 €	38 502 €	123 213 €	101 922 €
Germany	54 163 €	53 568 €	41 258 €	91 574 €	62 105 €	53 568 €	41 258 €	91 574 €	62 105 €
Greece	NA	31 710 €	22 795 €	87 247 €	49 749 €	31 710 €	22 795 €	87 247 €	49 749 €
Hungary	14 906 €	23 942 €	15 922 €	63 886 €	42 484 €	24 156 €	16 063 €	50 796 €	33 779 €
Ireland	44 912 €	130 197 €	NA	208 145 €	NA	33 370 €	NA	NAP	NAP
Italy	31 484 €	57 500 €	35 537 €	194 005 €	105 248 €	57 500 €	35 537 €	194 005 €	105 248 €
Latvia	15 324 €	35 808 €	25 164 €	57 302 €	39 909 €	35 064 €	24 654 €	43 479 €	30 427 €
Lithuania	19 084 €	36 473 €	22 066 €	49 960 €	30 225 €	29 523 €	17 861 €	48 996 €	29 642 €
Luxembourg	67 574 €	92 591 €	NA	110 865 €	NA	92 591 €	NA	110 865 €	NA
Malta	19 755 €	96 176 €	69 531 €	104 336 €	77 306 €	44 496 €	33 571 €	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	64 300 €	85 440 €	53 827 €	155 799 €	NA	84 351 €	54 686 €	NA	NA
Poland	15 397 €	25 796 €	21 312 €	71 941 €	52 540 €	25 796 €	21 312 €	71 941 €	52 540 €
Portugal	18 729 €	48 378 €	NA	106 183 €	NA	48 378 €	NA	106 183 €	NA
Romania	14 093 €	42 550 €	24 892 €	86 160 €	50 403 €	42 550 €	24 892 €	66 007 €	38 613 €
Slovak Republic	14 532 €	42 828 €	NA	61 862 €	NA	40 448 €	29 178 €	60 162 €	45 290 €
Slovenia	23 635 €	32 628 €	20 568 €	63 660 €	36 984 €	32 628 €	20 568 €	63 660 €	36 984 €
Spain	24 271 €	52 534 €	38 350 €	131 830 €	84 371 €	52 534 €	38 350 €	131 830 €	84 371 €
Sweden	43 384 €	79 387 €	50 808 €	136 945 €	75 320 €	56 000 €	NA	89 800 €	NA
Average	30 012 €	57 989 €	35 026 €	109 484 €	62 034 €	46 221 €	30 289 €	88 625 €	53 922 €
Median	23 953 €	52 534 €	35 537 €	104 336 €	54 992 €	44 496 €	27 129 €	83 530 €	45 625 €
Minimum	9 514 €	23 942 €	15 922 €	48 222 €	30 225 €	24 156 €	16 063 €	43 479 €	29 642 €
Maximum	67 574 €	130 197 €	69 531 €	221 226 €	105 500 €	92 591 €	54 686 €	194 005 €	105 248 €
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	0%	30%	0%	33%	0%	33%	4%	26%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15%	15%

Table 7.5.2 Ratio of annual salaries of judges and public prosecutors with annual gross salary in the country in 2021 (Q4 and Q132)

States	Professional Judges		Public Prosecutors	
	At the beginning of career	Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court	At the beginning of career	Public prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court
Austria	1,6	3,8	1,7	3,8
Belgium	1,7	3,0	1,7	3,1
Bulgaria	2,9	5,1	2,9	5,1
Croatia	1,9	3,7	1,9	3,7
Cyprus	3,1	5,5	1,4	NAP
Czech Republic	2,3	5,3	2,1	4,4
Denmark	2,8	5,2	1,2	2,1
Estonia	3,1	4,0	2,8	3,2
Finland	1,5	3,0	1,1	NAP
France	1,2	3,3	1,2	3,3
Germany	1,0	1,7	1,0	1,7
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	1,6	4,3	1,6	3,4
Ireland	2,9	4,6	0,7	NAP
Italy	1,8	6,2	1,8	6,2
Latvia	2,3	3,7	2,3	2,8
Lithuania	1,9	2,6	1,5	2,6
Luxembourg	1,4	1,6	1,4	1,6
Malta	4,9	5,3	2,3	NAP
Netherlands	1,3	2,4	1,3	NA
Poland	1,7	4,7	1,7	4,7
Portugal	2,6	5,7	2,6	5,7
Romania	3,0	6,1	3,0	4,7
Slovak Republic	2,9	4,3	2,8	4,1
Slovenia	1,4	2,7	1,4	2,7
Spain	2,2	5,4	2,2	5,4
Sweden	1,8	3,2	1,3	2,1
Average	2,2	4,1	1,8	3,6
Median	1,9	4,1	1,7	3,4
Minimum	1,0	1,6	0,7	1,6
Maximum	4,9	6,2	3,0	6,2
Nb of values	27	27	27	27
% of NA	4%	4%	4%	7%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	15%

Table 7.5.3: Existence of additional benefits for judges and public prosecutors in 2021 (Q133)

States	Judges				Public Prosecutors			
	Reduced taxation	Special pension	Housing	Other financial benefits	Reduced taxation	Special pension	Housing	Other financial benefits
Austria								
Belgium								
Bulgaria								
Croatia								
Cyprus								
Czech Republic								
Denmark								
Estonia								
Finland								
France								
Germany								
Greece								
Hungary								
Ireland								
Italy								
Latvia								
Lithuania								
Luxembourg								
Malta								
Netherlands								
Poland								
Portugal								
Romania								
Slovak Republic								
Slovenia								
Spain								
Sweden								
Yes	0	8	6	14	0	8	6	13
No	27	19	21	13	27	19	21	14

Disciplinary proceedings against judges and prosecutors

Table 7.5.4 (2021) Number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges and prosecutors in 2021 (Q144)

States	Type of disciplinary proceedings in 2021									
	Against Professional judges					Against Prosecutors				
	Total number	For breach of professional ethics	For professional inadequacy	For criminal offence	For other	Total number	For breach of professional ethics	For professional inadequacy	For criminal offence	For other
Austria	5	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Belgium	2	1	0	1	NAP	1	0	1	0	NAP
Bulgaria	3	2	1	NAP	NAP	11	5	6	NAP	NAP
Croatia	23	0	22	0	1	4	4	0	0	0
Cyprus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Czech Republic	20	3	16	0	1	5	1	3	0	1
Denmark	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	3	1	2
Estonia	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	16	6	6	4	NAP	3	2	1	0	NAP
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	13	2	9	1	1	11	2	9	0	0
Ireland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	10	1	9	0	0	6	3	3	0	0
Lithuania	7	4	3	0	0	39	4	35	0	NAP
Luxembourg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	0	1	0
Poland	25	15	6	3	1	59	NA	NA	NA	NA
Portugal	27	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	11	10	1	0	0
Romania	22	6	21	NAP	NAP	12	9	7	NAP	NAP
Slovak Republic	15	4	4	0	7	7	2	5	0	0
Slovenia	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
Spain	23	0	23	0	0	3	0	3	0	0
Sweden	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average	10	2	6	0	1	9	2	4	0	0
Median	6	1	3	0	0	4	2	1	0	0
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	27	15	23	4	7	59	10	35	1	2
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	22%	22%	22%	22%
% of NAP	0%	4%	4%	11%	19%	0%	0%	0%	7%	19%

Table 7.5.5 (2021) Number of disciplinary sanctions pronounced against professional judges in 2021 (Q145)

States	Professional judges										
	Types of pronounced sanctions in 2021										
	Total number	Reprimand	Suspension	Withdrawal from cases	Fine	Temporary reduction of salary	Position downgrade	Transfer to another geographical (court) location	Resignation	Other	Dismissal
Austria	2	0	NAP	NAP	2	0	NAP	0	0	0	0
Belgium	2	0	2	NAP	NAP	0	0	NAP	0	NAP	0
Bulgaria	3	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	0	NAP	NAP	2	0
Croatia	10	4	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cyprus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Czech Republic	17	2	NAP	NAP	0	9	0	NAP	2	3	1
Denmark	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Estonia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NA	NA	NA
France	10	1	2	NAP	NAP	0	1	4	NAP	0	2
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	19	9	0	NAP	NAP	6	NAP	NAP	NAP	4	0
Ireland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy	83	13	7	45	0	0	3	2	8	4	1
Latvia	7	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	2	NAP	NAP	0	4	0
Lithuania	1	0	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	0
Luxembourg	0	0	0	NAP	0	0	NAP	NAP	0	0	0
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Poland	NA	2	NA	NA	NA	2	NA	0	NA	9	0
Portugal	28	8	9	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	2
Romania	29	3	6	NAP	NAP	13	5	0	NAP	NAP	2
Slovak Republic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Slovenia	0	0	NAP	NAP	NAP	0	NAP	0	0	0	0
Spain	22	3	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sweden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average	10,7	2,1	2,2	4,1	1,6	1,5	0,6	0,4	0,6	1,4	0,5
Median	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Minimum	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Maximum	83,0	13,0	9,0	45,0	9,0	13,0	5,0	4,0	8,0	9,0	2,0
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	19%	15%	19%	15%	19%	11%	15%	11%	19%	15%	15%
% of NAP	0%	4%	22%	44%	30%	7%	26%	30%	19%	7%	0%

Table 7.5.6 (2021) Number of disciplinary sanctions pronounced against public prosecutors in 2021 (Q145)

States	Public Prosecutors										
	Types of pronounced sanctions in 2021										
	Total number	Reprimand	Suspension	Withdrawal from cases	Fine	Temporary reduction of salary	Position downgrade	Transfer to another geographical (court) location	Resignation	Other	Dismissal
Austria	0	0	NAP	NAP	0	0	NAP	0	0	0	0
Belgium	0	0	0	NAP	NAP	0	0	NAP	0	NAP	0
Bulgaria	9	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	0	NAP	NAP	8	0
Croatia	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Cyprus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Czech Republic	5	0	NAP	NAP	0	4	0	NAP	0	1	0
Denmark	10	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0
Estonia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finland	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
France	3	0	0	NAP	NAP	1	1	0	NAP	0	1
Germany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hungary	18	6	NAP	NAP	NAP	0	0	NAP	NAP	10	2
Ireland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Italy	53	7	0	25	0	0	1	7	7	5	1
Latvia	5	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	1	1	NAP	0	2	0
Lithuania	19	2	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	0	NAP	NAP	13	3
Luxembourg	0	0	0	NAP	0	0	NAP	NAP	0	0	0
Malta	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Netherlands	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Poland	55	14	27	NAP	0	14	NAP	0	NAP	0	0
Portugal	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Romania	2	1	0	NAP	NAP	1	0	0	NAP	NAP	0
Slovak Republic	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Slovenia	1	1	NAP	NAP	NAP	0	NAP	0	0	0	0
Spain	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sweden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average	8,5	1,9	1,8	2,6	0,1	1,1	0,2	0,7	0,6	2,1	0,3
Median	3,0	1,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Minimum	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Maximum	55,0	14,0	27,0	25,0	1,0	14,0	1,0	7,0	7,0	13,0	3,0
Nb of values	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	15%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%
% of NAP	0%	4%	22%	44%	30%	4%	15%	26%	22%	7%	0%

Lawyers

Table 7.6.1 Number of lawyers (absolute number and per 100 000 inhabitants) from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q146, Q147)

States	Number of lawyers																			
	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021	
	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhabitants
Austria	5 756	68,1	5 801	68,4	5 940	69,2	6 138	70,5	6 132	70,2	6 325	71,9	6 483	73,5	6 667	74,9	6 707	75,1	6 875	76,6
Belgium	17 336	155,3	17 795	159,6	18 134	161,8	18 402	163,3	18 532	163,7	18 604	163,5	18 658	163,2	18 905	165,4	18 875	163,8	19 161	165,6
Bulgaria	12 010	164,9	12 010	165,8	12 696	176,3	13 013	181,9	13 500	190,1	13 720	194,6	13 640	194,9	13 880	199,7	13 964	201,9	13 605	198,9
Croatia	4 392	103,0	4 408	103,8	4 487	106,2	4 560	108,8	4 690	112,9	4 719	114,9	4 756	116,7	4 752	117,1	4 835	119,8	5 002	129,2
Cyprus	2 558	295,4	2 896	337,5	3 114	362,9	3 208	378,2	3 605	425,0	3 793	443,7	4 012	458,0	4 209	474,0	4 273	476,9	4 377	483,8
Czech Republic	10 944	104,1	10 255	97,6	11 842	112,5	12 300	116,5	11 310	106,9	11 587	109,4	11 180	105,0	12 188	114,2	12 267	114,6	12 390	117,8
Denmark	6 021	107,5	6 053	107,6	6 134	108,4	6 235	109,2	6 236	108,5	6 450	111,6	6 563	113,0	6 843	117,5	6 870	117,6	7 063	120,3
Estonia	846	65,8	878	66,7	934	71,1	970	73,7	993	75,5	1 024	77,8	1 041	78,9	1 076	81,2	1 096	82,4	1 074	80,7
Finland	1 935	35,7	2 009	36,9	2 115	38,7	3 550	64,7	3 791	68,9	3 846	69,8	3 965	71,8	4 022	72,8	4 087	73,9	4 173	75,2
France	56 176	85,7	60 223	91,5	62 073	93,6	62 073	93,2	65 480	97,7	66 958	99,7	66 958	99,9	68 835	102,6	70 073	104,0	70 794	104,7
Germany	160 880	200,5	162 695	201,4	163 513	202,4	163 772	200,3	164 393	200,1	164 656	199,2	165 104	198,9	165 901	199,5	165 680	199,2	165 587	198,9
Greece	42 113	380,7	42 177	381,3	42 052	387,7	42 226	388,9	42 091	390,3	41 903	389,1	42 949	399,9	42 500	396,3	44 595	416,1	43 240	404,9
Hungary	13 000	131,2	13 000	131,6	13 000	131,9	13 000	132,2	11 191	114,2	11 191	113,3	12 715	132,6	12 719	130,2	11 436	115,6	11 617	119,9
Ireland	11 055	240,8	11 215	243,7	11 588	250,5	11 907	255,3	12 237	261,8	12 588	262,7	13 142	270,6	14 816	301,0	14 054	282,4	13 434	262,2
Italy	226 202	379,0	226 202	379,0	223 842	368,2	237 132	390,9	229 292	378,4	231 565	382,9	234 386	388,3	236 494	392,6	235 964	398,2	229 783	389,6
Latvia	1 343	65,7	1 336	66,0	1 363	68,1	1 363	69,2	1 231	62,5	1 370	70,3	1 218	63,4	1 357	71,1	1 370	72,4	1 351	72,0
Lithuania	1 796	59,8	1 988	67,5	1 988	68,1	2 117	73,3	2 213	77,7	2 207	78,6	2 213	79,2	2 248	80,5	2 254	80,6	2 277	81,1
Luxembourg	2 020	384,8	2 203	400,5	2 180	387,2	2 323	412,6	2 381	403,1	2 597	431,4	2 993	487,5	2 914	465,4	3 080	485,2	3 247	503,1
Malta	1 400	331,4	1 112	259,0	1 485	337,7	1 569	348,3	1 327	288,3	1 473	309,6	1 535	322,7	1 648	333,9	1 762	342,4	1 316	255,0
Netherlands	17 068	101,7	17 298	102,8	17 713	104,8	17 343	102,1	17 498	102,4	17 672	102,9	17 784	102,9	17 829	102,4	17 964	102,8	18 108	103,4
Poland	43 974	114,1	-	-	52 760	137,1	-	-	48 315	125,7	51 227	133,3	53 081	138,2	55 178	143,7	57 365	150,0	59 635	156,6
Portugal	28 341	270,2	28 765	275,9	29 337	282,8	27 277	263,8	30 475	295,6	31 326	304,4	32 368	315,0	33 204	322,5	33 115	321,6	33 937	327,8
Romania	20 919	98,2	23 332	117,0	23 244	104,3	23 635	119,6	23 205	118,2	23 020	117,9	22 873	117,9	23 554	121,3	23 424	122,1	23 308	122,4
Slovak Republic	5 210	96,3	5 541	102,3	5 827	107,5	5 993	110,4	6 142	113,0	6 037	110,9	6 112	112,1	6 186	113,3	6 266	114,8	6 469	119,0
Slovenia	1 417	68,8	1 529	74,2	1 628	79,0	1 669	80,9	1 711	82,8	1 737	84,0	1 768	85,0	1 813	86,5	1 834	87,0	1 856	88,1
Spain	131 337	285,5	-	-	135 016	290,7	149 818	322,6	142 061	305,3	144 212	308,8	143 205	304,6	143 398	302,3	143 717	303,6	144 642	304,9
Sweden	5 246	54,9	5 422	56,2	5 575	57,2	5 800	58,9	5 767	57,7	5 911	58,4	6 000	58,6	6 000	58,1	6 257	60,3	6 436	61,6
Average	30 789	190,4	26 646	163,7	31 836	172,8	32 207	180,4	32 437	177,6	32 878	182,0	33 211	187,1	33 672	190,4	33 822	192,0	33 732	189,8
Median	10 944	121,3	6 053	107,6	11 588	112,5	9 071	118,1	11 191	114,2	11 191	114,9	11 180	117,9	12 188	121,3	11 436	119,8	11 617	122,4
Minimum	846	58,1	878	36,9	934	38,7	970	58,9	993	57,7	1 024	58,4	1 041	58,6	1 076	58,1	1 096	60,3	1 074	61,6
Maximum	226 202	474,0	226 202	400,5	223 842	387,7	237 132	412,6	229 292	425,0	231 565	443,7	234 386	487,5	236 494	474,0	235 964	485,2	229 783	503,1
Nb of values	27	27	25	25	27	27	26	26	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

***Before 2017, Cyprus also included "legal advisors", who cannot represent clients in court.**

Finland: Since 2015, the number of lawyers provided includes both the number of lawyers working in the private sector and the number of lawyers working in the public sector. Before 2015 the number given only included the members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional titles advokat (advocate).

Table 7.6.2 Variations (in percentage) of the total number of lawyers* (between 2020 and 2021 and between 2012 and 2021) (Q1, Q146, Q147)

States	Variation of the total number of lawyers	
	2012 - 2021	2020 - 2021
Austria	19,4%	2,5%
Belgium	10,5%	1,5%
Bulgaria	13,3%	-2,6%
Croatia	13,9%	3,5%
Cyprus	71,1%	2,4%
Czech Republic	13,2%	1,0%
Denmark	17,3%	2,8%
Estonia	27,0%	-2,0%
Finland	115,7%	2,1%
France	26,0%	1,0%
Germany	2,9%	-0,1%
Greece	2,7%	-3,0%
Hungary	-10,6%	1,6%
Ireland	21,5%	-4,4%
Italy	1,6%	-2,6%
Latvia	0,6%	-1,4%
Lithuania	26,8%	1,0%
Luxembourg	60,7%	5,4%
Malta	-6,0%	-25,3%
Netherlands	6,1%	0,8%
Poland	35,6%	4,0%
Portugal	19,7%	2,5%
Romania	11,4%	-0,5%
Slovak Republic	24,2%	3,2%
Slovenia	31,0%	1,2%
Spain	10,1%	0,6%
Sweden	22,7%	2,9%
Average	16,5%	3,1%
Median	17,3%	1,0%
Minimum	-10,6%	-25,3%
Maximum	115,7%	5,4%
Nb of values	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%

***Before 2017, Cyprus also included "legal advisors", who cannot represent clients in court.**

Finland: Since 2015, the number of lawyers provided includes both the number of lawyers working in the private sector and the number of lawyers working in the public sector. Before , the number included only the members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional title “advokat” (advocate).

Table 7.6.3 Number of professional judges and lawyers* per 100 000 inhabitants from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q46, Q146, Q147)

States	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021	
	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.	Professional judges per 100 000 inh.	Lawyers per 100 000 inh.
Austria	18,3	68,1	18,4	68,4	18,9	69,2	18,6	70,5	27,4	70,2	28,2	71,9	27,3	73,5	29,5	74,9	29,0	75,1	26,6	76,6
Belgium	14,3	155,3	14,4	159,6	14,3	161,8	14,3	163,3	14,1	163,7	13,8	163,5	13,3	163,2	13,3	165,4	13,2	163,8	14,4	165,6
Bulgaria	30,7	164,9	30,2	165,8	30,8	176,3	31,1	181,9	31,8	190,1	31,7	194,6	31,8	194,9	31,9	199,7	31,6	201,9	32,1	198,9
Croatia	45,3	103,0	45,0	103,8	44,4	106,2	44,5	108,8	43,3	112,9	43,2	114,9	40,7	116,7	41,4	117,1	40,7	119,8	42,4	129,2
Cyprus	11,9	295,4	11,8	337,5	11,3	362,9	13,3	378,2	13,1	425,0	13,9	443,7	13,5	458,0	13,0	474,0	14,1	476,9	14,3	483,8
Czech Republic	29,1	104,1	29,1	97,6	28,8	112,5	28,6	116,5	28,4	106,9	28,4	109,4	28,4	105,0	28,2	114,2	28,1	114,6	28,4	117,8
Denmark	6,6	107,5	6,3	107,6	6,7	108,4	6,6	109,2	6,5	108,5	6,5	111,6	6,5	113,0	6,4	117,5	6,6	117,6	6,6	120,3
Estonia	17,7	65,8	17,2	66,7	17,6	71,1	17,8	73,7	17,6	75,5	17,3	77,8	17,7	78,9	17,3	81,2	17,6	82,4	17,7	80,7
Finland	18,1	35,7	18,1	36,9	18,1	38,7	18,1	64,7	19,4	68,9	19,0	69,8	19,6	71,8	19,7	72,8	19,5	73,9	20,9	75,2
France	10,7	85,7	10,7	91,5	10,5	93,6	10,5	93,2	10,4	97,7	10,5	99,7	10,9	99,9	11,1	102,6	11,2	104,0	11,2	104,7
Germany	24,7	200,5	23,9	201,4	23,9	202,4	23,6	200,3	24,2	200,1	24,3	199,2	24,5	198,9	24,7	199,5	25,0	199,2	25,2	198,9
Greece	23,3	380,7	35,0	381,3	20,6	387,7	20,3	388,9	25,8	390,3	26,6	389,1	26,8	399,9	26,9	396,3	36,0	416,1	37,6	404,9
Hungary	27,9	131,2	28,4	131,6	28,5	131,9	28,6	132,2	28,7	114,2	28,6	113,3	30,2	132,6	29,5	130,2	28,2	115,6	28,0	119,9
Ireland	3,1	240,8	3,2	243,7	3,5	250,5	3,4	255,3	3,5	261,8	3,3	262,7	3,3	270,6	3,4	301,0	3,3	282,4	3,3	262,2
Italy	10,6	379,0	11,0	379,0	11,4	368,2	10,9	390,9	10,6	378,4	10,8	382,9	11,6	388,3	11,8	392,6	11,9	398,2	12,1	389,6
Latvia	21,5	65,7	23,8	66,0	24,4	68,1	25,0	69,2	25,5	62,5	25,1	70,3	29,1	63,4	27,3	71,1	29,1	72,4	29,1	72,0
Lithuania	25,6	59,8	26,2	67,5	25,8	68,1	26,4	73,3	27,3	77,7	27,3	78,6	27,1	79,2	26,8	80,5	26,5	80,6	25,6	81,1
Luxembourg	34,1	384,8	32,7	400,5	32,7	387,2	32,5	412,6	31,7	403,1	32,9	431,4	36,2	487,5	36,1	465,4	36,1	485,2	35,6	503,1
Malta	9,5	331,4	9,8	259,0	9,3	337,7	9,3	348,3	9,8	288,3	9,0	309,6	9,5	322,7	8,7	333,9	8,2	342,4	9,1	255,0
Netherlands	14,4	101,7	14,1	102,8	14,0	104,8	13,9	102,1	13,6	102,4	14,8	102,9	14,6	102,9	14,5	102,4	14,9	102,8	15,1	103,4
Poland	26,2	114,1	-	-	26,2	137,1	-	-	26,0	125,7	26,1	133,3	25,5	138,2	25,3	143,7	25,2	150,0	25,8	156,6
Portugal	19,2	270,2	19,4	275,9	19,2	282,8	19,2	263,8	19,3	295,6	20,0	304,4	19,3	315,0	19,4	322,5	19,4	321,6	19,5	327,8
Romania	20,2	98,2	22,6	117,0	20,5	104,3	23,3	119,6	23,6	118,2	23,9	117,9	24,1	117,9	24,5	121,3	24,0	122,1	24,1	122,4
Slovak Republic	24,2	96,3	24,8	102,3	24,4	107,5	23,8	110,4	24,1	113,0	25,3	110,9	25,3	112,1	25,1	113,3	23,9	114,8	25,5	119,0
Slovenia	47,1	68,8	46,1	74,2	44,8	79,0	43,5	80,9	42,6	82,8	41,6	84,0	41,7	85,0	41,7	86,5	41,5	87,0	40,8	88,1
Spain	11,2	285,5	-	-	11,5	290,7	11,6	322,6	11,5	305,3	11,5	308,8	11,5	304,6	11,3	302,3	11,2	303,6	11,4	304,9
Sweden	11,8	54,9	11,7	56,2	11,8	57,2	11,8	58,9	11,8	57,7	11,8	58,4	11,9	58,6	11,5	58,1	11,6	60,3	11,9	61,6
Average	20,6	164,8	21,4	163,7	20,5	172,8	20,4	180,4	21,2	177,6	21,3	182,0	21,5	187,1	21,5	190,4	21,8	192,0	22,0	189,8
Median	19,2	107,5	19,4	107,6	19,2	112,5	18,9	118,1	23,6	114,2	23,9	114,9	24,1	117,9	24,5	121,3	23,9	119,8	24,1	122,4
Minimum	3,1	35,7	3,2	36,9	3,5	38,7	3,4	58,9	3,5	57,7	3,3	58,4	3,3	58,6	3,4	58,1	3,3	60,3	3,3	61,6
Maximum	47,1	384,8	46,1	400,5	44,8	387,7	44,5	412,6	43,3	425,0	43,2	443,7	41,7	487,5	41,7	474,0	41,5	485,2	42,4	503,1
Nb of values	27	27	25	25	27	27	26	26	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% of NAP	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

***Before 2017, Cyprus also included "legal advisors", who cannot represent clients in court.**

Finland: Since 2015, the number of lawyers provided includes both the number of lawyers working in the private sector and the number of lawyers working in the public sector. Before , the number included only the members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional title “advokat” (advocate).

Italy: Administrative justice has been taken into account since 2018.

Lawyers

Table 7.7 (EC) Total number of professional judges sitting in courts per 100 000 inhabitants from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q46)

States	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	*20*	18,3	18,4	18,9	18,6	27,4	28,2	27,3	29,5	29,0	26,6
Belgium	*1*	14,3	14,4	14,3	14,3	14,1	13,8	13,3	13,3	13,2	14,4
Bulgaria	*2*	30,7	30,2	30,8	31,1	31,8	31,7	31,8	31,9	31,6	32,1
Croatia	*11*	45,3	45,0	44,4	44,5	43,3	43,2	40,7	41,4	40,7	42,4
Cyprus	*13*	11,9	11,8	11,3	13,3	13,1	13,9	13,5	13,0	14,1	14,3
Czech Republic	*3*	29,1	29,1	28,8	28,6	28,4	28,4	28,4	28,2	28,1	28,4
Denmark	*4*	6,6	6,3	6,7	6,6	6,5	6,5	6,5	6,4	6,6	6,6
Estonia	*6*	17,7	17,2	17,6	17,8	17,6	17,3	17,7	17,3	17,6	17,7
Finland	*26*	18,1	18,1	18,1	18,1	19,4	19,0	19,6	19,7	19,5	20,9
France	*10*	10,7	10,7	10,5	10,5	10,4	10,5	10,9	11,1	11,2	11,2
Germany	*5*	24,7	23,9	23,9	23,6	24,2	24,3	24,5	24,7	25,0	25,2
Greece	*8*	23,3	35,0	20,6	20,3	25,8	26,6	26,8	26,9	36,0	37,6
Hungary	*17*	27,9	28,4	28,5	28,6	28,7	28,6	30,2	29,5	28,2	28,0
Ireland	*7*	3,1	3,2	3,5	3,4	3,5	3,3	3,3	3,4	3,3	3,3
Italy	*12*	10,6	11,0	11,4	10,9	10,6	10,8	11,6	11,8	11,9	12,1
Latvia	*14*	21,5	23,8	24,4	25,0	25,5	25,1	29,1	27,3	29,1	29,1
Lithuania	*15*	25,6	26,2	25,8	26,4	27,3	27,3	27,1	26,8	26,5	25,6
Luxembourg	*16*	34,1	32,7	32,7	32,5	31,7	32,9	36,2	36,1	36,1	35,6
Malta	*18*	9,5	9,8	9,3	9,3	9,8	9,0	9,5	8,7	8,2	9,1
Netherlands	*19*	14,4	14,1	14,0	13,9	13,6	14,8	14,6	14,5	14,9	15,1
Poland	*21*	26,2	-	26,2	-	26,0	26,1	25,5	25,3	25,2	25,8
Portugal	*22*	19,2	19,4	19,2	19,2	19,3	20,0	19,3	19,4	19,4	19,5
Romania	*23*	20,2	22,6	20,5	23,3	23,6	23,9	24,1	24,5	24,0	24,1
Slovak Republic	*25*	24,2	24,8	24,4	23,8	24,1	25,3	25,3	25,1	23,9	25,5
Slovenia	*24*	47,1	46,1	44,8	43,5	42,6	41,6	41,7	41,7	41,5	40,8
Spain	*9*	11,2	-	11,5	11,6	11,5	11,5	11,5	11,3	11,2	11,4
Sweden	*27*	11,8	11,7	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,9	11,5	11,6	11,9

Austria: The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. Data on administrative justice is introduced for 2016 cycle for the first time.

Greece: Unlike 2014 and 2015 data, since 2016 data on number of professional judges includes all the ranks for second instance criminal as well as administrative judges.

Italy: The administrative courts' judges have been included since 2018.

Poland: Starting from 2020, the number of Supreme Court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court.

Table 7.8 (EC) Number of lawyers* per 100 000 inhabitants from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q146, Q147)

States	EC Code	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Austria	20	68,1	68,4	69,2	70,5	70,2	71,9	73,5	74,9	75,1	76,6
Belgium	1	155,3	159,6	161,8	163,3	163,7	163,5	163,2	165,4	163,8	165,6
Bulgaria	2	164,9	165,8	176,3	181,9	190,1	194,6	194,9	199,7	201,9	198,9
Croatia	11	103,0	103,8	106,2	108,8	112,9	114,9	116,7	117,1	119,8	129,2
Cyprus	13	295,4	337,5	362,9	378,2	425,0	443,7	458,0	474,0	476,9	483,8
Czech Republic	3	104,1	97,6	112,5	116,5	106,9	109,4	105,0	114,2	114,6	117,8
Denmark	4	107,5	107,6	108,4	109,2	108,5	111,6	113,0	117,5	117,6	120,3
Estonia	6	65,8	66,7	71,1	73,7	75,5	77,8	78,9	81,2	82,4	80,7
Finland	26	35,7	36,9	38,7	64,7	68,9	69,8	71,8	72,8	73,9	75,2
France	10	85,7	91,5	93,6	93,2	97,7	99,7	99,9	102,6	104,0	104,7
Germany	5	200,5	201,4	202,4	200,3	200,1	199,2	198,9	199,5	199,2	198,9
Greece	8	380,7	381,3	387,7	388,9	390,3	389,1	399,9	396,3	416,1	404,9
Hungary	17	131,2	131,6	131,9	132,2	114,2	113,3	132,6	130,2	115,6	119,9
Ireland	7	240,8	243,7	250,5	255,3	261,8	262,7	270,6	301,0	282,4	262,2
Italy	12	379,0	379,0	368,2	390,9	378,4	382,9	388,3	392,6	398,2	389,6
Latvia	14	65,7	66,0	68,1	69,2	62,5	70,3	63,4	71,1	72,4	72,0
Lithuania	15	59,8	67,5	68,1	73,3	77,7	78,6	79,2	80,5	80,6	81,1
Luxembourg	16	384,8	400,5	387,2	412,6	403,1	431,4	487,5	465,4	485,2	503,1
Malta	18	331,4	259,0	337,7	348,3	288,3	309,6	322,7	333,9	342,4	255,0
Netherlands	19	101,7	102,8	104,8	102,1	102,4	102,9	102,9	102,4	102,8	103,4
Poland	21	114,1	-	137,1	-	125,7	133,3	138,2	143,7	150,0	156,6
Portugal	22	270,2	275,9	282,8	263,8	295,6	304,4	315,0	322,5	321,6	327,8
Romania	23	98,2	117,0	104,3	119,6	118,2	117,9	117,9	121,3	122,1	122,4
Slovak Republic	25	96,3	102,3	107,5	110,4	113,0	110,9	112,1	113,3	114,8	119,0
Slovenia	24	68,8	74,2	79,0	80,9	82,8	84,0	85,0	86,5	87,0	88,1
Spain	9	285,5	-	290,7	322,6	305,3	308,8	304,6	302,3	303,6	304,9
Sweden	27	54,9	56,2	57,2	58,9	57,7	58,4	58,6	58,1	60,3	61,6

***Before 2017, Cyprus also included "legal advisors", who cannot represent clients in court.**

Finland: Since 2015, the number of lawyers provided includes both the number of lawyers working in the private sector and the number of lawyers working in the public sector. Before 2015 the number given only included the members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional titles advokat (advocate).

Indicator 7: Professionals of justice

comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 004. Average gross annual salary (in €) for the reference year

Question 046. Number of professional judges sitting in courts (if possible on 31 December of the reference year). (please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled for all types of courts - general jurisdiction and specialised courts)

Question 046-2. Number of judges (FTE) by case type:

Question 052. Number of non-judge staff who are working in courts (if possible on 31 December of the reference year) (this data should not include the staff working for public prosecutors; see question 60) (please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled)

Question 052-1. Number of non-judge staff by instance (if possible, on 31 December of the reference year) (this data should not include the staff working for public prosecutors; see question 60) (please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled).

Question 055. Number of public prosecutors (on 31 December of the reference year). (Please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled, for all types of courts – general jurisdiction and specialised courts).

Question 060. Number of staff (non-public prosecutors) attached to the public prosecution services, if possible, on 31 December of the reference year and without the number of non-judge staff, see question 52 (in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled).

Question 132. Salaries of judges and public prosecutors on 31 December of the reference year:

Question 133. Do judges and public prosecutors have additional benefits?

Question 144. Number of disciplinary proceedings initiated during the reference year against judges and public prosecutors. (If a disciplinary proceeding is undertaken because of several reasons, please count the proceedings only once and for the main reason.)

Question 145. Number of sanctions pronounced during the reference year against judges and public prosecutors:

Question 146. Total number of lawyers practising in your country:

Question 147. Does this figure include "legal advisors" who cannot represent their clients in court (for example, some solicitors or in-house counsellors)?

Question 148. Number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court:

Austria

Q004 (General Comment): Since the 2010 evaluation, the provided figure corresponds to the average gross income including taxes and social expenses borne by the employee, but not employer's contribution for social insurance. This is in line with the figures given in question 132 (gross annual salary of judges and prosecutors).

Q004 (2021): Not available yet.

Q004 (2019): 2018 data has been communicated, pending 2019 data.

Q046 (General Comment): For the all exercises, data have been provided in full time equivalent. The first instance judges sit in District and partly regional courts. The second instance judges sit in partly regional courts and Courts of appeal. The last instance includes judges sitting in the Supreme Court and the Supreme Administrative Court.

Q046 (2019): Data in full time equivalent
1.: district courts and partly regional courts + administrative courts 2.: courts of appeal and partly regional courts

Q046 (2018): Data in full time equivalent
1.: district and regional Courts + administrative court
2.: courts of appeal

Q046 (2017): The data also include those of administrative courts.

Q046 (2016): This cycle admnistrative courts were taken into account for the first time.
The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. After their establishment the data of the administrative courts is introduced this cycle for the first time.

Q046 (2015): The right (not rounded) numbers are:

TotalMalesFemales
Total number of professional judges (1 + 2 + 3)1620,65 - 790,52 - 830,13
1. Number of first instance professional judges1222,95 - 559,08 - 663,87
2. Number of second instance (court of appeal) professional judges 330,35 - 187,75 - 142,60
3. Number of supreme court professional judges 67,35 - 43,69 - 23,66

Data in full time equivalent
1.: district and partly regional courts
2.: partly regional courts and courts of appeal

Q046 (2014): For 2014, the numerical values in the table have been rounded. The most exact replies would be: Total: 1 620,04 (789,68 Male, 830,36 Female); first instance professional judges: 1 224,36 (556,01 Male, 668,35 Female); second instance professional judges: 329,63 (190,78 Male, 138,85 Female); Supreme court professional judges: 66,05 (42,89 Male, 23,16 Female). In 2014, some judges entitled to adjudicate in different law fields have been counted twice.

Q046 (2013): In 2013, the different tasks had been assigned to the full time equivalent judges, distinguishing between dealing with first and second instance court proceedings on the one hand and administrative tasks on the other hand.

Q046 (2012): In 2012, in contrast with previous evaluations, the different tasks had been more exactly assigned to the full time equivalent judges, distinguishing between dealing with first and second instance court proceedings on the one hand and administrative tasks on the other hand.
Q052 (General Comment): Starting from 2021, the “Kanzlei” who are responsible for handling of case files are counted as “staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts”. “Other staff” only includes trainees (including trainees for Rechtspfleger) and staff representation. Moreover, starting from 2021, “technical staff” also includes staff working at the courts‘ IT departments.
Q052 (2021): Starting from 2021, the “Kanzlei” who are responsible for handling of case files are no more counted as “other staff”, but as “staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts”. “Other staff” only includes trainees (including trainees for Rechtspfleger) and staff representation. Moreover, starting from 2021, “technical staff” also includes staff working at the courts‘ IT departments, therefore the number is higher than in previous years.

Q052 (2020): "Other": Handling of case files (“Kanzlei”)
2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges: the increased number concerns administrative courts.

Q052 (2019): Non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges: more staff at the administrative courts
Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts: more staff
Other: Handling of case files (“Kanzlei”)
Q052 (2018): Handling of case files (“Kanzlei”)

Q052 (2017): The data also include those of administrative courts.

Q052 (2016): This cycle admnistrative courts were taken into account for the first time.
The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. After their establishment the data of the administrative courts is introduced this cycle for the first time.

Q052 (2015): The right (not rounded) numbers are:
Total non-judge staff working in courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5) 4734,55 - 1407,08 - 3327,47
1. Rechtspfleger (or similar bodies) with judicial or quasi-judicial tasks having autonomous competence and whose decisions could be subject to appeal798,11 - 331,63 - 466,48
2. Non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case file preparation, assistance during the hearing, court recording, helping to draft the decisions) 19,05 - 1 - 18,05
3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (human resources management, material and equipment management, including computer systems, financial and budgetary management, training management)439,56 - 155,86 - 283,70
4. Technical staff21,70 - 9,85 - 11,85
5. Other non-judge staff3456,13 - 908,74 - 2547,39

Q052 (2014): The numerical values in the table have been rounded. The most exact replies for this period would be: total non-judge staff: 4 704,51 (1 388 Male, 3 316,51 Female); Rechtspfleger: 784,78 (320,21 Male, 464,57 Female); non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges: 19,18 (1 Male, 18,18 Female); staff in charge of different administrative tasks: 438,97 (159,85 Males, 279,12 Females); technical staff: 23,05 (9,95 Males, 13,10 Females); other non-judge staff: 3 438,53 (896,99 Males, 2 541,54 Females).

Q055 (General Comment): Data is presented in full time equivalent.

Q055 (2014): The numerical values provided in the table are rounded. The accurate figures are: total – 344,83 (171,52 males and 173,31 females); prosecutors at first instance level – 308,69 (147,13 males and 161,56 females); prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level – 20,94 (13,04 males and 7,90 females); prosecutors at Supreme Court level – 15,20 (11,35 males and 3,85 females).

Q055 (2012): In 2012, the various tasks were more exactly assigned to the number of full time equivalents - dealing with tasks of the prosecution on the one hand and the administrative tasks on the other hand.

Q132 (2021): Administrative Courts:
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 75700
Net annual salary: EUR 46900
Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: EUR 133000

Q132 (2020): Administrative Courts:
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 75000
Net annual salary: EUR 46600
Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: EUR 130000

Q132 (2019): Administrative Courts - First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her Career:
Gross annual salary, in €: 72.900 Net annual salary, in €: 45.100

Q132 (2018): Gross annual Salary in € on 31 Dec 2018 First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career 53 865
Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court : 131 227,88
Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career: 57 158,80
Public prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance : 131 227,88
Administrative court:
first instance professional Judge at the beginning of his/her Career: 69 600,00
Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court: 126 000

Q132 (2016): Because of the requirement of numerical values the numerical values in the table above are rounded. the correct and exact answer is:
Gross annual Salary in € on 31 Dec 2016 (= Gross annual Salary in local currency on 31 dec 2016):
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: 59 962,40
Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (please indicate the average salary of a judge at this level, and not the salary of the Court President): 126 594,16
Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career: 55 139
Public prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance (please indicate the average salary of a public prosecutor at this level, and not the salary of the Public prosecutor General): 126 594,16

Q132 (2014): For 2014, the numerical values in the table are rounded. The correct and exact reply concerning the gross annual salary in Euros on 31 December 2014 is: first instance professional judges at the beginning of their career: 50 402,80 Euros; judges of the Supreme Court or the Highest appellate Court: 121 651,25 Euros; public prosecutors at the beginning of their career: 53 485,60 Euros; public prosecutors of the Supreme Court or the Highest appellate instance: 121651,25 Euros.

Q133 (General Comment): Judges at Administrative Courts get the same benefits as functionaries (e.g. anniversary reward, child allowance, possibly cost of living bonus, travel fees of transportation allowance)

Q133 (2018): Judges at Administrative Courts get the same benefits as functionaries (e.g. anniversary reward, child allowance, possibly cost of living bonus, travel fees of transportation allowance)

Q133 (2016): Judges at Administrative Courts get the same benefits as officials (i.e. anniversary reward, child allowance, possibly costs of living Bonus, travel fees or Transportation allowance).

Q144 (General Comment): .

Q144 (2021): 2 disciplinary proceedings concern administrative judges, it was not possible to distinguish between different subtypes or categories of grounds. Therefore, only the total of disciplinare proceedings can be provide.

Q144 (2020): 2 disciplinary proceedings concern administrative judges, it was not possible to distinguish between different subtypes or categories of grounds. Therefore, only the total of disciplinare proceedings can be provide.

Q144 (2016): Austria does not differentiate between the categories mentioned above (numbers 1 to 4). Therefore, we can only refer to the number of disciplinary cases as a whole.

Q145 (General Comment): The difference between the data of disciplinary proceedings/sanctions against judges and prosecutors is mainly a result of the fact that there are much more judges than prosecutors in Austria. The bulk of disciplinary proceedings against judges are conducted on the ground of the long term of making out/transcription of judgments.

Q145 (2016): ---

Q145 (2012): In the frame of the 2010 and 2012 exercise, it was specified that “other” does apply to conviction and the order for costs of proceedings. Besides, it was stressed that 16 disciplinary (judge) cases were pending, partly because of pending penal cases, partly because of other reasons, while 3 disciplinary (public prosecutors) cases were pending mainly due to pending penal cases.

Q146 (2021): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31 December 2021 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at). The data only include lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers, lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers according to the Lawyers' Directives registered by 31 December 2021. It does not include legal advisors as such a professions/type of service provider does not exist in Austria.

Q146 (2017): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2017 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).
The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.238), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (87) registered by 31st of December 2017. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

Q146 (2016): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2016 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).
The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.132), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (84) registered by 31st of December 2016. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

Q146 (2015): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2015 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.057), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (81) registered by 31st of December 2015. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

Q146 (2014): The 2014 data includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (5940), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (80) and trainee lawyers (2072) registered by 31 December 2014. It does not encompass solicitors or legal advisors as such professions do not exist in Austria.

Q147 (2017): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2017 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).
The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.238), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (87) registered by 31st of December 2017. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

Q147 (2016): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2016 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.132), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (84) registered by 31st of December 2016. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

Q147 (2015): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2015 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.057), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (81) registered by 31st of December 2015. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

Belgium

Q004 (2021): The average gross annual salary is 44022,8 euros, source National Bank of Belgium.

Q004 (2020):
Answer provided based on the latest data published by the National Accounts (April 2021).

Q004 (2019): Average gross annual salary for employees (both full-time and part-time).

Q004 (2016): Average gross salary for a full-time employee (without exceptional bonuses and vacation pay)

Q046 (General Comment): There is no particular reason for the increase in the number of female second instance judges; it is related to the natural evolution (more women at the first instance implies, after some time, a larger base for recruitment at the appeal level).
The table contains data for civil and criminal courts, as well as for the Council of State (44 members) and the Aliens Litigation Council (55 judges).

Q046 (2021): Source: FPS Justice, Directorate-General for the Judiciary, HR Department Judiciary, Notaries and Enforcement agents.
Point 3 concerns judges of the Court of Cassation.
As for the previous cycles, the table contains data for the civil and criminal courts. For this cycle, the (administrative) judges of the Council of State and of the Aliens Litigation Council (41 and 55 judges respectively) have been added to the table. With regard to the administrative judges of the Council of State (as for the Aliens Litigation Council), it is decided to count them as first instance judges. It should be noted, however, that judges of the Council of State intervene both at first and last instance. The number of judges at the Council of State is 44 members and for the Aliens Litigation Council it is 55. For the Aliens Litigation Council, the total of 55 is broken down as follows: 32 female judges - 23 male judges, of whom the first president and the president are men. For the Council of State, the situation is as follows: in principle, the Council is composed of 44 members (1 first president, 1 president, 14 chamber presidents and 28 councillors of State); in practice, 41 members are currently in office (two recent retirements and one death); 20 Dutch-speaking and 21 French-speaking; 12 women and 29 men. It is worth mentioning that an extension of the framework of the Council of State is provided for by a law of 6 September 2022 (which amended article 69 of the laws on the Council of State, coordinated on 12 January 1973). The Council will now consist of 58 members. These new members have not yet been recruited.

Q046 (2020): "No particular reason for the increase in the number of female second instance judges; related to natural evolution (more women in the first degree means, after a while, a larger base for recruitment to the appellate degree).
As in previous cycles, the table contains data for the judicial courts. The number of judges in the Council of State is 44 members and for the Council of Foreigners' Disputes it is 54 judges. "

Q046 (2019): Number of judges in courts within the ambit of the Federal Public Service of Justice (ordre judiciaire)

Q046 (2018): As a result of the reform of the cantons of justice of the peace, the number of places for justices of the peace has decreased by 25.

Q046 (2014): For 2014, the number of professional judges includes presidents of courts.

Q046 (2013): The 2013 data on the number of professional judges reflects the situation as at 18 January 2014.

Q046-2 (2020): The system does not allow part-time work for judges. Data by type of case are not known. Judges are appointed at the court level, and the head of the court assigns them to the different chambers of the court and allocates cases.

Q052 (2019): "Technical personnel": the slight increase observed between 2018 and 2019 results from investments in personnel.
Q052 (2013): The number of women per category is as follows: Total: 3839,45; category 2: 1212,62; category 3: 2031,93; category 4: 594,90.
Q052 (2012): The 2d category "non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars" covers clerks and referendaries; the 3d category "staff in charge of different administrative tasks" includes HRM staff, seconded staff to specific authorities of the judicial organisation and administrative staff of the court registry. This distribution can be presented with the following figures: Total: 5457,95 (3930,35 women); 2: 1707,72 (1166,52 women); 3: 2766,23 (2075,73 women); 5: 984 (688,10 women).
Q052-1 (2021): Source: Directorate P&O - HR Department Judicial staff - Directorate General Judicial Organisation, Federal Public Service Justice (FPS Justice)
Q052-1 (2020): Source: HR Service Judicial Personnel-Directorate General Judicial Organization, FPS Justice

Q055 (2021): Source: FPS Justice - Directorate General for the Judiciary, HR Department of the Judiciary, Notaries and Enforcement agents
Q055 (2020): Support Service of the College of Public Prosecutors

Q055 (2014): In 2014, the number of professional prosecutors includes the heads of division of the 15 public prosecutors' offices and the heads of the 8 prosecution offices within labour courts.
Q060 (2020): V: 1694
M: 730
Q132 (General Comment): Elements taken into account for salaries: judge at the first instance court or deputy king public prosecutor, with three years' seniority (beginning of career), married with two dependent children. Councillor at the Court of Cassation with 24 years' seniority, married, no dependent children. Advocate General at the Court of Cassation, with 24 years' seniority, no dependent children.
Q132 (2019): Judge at the court of first instance or deputy king's prosecutor, with three years of seniority (beginning of career) married and two dependent children.
Advisor to the Supreme Court with 24 years of seniority, married and no dependent children.
Advocate General at the Supreme Court, with 24 years of service and no dependent children.

Q132 (2016): Judge at the Court of First Instance or Deputy Crown Prosecutor, with three years seniority (beginning of career) married and two dependent children
Councillor at the Court of Cassation with 24 years seniority, married, no dependent children
Advocate General at the Court of Cassation, with 24 years seniority, no dependent children

Q133 (2021): Judges and prosecutors have a specific pension scheme (age limit at 67 + preferential rate).

Q133 (2020): Magistrates have a specific pension scheme (age limit at 67 + preferential rate).

Q144 (General Comment): These are proceedings before the disciplinary courts competent for major sanctions. There is no consolidated register for disciplinary proceedings at the level of the courts or public prosecutor's offices that have resulted in a dismissal or a minor sanction. The disciplinary sanctions applicable to judges and public prosecutors are set out in Article 405(1) of the Judicial Code. According to this article, minor disciplinary sanctions are: a call to order; a reprimand. Major disciplinary sanctions are: reduction of salary; disciplinary suspension; regression in salary scales or loss of the last salary supplement; position downgrade or withdrawal of the mandate referred to in Article 58 bis; ex officio resignation; removal from office or dismissal.

Q144 (2014): A new legislation entered into force in September 2014, establishing disciplinary courts. As a result, the number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges decreased between 2012 and 2014.

Q145 (General Comment): Number of major disciplinary sanctions pronounced by disciplinary courts and disciplinary courts of appeal. There is no consolidated register of minor sanctions (call to order and reprimand) pronounced by local heads of corps.

Q145 (2021): Clarification for one case of suspension: it is a one-month suspension with a 3-year carry-over. Sources: the Dutch-speaking Disciplinary court in Ghent, the French-speaking Disciplinary court in Namur, the Dutch-speaking Disciplinary court of Appeal in Brussels and the French-speaking Disciplinary court of Appeal in Brussels
Disciplinary sanctions foreseen by the Judicial Code (Article 405 §1).

Q145 (2020): The number of new disciplinary cases may differ from the number of completed disciplinary cases because some cases are completed in a calendar year later than the year the case was opened.

Q146 (2021): The figures are for the Orde Van Vlaamse Balies, 10 973, and for the Order of the French-speaking and German-speaking Bars, 8 188 as of 1 December 2021: a total of 19 161 lawyers.
Unfortunately, none of the Bars was able to provide figures by gender. The Bars report a stable annual increase. According to the latest "barometers of the profession" carried out by the Bar Associations (in 2018 and 2020), it seems that the legal profession is becoming more and more feminised, and the age pyramid suggests that this feminisation will increase in the years to come.

Q146 (2020): For the Order of the French- and German-speaking Bars: 8,160 and for the Orde van Vlaamse Balies (Order of the Flemish Bars) 10715--> total 18,875. According to a recent study (2020), in December 2019, 64.8% of trainee lawyers were women. On the other hand, 57.6% of the lawyers on the roll (who have completed the traineeship) were men. However, if these percentages are compared with those in previous similar studies, it must be concluded that the legal profession in Belgium is becoming more female.

Q146 (2019): The data correspond to the number of lawyers registered with the Belgian bars on September 1, 2019, therefore at the start of the judicial year 2019-2020. This number fluctuates during the judicial year.
Number of lawyers registered with Flemish bars: 10,862.
Number of lawyers registered with French and German speaking bars: 8,043.

Q146 (2018): 8002 for the French and German-speaking Bar Association
10656 for the Flemish Bar Association (OVB)

Q146 (2017): 7 939 lawyers for the French and German-speaking Bar Association on 1 December 2017
10 665 lawyers at the Flemish Bar (OVB)

Q146 (2016): 7,930 lawyers for the French- and German-speaking Bar Association on 1 December 2016
10,602 lawyers at the Flemish Bar (OVB)

Q146 (2015): As at 1 December 2015, there were 7,882 French-speaking and German-speaking lawyers (avocats.be) and 10,520 Dutch-speaking lawyers (Orde van Vlaamse balies).

Bulgaria

Q004 (2021): Preliminary data.
The minimum wage in the country has been risen with 6.6%. In section “Human health and social work activities” the average annual wage increased with 25.7% due to additional wage payments related with the health crisis. In section “Education” there was an increase of the teachers' wages and salaries and the increase in the section was 17.0%. High growth rate of wages and salaries in 2021 compared to 2020 (17.7%) was recorded in “Accommodation and food service activities” as the section started to recover after 2020 lockdowns.

Q004 (2018): NSI data

Q004 (2016): No explanation.

Q046 (General Comment): The number of the first instance professional judges encompasses the judges of the first instance courts as follows - 113 district, 28 administrative, 3 military-district and the Specialized Criminal Court;
The number of the second instance (court of appeal) professional judges encompasses the judges of second instance courts as follows - 28 regional/provincial, 5 appellate, The Military Court of Appeal and the Specialized Criminal Court of Appeal.
The number of Supreme Court professional judges encompasses the judges of the Supreme Court of Cassation and the Supreme administrative court.

Q046 (2021): First instance courts – district, administrative, military district and Specialized Criminal Court.
Second instance courts (courts of appeal) – regional, appellate, Appellate Specialized Criminal Court and Military Appellate Court.
Supreme Courts – Supreme Court of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Court

Q046 (2020): Number of professional judges from district courts - 959, incl. men - 354 and women - 605. Annex: Summary information on the data as of 31.12.2020, received by all regional courts and all administrative courts, regarding the number of judges working in the first instance panels and the number of judges, who administer justice in the appellate / cassation panels, as well as data on how many of them are men and how many of them are women. It should be borne in mind that, according to the information received, in almost all courts, a large number of judges sit both at first instance and as second instance judges. Therefore, the sum of the number of first instance judges and the number of second instance judges should not give the total number of magistrates in the respective region/ administrative court. Number of professional judges from the Court of Appeal - 124, incl. men - 43 and women - 81.

Q046 (2019): 046/2. The indicated number of 134 judges refers only to the magistrates appointed and working in the 7 courts of appeal in Bulgaria. The calculation is made on the basis of the question itself, which draws attention only to the number of appellate judges (judges working in a court of appeal), as is evident from it - "professional judges of second instance / appellate court /". In almost all regional courts, most judges sit in both the first and second instance departments of the courts and this makes it difficult to differentiate them. This year all judges in regional courts are listed in 046/1 - Number of first instance professional judges.

Q046 (2017): P. 1 – The number of first instance professional judges consists of judges in 27 Regional courts within regional centres; 86 out of regional centres; 28 Administrative courts; 1 Specialized Criminal Court; 3 Military courts; and the number of the first instance judges in District courts has been added to them;
P.2 – The number of the second instance judges consists of judges in 27 District courts; Sofia City Court; 5 Courts of Appeal; 1 Military court of appeal and 1 Appealate Specialized Criminal Court. This number does not include the second instance judges who have adjudicated in first instance pannels.
P.3- The number of working judges in the Supreme Court of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Court at 31.12.2017

Q046 (2016): P. 1 – The number of first instance professional judges consists of judges in 27 Regional courts within regional centres; 86 out of regional centres; 28 Administrative courts; 1 Specialized Criminal Court; 3 Military courts; and the number of first instance judges in District courts has been added to them;
P.2 – The number of second instance judges consists of judges in 27 District courts; Sofia City Court; 5 Courts of Appeal; 1 Military court of appeal and 1 Appealate Specialized Criminal Court. This number does not include the second instance judges who have served in first instance courts. P.3- The number of working judges in the Supreme Court of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Court at 31.12.2016

Q046 (2015): 1.The figure 1760 includes the number of judges, employed at the 1st instance courts ((113 regional courts (27 Regional courts in the district centers and 86 regional courts outside the district centers); 28 Administrative courts; 1 Specialized criminal court; 3 Military courts) including the number of the first instance judges` (524) working in the first instance court formations in the District courts as from 31.12.2015. The number of Military courts has been reduced after decision under protocol ? 44/13.12.2013 of the Supreme Judicial Council from 5 to 3.

2.The number of judges, employed at the 2nd instance courts as from 31.12.2015 and the Courts of Appeal is 277. This figure is a result from the addition of the judges in the 28 District courts; 6 Courts of appeal and 1 Specialized criminal court of appeal – 801 judges in total, where the number of the first instance judges in the District courts (524) have been deducted.

3.The number of judges, employed in the Supreme Court of Cassation and the Supreme Administrative courts as from 31.12.2015 is 188.

Q046 (2014): In 2014, the number 1753 shows the number of judges employed in the first instance courts (113 regional, 28 administrative and 3 military courts) and 550 first instance judges, working in the district courts. The number of military courts was reduced from 5 to 3. The number of second instance judges is 277 and does not encompass first instance judges, working in the first instance chambers of the district courts.

Q046-2 (2021): The total number of first-instance judges is 1258. It includes 991 district (first instance) judges, for whom there is no available information regarding the specialization, 236 administrative, 10 other (military) and 21 - judges at first instance Specialized Criminal Court.
The total number of second-instance judges includes also 59 junior judges, adjudicating at regional courts (second instance), for whom information on specialization is not available. 5 other are military judges.
The total number of supreme judges includes the president of the Supreme Court of Cassation, for whom there is no available information regarding the specialization.

Q046-2 (2020): The column "others" in question 46-2 refers to the military judges - 12 regional/provincial and 5 appellate - a total of 17.
The total number of judges in the district courts is 959, and the same, with the exception of the Sofia District Court, are not divided by subject matter. Therefore, data related to the number of first instance judges dealing with civil / commercial and criminal cases are not available. Appendix: Summary information on the data as of 31.12.2020, received by all regional/provincial courts (first and second instance) regarding the number of judges in them, who work in the civil, commercial and criminal divisions. It should be borne in mind that, according to the information received, in almost all courts, a large number of judges sit in more than one division, therefore the summation of the number of judges from the three divisions should not give the total number of judges in the respective court. Total number of judges in the Court of Appeal (second instance) - 124, of which in the civil division - 36, in the commercial division - 38 and in the criminal division - 50.

Q052 (General Comment): Since 2012, the category “other” encompasses the number of non-judge staff employees working in the recreational field, while in 2010 it subsumes the number of court assistants. The Judicial Administration Commission does not keep statistics of those who are trained, as well as of trainee judges. There are junior judges in the courts in the country, for whom Judicial Administration Commission has no relation, no data. Accordingly, the total number of judicial employees in the courts does not include trainee judges.

Q052 (2019): Since 2012, the category “other” encompasses the number of non-judge staff employees working in the recreational field, while in 2010 it subsumes the number of court assistants.
Q052 (2017): These are the staff employed in the recreational establishments of the Supreme Administrative Court and the Supreme Court of Cassation such as: manager of the training center, chefs, worker in the kitchen, bartender, waiter, tendant.

Q052 (2015): Unlike the previous evaluation cycles, now we indicate the figure 502 – technical staff (it includes drives, cleaning staff, guards, etc.), which reduce the number of the employees engaged with administrative tasks and court management under number 3.
Other non-judge staff includes 55 court servants working in recreation department.
Q052 (2013): The number of non-judge staff assisting judges includes the number of all court staff from the so called specialized administration supporting judges, including court secretaries and court assistance, while for 2010 it subsumes only court secretaries. The category “staff in charge of different administrative tasks” subsumes the number of non – judge staff of general administration.
Q052 (2012): The number of non-judge staff assisting judges includes the number of all court staff from the so called specialized administration supporting judges, including court secretaries and court assistance, while for 2010 it subsumes only court secretaries.
Q052-1 (General Comment): The regional courts in Bulgaria are first and second instance so this is a problem when giving data according to CEPEJ criteria, so this can explain the discrepancies here.
Item 1 "Total non-judge staff working in courts at first instance" includes staff from district and administrative courts. Item 2 "Total non-judge staff working in courts at second instance (court of appeal) level" includes staff from regional and appellate courts although in some types of cases the regional court is first instance.

Q052-1 (2021): 2. "Total non-judge staff working in courts at second instance": the increased number is due to newly opened vacancies for non-judge staff in view of strengthening the courts' activities.
Q052-1 (2020): This answer 5 204 - item 1 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of first instance" includes all employees of the district, regional and administrative courts, although in some types of cases the regional court is the second instance. The number 716 - item 2 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of second instance (appellate court)" includes all employees working in the courts of appeal in the country.

Q055 (General Comment): The provided data refers to the actual number of employed persons for the year of reference.

Q055 (2016): 1511 is the total number of working prosecutors at 31.12.2016; 888 prosecutors at first instance level includes – the prosecutors from 113 Regional Prosecutor`s Offices and 1 Specialized Prosecotr`s Office; 500 prosecutors work in 28 District Prosecutor`s Offices, 7 Appelate Prosecutor`s Offices and 3 Military District Prosecutor`s Offices; 123 are the prosecutors working in Supreme Prosecutor`s Office of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Prosecutor`s Office and 1 Prosecutor General. (The indicated numbers do not include the number of the investigative magistrates in the investigative departments at District Prosecutor`s Offices and National Investigation Service and their administrative heads.

Q055 (2014): For 2014, the number of prosecutors acting at 1st instance includes prosecutors of the regional prosecutor's offices, specialized prosecutor's offices and the military prosecutor's offices. The number of prosecutors acting at 2nd instance includes prosecutors from district and appellate prosecutor's offices. The number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level includes prosecutors from the Supreme Prosecutor's Office of Cassation, Supreme Administrative Public Prosecutor's Office, and the Prosecutor GeneralIn contrast with the 2012 evaluation, the number of investigators in the District Investigation Departments at the District Prosecutor's Offices and the National Investigation Service is not taken into consideration for 2014.

Q055 (2012): For 2012, the total includes 512 magistrates with position of "investigator in the Investigation Department at the District Prosecution Office". Conversely, these 512 magistrates are not subsumed in the number of prosecutors at 1st instance level. The number of prosecutors at 2nd instance level including Prosecutor's Office of Appeal and Military District Prosecutor's Office encompasses 451 prosecutors and 433 investigators in the Investigation Departments at the District Prosecution Offices and military investigators. The number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level includes 128 prosecutors and 79 investigators at the National Investigation Service.

Q060 (2021): The decrease in the number of staff (non-public prosecutors) in the prosecutor's offices is due to the closing of the majority of the first-instance prosecutor's offices and their merger with those in the regional centers. Thus, the managing and duplicating positions in the closed prosecutor's offices were cut.
Q060 (2014): For 2014, the number of actually working servants in the Prosecutors office at 31 December 2014 (2918,5) includes also 66 servants working in the field of recreational craft. The main source of this data is the establishment plan of the Prosecutors office of the Republic of Bulgaria for the number of prosecutors and investigators and a reference for the number of employees in the Prosecutors office of the Republic of Bulgaria at December 2014.

Q060 (2012): For 2012, the number of actually employed servants in the Prosecutors Office at 31 December 2012 (2989,5) includes 177 servants in the recreation department.
Q132 (2021): In the data for Q 132, the line "Prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career" is correct, but refers to the salaries of a district (first instance) prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career. The data for judges and prosecutors is calculated from the salary report collected and summarized by the Judiciary as of December 2021. The gross salary of the lowest judicial/prosecutor level, i.e. district judge and district prosecutor, is calculated. The system also has the position of "junior judge", but at the beginning of their career, they work in second-instance courts (regional courts), and based on the Questionnaire, information is requested about the lowest position in the first instance. The salary of a district judge and a district prosecutor according to "Table No. 1 of the SJC for Determining the Maximum Basic Monthly Salaries of Judges, Prosecutors and Investigators" is the same.
The data for question 132, line "Prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance" for the supreme judges and supreme prosecutors is calculated from the salary report provided by the supreme judicial bodies as of December 2021. The gross salary of a magistrate in the supreme judicial body was calculated. According to "Table No. 1 of the SJC for Determining the Maximum Basic Monthly Salaries of Judges, Prosecutors, and Investigators", the determined remuneration of a supreme judge and a supreme prosecutor is the same.

Q132 (2020): In 2019, with a decision of the Plenum of the SJC under item 6 of Protocol № 2 / 24.01.2019, an updated Table № 1 of the SJC was approved to determine the maximum basic monthly salaries of judges, prosecutors and investigators pursuant to Art. 218, para 2 and para 3 of the JSA with an increase of 10%, as of 01.01.2019. With the same decision the ranks for magistrates were increased by BGN 100 per rank, as of 01.03.2019.
In 2020, with a decision of the Plenum of the SJC under item 2 of Protocol № 2 / 30.01.2020, an updated Table 1 of the SJC was approved for determining the maximum basic monthly salaries of judges, prosecutors and investigators on the grounds of Article 218. , para 2 and para 3 of JSA with an increase of 10%, as of 01.01.2020. With the same decision the ranks for magistrates were increased by BGN 50 per rank, as of 01.03.2020.

Q132 (2018): The sums shown do not include the amount of the social security contributions, in order to be made comparable to the data given in the previous assessment cycle when they were not included either in the amount of the gross salary for the relevant position. The source of the data was information summarized and analyzed in the "Financial planning and analysis" Department of Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria

Q132 (2016): Under the provisions of Art. 218 (2) of the Judiciary System Act, the basic monthly remuneration for the lowest judicial, prosecutorial or investigating magisterial position shall be set at the double amount of the average monthly salary of employees in the public-financed sphere according to data of the National Institute of Statistics.
The increase in the salaries of the magistrates that occupy the lowest position is in line with the increase of the average monthly salary of the employees in the public-financed sphere, according to data of the National Statistical Institute and the financial resources of the budget of the judiciary.
Under the provisions of Art. 218, (3) of the Judiciary System Act, the remuneration of the other positions, including judges and prosecutors in the Supreme Court / Supreme Prosecution Office in the bodies of the judiciary, shall be determined by a decision of the SJC Plenum and taking into account the financial possibilities on the budget of the judiciary.

Q132 (2014): For 2014, the indicated amounts do not include the insurance contributions for the purpose of data comparability in respect of the previous evaluation scheme, when these amounts have not also been taken into consideration.

Q132 (2012): For 2010, the basis for assessment were the data from Table 1 of the Supreme Judicial Council determining the maximum amount of the monthly salary of judges, prosecutors and investigators, while for 2012, the basis for assessment were the data from the Information for the funds for salaries from the establishment plans and the average salary by positions, which is prepared by all the bodies of the judiciary and is summarized in the SJC. This information file reflects the actually received gross salaries, which include the basic salary and additional remuneration for grade and service.

Q133 (2021): Pursuant to Article 223 of the Judiciary System Act, judges and prosecutors may use dwellings from the institutional housing stock of the judiciary.

Q133 (2020): Pursuant to Article 223 of the Judiciary System Act, judges and prosecutors may use dwellings from the institutional housing stock of the judiciary

Q133 (2019): Persuant to art. 223 of the Judiciary System Act, judges and prosecutors may use housing of the departmental housing fund of the judicial authorities.
Q144 (General Comment): Professional inadequacy refers to "systematic non-compliance with the time limits provided for in the procedural laws", "action or inaction that unjustifiably delays the proceedings", "action or inaction that damages the prestige of the judiciary", "Failure to perform official duties".

Q144 (2021): Concerning the category "Professional inadequacy": with regard to judges: in 2021, disciplinary proceedings were initiated for culpable failure to fulfil other official duties, resulting in not appearing at work for two consecutive working days. With regard to prosecutors: in 2021, 1 (one) proceeding was instituted for "systematic failure to comply with the deadlines provided for in the procedural laws"; 5 (five) proceedings were instituted for "action or inaction which unjustifiably delays the proceedings".

Q144 (2020): Others - 2 / two / disciplinary proceedings have been instituted for culpable non-fulfillment of official duties, expressed in systematic non-observance of the terms, provided in the procedural laws; 1 / one / disciplinary proceeding is instituted for action or inaction, which damages the prestige of the judiciary and 1 / one / disciplinary proceeding is instituted for action or inaction, which unjustifiably delays the proceedings and non-fulfillment of other official duties.
Others - "systematic non-compliance with the time limits provided for in the procedural laws"; "action or inaction that unjustifiably delays the proceedings"; "action or inaction that damages the prestige of the judiciary"; "Failure to perform official duties".

Q144 (2018): Other – „ any systematic failure to keep the deadlines provided for in the procedural laws “; „ any act or omission that unjustifiably delays the proceedings“; „any act or omission, which damages the prestige of the Judiciary“; „failure to discharge the official duties“
Q144 (2016): "Other": Systematic failure to comply with the deadlines provided for in procedural laws and / or action or omission which unduly slows down proceeding; non-performance of other official duties.
Q144 (2014): For 2014, the category “other” refers to “consistent non-observance of the deadlines provided for in the procedural laws”, “action or inaction, which unduly delays the proceedings”, “action or inaction, which undermines the prestige of the judiciary”, “non-observance of the official duties”.
Q144 (2012): For 2012, the category “other” refers to “consistent non-observance of the deadlines provided for in the procedural laws”, “action or inaction, which unduly delays the proceedings”, “action or inaction, which undermines the prestige of the judiciary”, “non-observance of the official duties”.

Q145 (General Comment): The temporary suspension from office (temporary suspension of functions) is not a disciplinary sanction, and for that reason the number of such suspensions is not included in the total number of imposed sanctions. The difference between the number of the initiated disciplinary proceedings and the number of the imposed disciplinary sanctions is due to the fact that part of the imposed sanctions are under proceedings, initiated during the preceding reporting period or are imposed by order of the administrative head.

Q145 (2021): There is no such sanction "reprimand" in Article 308 of the Judiciary System Act, since the lightest disciplinary punishment is a "remark". With regard to judges: - a total of 6 /six/ disciplinary proceedings, initiated in previous periods, were concluded, and the Judges' College of the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC) ruled on them as follows:
- "remark" penalty imposed - 1 /one/ disciplinary proceeding;
- imposed sanction "reduction of basic remuneration" - 1 /one/ disciplinary proceeding;
- 1 /one/ disciplinary proceeding was terminated
- in 2 /two/ disciplinary proceedings, the proposals to impose a disciplinary penalty were not accepted.

With a decision of the Judges' College of the SJC, the judge's "remark" imposed by order of the administrative head was confirmed.
Regarding prosecutors:
In 2021, a total of 11 (eleven) disciplinary proceedings were concluded, on which the Prosection College of the SJC ruled as follows:
- Imposed disciplinary punishment "remark" - 8 items (the Prosection College of the SJC issued decisions by which it confirmed on the basis of Art. 314, para. 4 of the Judiciary System Act, 8 (eight) orders of administrative heads to impose disciplinary punishment "remark");
- imposed disciplinary penalty "reduction of basic remuneration by 10 (ten) percent for a period of 7 (seven) months" - 1 ";
- in 2 (two) disciplinary proceedings, the collegium did not impose disciplinary punishments, having accepted that in one case the magistrate did not commit a disciplinary violation, and in the other case, due to the absence of committed disciplinary violations;

For the specified period, 4 (four) disciplinary proceedings have been suspended.

Q145 (2020): In 2020 a total of 11 / eleven / disciplinary proceedings, initiated in previous periods, have been completed, and the Judges' College of the SJC has ruled as follows:
- imposed penalty "remark"/"reprimand" - 4 / four / disciplinary proceedings /;
- imposed penalty "disciplinary dismissal" - 1 / one / disciplinary proceedings;
- 6 / six / disciplinary proceedings have been terminated.

In 2020, a total of 9 (nine) disciplinary proceedings were completed, on which the Prosecutors' College of the SJC ruled as follows:
- Imposed disciplinary sanction "remark" /"reprimand"- 4;

(The PC of the SJC has ruled, on the basis of Article 314, paragraph 4 of the JSA, on 3 (three) orders of administrative heads for imposing a disciplinary sanction "remark", and 1 (one) disciplinary proceedings on the list of the Supreme Judicial Council was completed with a decision of the PC of the SJC to impose a disciplinary sanction "remark"/"reprimand")
- 2 (two) disciplinary proceedings have been terminated due to dismissal of the magistrate and death of the magistrate;
- in 2 (two) disciplinary proceedings the college did not impose disciplinary sanctions by assuming that in one case the magistrate had not committed a disciplinary violation,and, on the other, that the subjective element of the infringement was missing, since the magistrate could not understand the nature and significance of what had committed and direct his actions during the period in which the acts had been committed;
- imposed disciplinary sanction "reduction of the basic salary by 20 percent for a period of one year" -1.

Q145 (2018): Transfer to another geographical (court) location- in our legal system there is no such sanction, but it's possible the position downgrade to lead to transfer to another geographical (court) location. For 2018 there are no such cases.

Q145 (2016): There are imposed sanctions "reprimand" and "removal from post of administrative head and deputy administrative head". The disciplinary proceedings initiated in previous years have been completed. "Suspension" is possible when a judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate is constituted as a party accused of a publicly prosecutable offence but it is not a disciplinary sanction.

Q145 (2014): For 2014, the category "other" subsumes the following disciplinary sanctions: reprimand, demotion in rank at the same judicial system body for a term of one to three years, relief from office as administrative head or deputy of an administrative head.

Q145 (2012): For 2012, the category "other" subsumes the following disciplinary sanctions: remark and reprimand.

Q148 (2019): With a comment that legal advisors, other legal educated staff at institutions, businesses, legal entities and sole traders who are hired employees represent only their employer in court ("as a client")

Q148 (2018): With a comment that legal advisors, other legal educated staff at institutions, businesses, legal entities and sole traders who are hired employees represent only their employer in court ("as a client").

Croatia

Q004 (2021): Average monthly gross salary for 2021 for person in paid employment in legal entities in the Republic of Croatia is available at web page of the Croatian Bureau of Statistics (https://podaci.dzs.hr/2021/en/10583).
This monthly gross salary (9599 Croatian Kuna) has been multiplied by 12 and then divided by Croatian Kuna / Euro average annual medium exchange rate published by the Croatian National Bank (7,52418 Croatian Kuna for 1 Euro; this information is available at https://www.hnb.hr/temeljne-funkcije/monetarna-politika/tecajna-lista/tecajna-lista.)

Q046 (General Comment): In the total number of judges, only data on actually working judges is presented (the total does not include judges on unpaid leave; judges on maternity leave; judges suspended after the disciplinary procedure; judges transferred to other State bodies- for example to Ministry of Justice or Judicial Academy). Moreover, two judges working half-time (for the reason of care for a child with special needs) are counted as 1 judge. Data refer to all judges: presidents of courts, judges authorised to perform judicial administration and judges.

Q046 (2018): Source: Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Croatia
The number of court presidents is included in the number of judges provided, but the data does not include the number of judges who are on unpaid leave, judges who are in non-active status, judges who work part-time in accordance with the Maternity and Parental Benefits Act, judges who are on maternity leave or on parental leave, judges suspended after disciplinary proceedings, judges working part time in order to time care for a child with special needs, judges transferred in another state body (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council) and international institutions and missions.

Q046 (2017): The number of court presidents is included in the number of judges provided, but the data does not include the number of judges who are on unpaid leave, judges who are in non-active status, judges who work part-time in accordance with the Maternity and Parental Benefits Act, judges who are on maternity leave or on parental leave, judges suspended after disciplinary proceedings, judges working part time in order to time care for a child with special needs, judges transferred in another state body (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council) and international institutions and missions.

Q046 (2016): Source: Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Croatia
The number of court presidents is included in the number of judges provided, but the data does not include the number of judges who are on unpaid leave, judges who are in non-active status, judges who work part-time in accordance with the Maternity and Parental Benefits Act, judges who are on maternity leave or on parental leave, judges suspended after disciplinary proceedings, judges working part time in order to time care for a child with special needs, judges transferred in another state body (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council) and international institutions and missions.

Q046 (2015): The Republic of Croatia submits now correct numbers of professional judges sitting in courts for previous cycles (2013 and 2014), because in the previous cycles this number did not include court presidents, while there were excluded in the separate questions. Therefore, the correct numbers for these cycles is now provided.

Q046 (2014): In 2014, the number of professional judges in first instance courts includes judges of municipal, commercial, administrative and misdemeanour courts. The number of judges in second instance courts includes judges of county courts, the High Commercial Court, the High Misdemeanour Court and the High Administrative Court. The number of 3rd instance judges refers to the Supreme Court. Four first instance administrative courts became operational in 2012, while the Administrative Court of the Republic of Croatia became the High Administrative Court.

Q046-2 (General Comment): The difficulty to provide the data lays in mixed specialization of judges in courts, so exact data cannot be extracted.
Q052 (General Comment): The total number of non-judicial staff is a result of a deduction and subsumes only actually working staff. Thus, the total does not include staff on unpaid leave; staff on maternity leave; staff suspended after disciplinary procedures; staff transferred to other State bodies (for example the Ministry of Justice or Judicial Academy). Besides, two non-judicial officials working half-time (for the reason of care for a child with special needs) are counted as 1 non-judicial official. The reason for fluctuation and differences in the number of Rechtpflegers in Republic of Croatia is that they work for 2 years, then prolonged 5 years and then they get a permanent post or not.

Q052 (2015): The Republic of Croatia submits correct numbers of non-judge staff who are working in courts for previous cycles (2012, 2013 and 2014), because in the previous cycles this number included the staff working for public prosecutors. Therefore, the correct numbers for these cycles are now provided.
Q052 (2014): In 2013, the number of "Rechtspfleger" included judicial advisors because they work autonomously on cases, on the one hand, and staff who are not judges, but who can enact decisions (land registry officials and court registry officials), on the other hand. In 2014, the interpretation changed and judicial advisors were moved to the category "non-judicial staff whose task is to assist the judges", since they work autonomously but their decision must be signed by a judge.

Q052 (2013): The variations between 2012 and 2013 in respect of certain sub-categories are due only to a different methodology of classification. The total is slightly different for the two years.
Q055 (General Comment): The provided data encompasses all officials in the public prosecutors' offices, including heads of the public prosecutors' offices (the Public Prosecutor of the Republic of Croatia, county and municipal public prosecutors, the head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime) and all public prosecutors deputies. The number of prosecutors at the first instance level includes all municipal public prosecutors, their deputies, as well as the head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime and his deputies. The number of prosecutors at the second instance (court of appeal) level includes all county public prosecutors and their deputies. The number of prosecutors at the Supreme Court level includes the Public Prosecutor and his deputies.

Q055 (2018): The above information includes all officials in the public prosecutor's offices – all public prosecutors (heads of prosecution offices) and public prosecutors' deputies (deputies of the Public Prosecutor, deputies of the Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime and deputies of the county and municipal public prosecutors).
The number of prosecutors at the first instance level includes all municipal public prosecutors (heads of municipal prosecution offices and Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime), their deputies, as well as the deputies of the Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime. The number of prosecutors at the second instance level (court of appeal) includes all county public prosecutors (heads of the county prosecutors' offices) and their deputies. The number of prosecutors at the supreme court level includes the Public Prosecutor General and his deputies.

Q055 (2012): In 2012, the public prosecutors' Office of the Republic of Croatia employed 21 officials. The county public prosecutors' offices employed 155 officials, and the municipal public prosecutors' offices employed 410 officials. Out of 617 officials, 385 or 62.4% were women. The number of officials remained the same as in 2011. As of 31 December 2012, 7 public prosecutor's posts and 130 deputy public prosecutor's posts were vacant.
Q132 (2021): Salaries of judges and other judicial officials are determined by multiplying the base for calculating the salary by the coefficient for a particular official, which are proscribed by the Judges' and other Judicial Officials' Salaries Act (Official Gazette No. 10/99, 25/00, 01/01, 30/01, 59/01, 114/01, 116/01, 64/02, 153/02, 154/02, 17/04, 08/06, 142/06, 34/07, 134/07, 146/08, 155/08, 39/09, 155/09, 14/11, 154/11, 12/12, 143/12, 100/14, 147/14, 120/16, 16/19). Determined salaries are increased by 0.5% for each completed year of service, by a maximum of 20%.

Q132 (2020): Salaries of judges and other judicial officials are determined by multiplying the base for calculating the salary by the coefficient for a particular official, which are proscribed by the Judges' and other Judicial Officials' Salaries Act (Official Gazette No. 10/99, 25/00, 01/01, 30/01, 59/01, 114/01, 116/01, 64/02, 153/02, 154/02, 17/04, 08/06, 142/06, 34/07, 134/07, 146/08, 155/08, 39/09, 155/09, 14/11, 154/11, 12/12, 143/12, 100/14, 147/14, 120/16, 16/19). Determined salaries are increased by 0.5% for each completed year of service, by a maximum of 20%.

Q132 (2012): Due to the different calculation of tax rates and changes in the amounts of tax reliefs, there is a difference between calculation of salaries in 2010 and 2012.
Q133 (2019): Additional benefits was recently introduced by the Law amending the Law on Salaries of Judges and Other Judicial Officials (Official Gazette 16/19).
Q144 (General Comment): Pursuant to the State Judiciary Council, disciplinary offences are: careless performance of judicial office; failure to act pursuant to a decision regarding the right to trial within a reasonable time; performance of any other service or job incompatible with a judicial function; performance of any service, tasks or activities incongruent with judicial office; causing of disruptions in the work of a court which have a significant impact on the exercise of judicial power; disclosure of an official secret concerning the performance of judicial office; damaging of the reputation of the court or of judicial office in any other way; failure to submit a declaration of assets or the untruthful presentation of data in the declaration of assets; failure to subject to the physical and mental evaluation in order to assess the ability to perform judicial duties.

Q144 (2021): One disciplinary proceeding against a judge because of damage to the reputation of the court.

Q144 (2020): Two disciplinary sanctions against judges because of damage to the reputation of the court.

Q145 (2016): Conditional dismissal

Q145 (2014): In 2014, the following disciplinary sanctions have been declared against judges for committed disciplinary acts: suspended sentences of dismissal from office (5), reprimand (1), temporarily salary reduces (11). In 2 cases, disciplinary proceedings ended with a dismissal, while 3 ended with an acquittal.
In 2014, 2 disciplinary sanctions have been declared against State attorneys for the committed disciplinary acts: one relating to the disciplinary proceeding initiated in 2014 and the second relating to the disciplinary proceeding initiated in 2013, which ended in 2014. For this reason, the number of sanctions imposed in 2014 increased in comparison to the number of disciplinary proceedings initiated in 2014.

Q147 (2020): Not applicable

Q148 (2020): Not applicable

Cyprus

Q046 (General Comment): Cyprus has a two tier system. The Supreme Court is the second and final instance court. All judges of the Supreme Court hear appeals.
Q046 (2020): Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in the second instance cases - questions 97 and 98.
Q046 (2015): From 2014, following the retirement of male judges at last instance, female judges were appointed.

Q046-2 (General Comment): Cyprus has a two-tier system; therefore, the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court is included in the second instance cases (questions 97 and 98).

Q046-2 (2021): All 13 Supreme court judges hear all cases. District court judges are dealing with criminal and civil cases, and they were previously included in the 'Other' cases. We have now limited this to judges of special jurisdiction courts.

Q046-2 (2020): This includes the supreme court judges who deal with all types of cases, first instance family court judges, labour court judges, rent control court judges and military court.
Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in the second instance cases - questions 97 and 98.

Q052 (General Comment): The total number of non-judge staff includes clerical staff and also court bailiffs.

Q052 (2021): court baillifs

Q052 (2020): Other non-judge staff includes court bailiffs. Differences in number of staff compared to previous year come from new appointments and retirements.
Q052 (2018): Court bailiffs are included in category Other.

Q052 (2017): court bailiffs

Q052 (2016): court bailiff
in 2014 the correct number for male no judge staff assisting the judge should be 9
Question 52: if we change the number of male non judge staff assisting the judge for 2014 from 23 to 9, we must also change the number of non-judge staff assisting judges from 143 to 129 and also the total from 462 to 448. Do you agree on up-dating in this way 2014 data in order to ensure the consistency of the table? the numbers for 2014 must also be changed

Q052 (2015): Between 2014 and 2015, there was a change in the distribution of non-judge staff. In 2014, in the category "staff in charge of administrative tasks", only the number of high-level administrative staff was included. The other administrative staff were included in the category "other non judge staff". Whereas in 2015, all administrative staff were included in the category "staff in charge of administrative tasks". This change of distribution leads to significant variations.

Q052 (2014): Variations concerning data on different categories of non-judge staff are due to different methodology of presentation of data used for 2014 and the previous evaluations.
Q052-1 (2021): Positions that were vacant had been filled.

Q052-1 (2020): Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in the second instance cases - questions 97 and 98.
Q052-1 (2018): The Court of Appeal is also the Supreme Court

Q055 (2020): The number includes also legal advisors to the Attorney General's office.
The number increased because more positions of prosecutors were approved.
Q055 (2014): All prosecutors appear before all courts.

Q060 (2021): In 2021, a significant number of public prosecutors were appointed, as new posts have been approved and vacant posts have been filled.
Q060 (2020): trainees are not included

Q145 (2014): In 2014, there were no sanctions pronounced against judges.

Q147 (2018): This figure represents the Lawyers who are registered and have a license for registering practicing advocates

Q147 (2017): the lawyers who do not renew their license are not included in this number

Czech Republic

Q004 (2021): The gross salary is constantly growing.

Q004 (2020): The gross salary is constantly growing.

Q004 (2019): Positive trends in Czech economy and the exchange rate have had an influence on the rise of average gross annual salary (in €).

Q004 (2016): The Czech economy is doing well + the exchange rate.

Q046 (General Comment): The Czech Republic has a four-tier system. The number of judges of the two High Courts is included in the number of second instance judges. This methodology of presentation of data is applied since 2013, while for the previous evaluations, magistrates of the High Courts were considered as third instance judges.

Q046 (2016): The Czech Republic has a four-tier system. The number of judges of the two High Courts is included in the number of second instance judges.

Q046-2 (2021): Insolvency proceedings and Guardianship proceedings

Q046-2 (2020): Insolvency Proceedings

Q052 (General Comment): The category “other” encompasses for 2010 judicial trainees or staff in charge of court documentation. For 2012, 2013 and 2014, besides the already mentioned components, it subsumes also press centre and telephone exchange.
The judicial trainee is entitled to perform the acts of the court under the conditions and to the extent specified in factual and time plan of the preparatory service which is compiled by the chairman of the regional court after consultation with the advisory board for the education of trainees. The plan must be focused in such a way that the training for the performance of the function of a judge serves in particular to:
a) deepening the trainee's professional knowledge of substantive and procedural law,
b) developing the trainee's ability to apply legislation in a specific matter,
c) gaining knowledge of individual agendas maintained by courts and their implementation,
d) acquisition of procedural procedures and habits necessary for the performance of the function of a judge,
e) acquaintance with ethical principles related to the performance of the function of a judge.
In accordance with the preparatory service plan, the trainee performs preparatory service at a district or regional court. The trainee is usually assigned to one judge. Familiarization with individual court agendas is ensured by the fact that the president of the court where the judicial trainee is currently located gradually assigns the trainee to individual court departments.
The preparatory service includes adaptation courses, seminars and lectures organized by the Judicial Academy and educational activities organized by court for at least 2 days per month.
Nowadays, there are few judicial trainees and in 2022 the title will be replaced by a „judicial candidate“.

Q052 (2017): Other - judicial trainees, staff in charge of court documentation, press centre and telephone exchange.

Q052 (2016): Other - judicial trainees, staff in charge of court documentation, press centre and telephone exchange.

Q052 (2015): In 2015, compared to 2014, the number of non-judge staff increased due to a project financed from the European social fund and state budget: “Project on improvement of the efficiency of courts by strengthening of the administrative capacities”. The project is running until 30th December 2015.

Q052 (2014): In 2014, the number of non-judge staff increased due to a project financed from the European social fund and State budget: “Project on improvement of the efficiency of courts by strengthening of the administrative capacities”. The project is running until 30th December 2015.

Q055 (General Comment): The Czech Republic is endowed with a system of 4 levels of State prosecution offices: district, regional, high and supreme. The number of high public prosecutors is included in the number of prosecutors at second instance level.

Q132 (2020): the salaries have risen generally + exchange rate

Q132 (2012): In 2012, the salary of public prosecutors was increased in order to bring it closer to the judges’ salary.

Q133 (2018): Judges and prosecutors are entitled to obtain housing only if they are temporarily transferred to another court/prosecution office.

Q133 (2016): Judges and prosecutors are entitled to obtain housing only if they are temporarily transferred to another court/prosecution office.
Q144 (2021): Other: Judges:
- professional incompetence
Prosecutors:
- alcohol consumption

Q144 (2020): alcohol consumption

Q145 (2021): Other:
Judges:
1 discharging from sanction
1 acquittal of disciplinary charges
1 discontinuance of disciplinary proceeding
3 proceedings are not finished.
Prosecutors: 1 acquittal of disciplinary charges

Q145 (2018): Other:
Judges:
1 acquittal of disciplinary charges
2 discontinuance of disciplinary proceeding
1 dismissal of a motion for a new trial
2 proceedings are not finished.
Prosecutors: 1 acquittal of disciplinary charges
1 discontinuance of disciplinary proceeding

Q145 (2016): Judges:
1 removing a judge from the office
1 acquittal of disciplinary charges
1 discharge from disciplinary punishment 5 discontinuance of disciplinary proceeding
3 proceedings are not finished.
Prosecutors: 2 acquittal of disciplinary charges.

Q145 (2014): In 2014, the following other disciplinary sanctions have been pronounced against judges: 2 discharges from disciplinary punishment; 1 acquittal of disciplinary charges; 6 discontinuances of proceedings. As for public prosecutors, there were 1 acquittal of disciplinary charges and 3 discharges from disciplinary punishment.

Q145 (2012): In 2012, the following other disciplinary sanctions have been pronounced against judges: 2 discharges from disciplinary punishment; 4 acquittals of disciplinary charges; 12 discontinuances of proceedings. As for public prosecutors, there were 5 acquittals of disciplinary charges and 7 discharges from disciplinary punishment.

Q146 (2020): Data to: 31.12.2020

Q146 (2018): Data to: 31.12. 2018

Q146 (2017): There are 11587 active lawyers and 1496 inactive.

Q146 (2015): From the above mentioned number of lawyers there are 11011 active practising and 1289 temporary inactive.

Q146 (2013): In 2013, 10 255 lawyers are practicing in an active manner, while 1 141 lawyers discontinued their practicing.

Q147 (2016): There are no legal advisors (as decribed in the question above) in the Czech Republic.

Q148 (2016): There are no legal advisors (as decribed in the question 147) in the Czech Republic.

Denmark

Q046 (2017): The figures above show the numbers of appointed judges in the Danish judicial system. Thus, the figures also include the Court of Greenland, the High Court of Greenland and the court of the Faroe Islands.
Q046-2 (General Comment): We cannot answer this question by case type as all judges make decisions in all types of cases in Denmark.
Q052 (2020): -

Q052 (2019): information NA

Q052 (2017): "other non judge staff" - in 2017 there was no staff to fit into this category.

Q052 (2016): The 2016 data on the number of rechtspflegers is correct. The discrepancy that occurs compared to 2014 data is due to a mistake in the 2014 numbers.
Q052-1 (2020): -

Q055 (General Comment): The public prosecutors are the Director of Public Prosecutions, the state prosecutors, the police directors as well as the persons who are assumed to assist them in the judicial processing of criminal cases.
Organizationally, the Prosecution Service consists of the Director of Public Prosecutions and state prosecutor's offices (central prosecution service) with associated police districts (local prosecution service).
The Director of Public Prosecutions and selected employees appear before the Supreme Court. At the end of 2021, 58 prosecutors were employed at the Director of Public Prosecutions office. 6 of them appear before the Supreme Court. The Director of Public Prosecutions is superior to the other public prosecutors and supervises them and handles complaints about decisions made by the state prosecutors office as the first instance. The state prosecutors' offices appear before the high courts (second instance – court of appeal). The state prosecutors supervise the police directors' handling of criminal cases and handle complaints about decisions made by the police directors regarding criminal prosecution.
The directors of police and the public prosecutors who are employed by them appear before the district courts.
The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire. This is why the total number of prosecutors does not add up when compared to the number of males and females.

Q055 (2021): The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire. This is why the total number of prosecutors does not add up when compared to the number of males and females.

Q055 (2016): The observed discrepancies are due to ordinary changes in staffing.

Q055 (2014): The variations over the period 2012-2014 are due to the fact that in 2012, information was missing about prosecutors engaged in tasks concerning administrative cases (Ledelsessekretatiat) and prosecutors employed by the national police (Rigspolitiet).

Q060 (General Comment): In Denmark, the staff attached to the public prosecution service (non-public prosecutors) are shared between the police and the prosecution offices (first instance level).

Q060 (2021): The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire.

Q060 (2020): In 2020, lawyers and police personnel attached to the Prosecution Service are included in the figures.

Q060 (2018): The staff attached to the public prosecution service (non-public prosecutors) are shared between the police and the prosecution offices (first instance level).

Q132 (General Comment): We are not able to inform the net salary. The Danish tax system is progressive. That means that the percentage of tax depends on the income and the municipal tax varies from municipality to municipality.

Q132 (2021): The annual salaries are specified without pension. The annual salary for a Public prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate is specified based on the average salary for Senior Prosecutors, Special Prosecutors and the Deputy State Prosecutor at The Supreme Court Unit with the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Q144 (2021): Decorum

Q144 (2018): Of the two disciplinary proceedings mentioned regarding judges; one was against a judge and the other was against a deputy judge.
Of the five disciplinary proceedings mentioned regarding prosecutors as "other"; includes 3 breaches of personal data due to loss of documents / files (2) and loss of work computer (1) that was left in court by mistake. Furthermore, it includes incorrect registration of working hours (1) and unacceptable communication with co-workers and leader (1).

Q145 (2018): Of the two sanctions mentioned regarding judges; one was against a judge and the other was against a deputy judge.
Of the 9 sanctions mentioned regarind prosecturs as other: 2 cases are yet to be resolved. 7 cases were resolved by a meeting between Human Resources and the employee. The meetings were not a reprimand (disciplinary), however the importance of preventing a similar incident in the future was emphasized. The minutes of the respective meetings have been made part of the personal file of the individual employees.

Q145 (2016): Prosecutors: In the reference years, there have been two disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors, but there have not yet been any sanctions pronounced against public prosecutors.

Q146 (2021): The figures given above are the number of lawyers at the end of 2021.

Q146 (2013): The 2013 data corresponds to the statistical data for September 2014.

Q146 (2012): The 2012 data does not include assistant attorneys.

Q147 (2019): License to practice as an "advokat" is mandatory in Denmark.

Q148 (2019): This number include lawyers who have deposited their Danish license to practice as a lawyer. The number is limited to persons born after the 1st of October 1954. Please note that all lawyers have a degree in law (cand.jur), but to practice law in Denmark as an "advokat", lawyers need a license. Lawyers without a license are not included in the number.

Estonia

Q004 (2020): Inflation

Q004 (2018): There is no specific reason.

Q046 (2014): In 2014, one male judge left and a female judge was appointed.

Q046 (2012): In 2010, there were 3 female professional judges at the Supreme Court. At the beginning of 2012, one female judge became the judge representing Estonia in the European Human Rights Court.

Q046-2 (2020): In the first instance we don't have judges formally seperated as criminal or civil judges.

Q052 (2020): Trainees are not included in the numbers provided for Q52 and Q52-1.

Q052 (2019): Court interpreters are in the category "other non-judge staff".

Q052 (2018): Court interpreters are in the category "other non-judge staff".

Q052 (2017): The increase in the number of male staff in charge of administrative tasks is due to the general movement of personnel.
"Other non-judge staff": Court interpreters.

Q052 (2016): The observed variations in the numbers with regard to the different sub-categories are due to a general movement of staff.

In 2015, a reform of the Land Registry and Registration Department was carried out, during which the four districts were brought together registry and land registry departments to the Tartu County Court, thus establishing one land registry department and one registry office. The reform involved significant optimization of work processes and dossiers which resulted in the reduction of staff working in the registers. The objectives and results of the reform were largely achieved because registries are kept electronically, and individuals can largely interact with the registers, transmit and receive documents receive electronically.

Q052 (2015): The number of technical staff has been decreasing due to redundancies in the Registration and Land Registry Departments. The project of court lawyers was carried out having in mind that the Registration and Land Registry departments are fully digital. Therefore there is a possibility to decrease the number of technical staff.

Q052 (2014): A pilot project has been introduced in 2013 in one county court consisting in providing each judge with a personal legal assistant. After the first year of the pilot project, the average proceeding times in civil cases in that particular court dropped from 201 days to 160 days; after the second year the average proceeding times dropped further to 132 days. In 2015, the project has been extended to all first and second instance courts.

Q052 (2013): Since 2013, the second category includes a new position among court staff – judicial clerks. They assist judges in the administration of justice, participating in the preparation of court cases or in court proceedings. They replace step by step former consultants. There is one judicial clerk for every judge. In 2013, the reform was implemented in the largest court of general jurisdiction as a pilot (Harju County Court). In 2015,it was extended to all first and second instance courts.

Q052 (2012): The overall number of court staff has not changed much during the last years: 976 (2010), 957 (2012) and 990 (2013). Differences in figures in the sub-categories are due to the different categorization of court staff.

Q055 (General Comment): The categorization of questions 55 and 56 regarding public prosecutors do not exist in Estonia.

Q060 (2020): More males have been hired.

Q132 (2020): Since 2010 the salary of prosecutors depends of the salary of the President and is indexed by 1 April of each calendar year. In 2018 the salary system of public prosecutors changed and with that the smallest salaries increased the most.

Q132 (2019): Since 2010 the salary of prosecutors depends of the salary of the President and is indexed by 1 April of each calendar year. In 2018 the salary system of public prosecutors changed and with that the smallest salaries increased the most.

Q132 (2012): The salary of judges was increased on 1 January 2013.

Q133 (2012): On the occasion of the 2012 evaluation, it has been stressed that the salary of judges was increased on 1 January 2013. On the same time, the special pension was abolished for judges who are appointed to office after 30 June 2013, while judges appointed to office before 1 July 2013 retain their special pension.

Q145 (2012): In 2012, one disciplinary proceeding against a judge was initiated but the sanction was not pronounced in 2012.

Q148 (General Comment): Data on the number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court is not collected.

Finland

Q004 (General Comment): Source: Structure of Earnings, Statistics Finland
https://pxweb2.stat.fi/PxWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/StatFin__pra/
Q004 (2021): Preliminary information: salary in 2020 multiplied by the annual percentage change in the earnings level index 2021q4
Q004 (2020): In 2020, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3 595 per month.

Q004 (2019): In 2019, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3528 per month.

Q004 (2018): In 2018, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3465 per month. Correspondingly, the median was EUR 3079 per month. The most common monthly earnings of all full-time wage and salary earners was EUR 2600 per month.

Q046-2 (General Comment): We do not have statistic of the amount of the civil and/ or commercial and criminal judges in the general courts as in many courts judges work in both types of cases. In Market Court, there are 21 judges who are civil/commercial judges.
Q052 (General Comment): The Finnish court staff organisation does not correspond to the CEPEJ subcategories. Therefore, only the total of non-judge staff can be provided for the question 52. Office staff has tasks mentioned in the categories 2-5. Summoners' tasks are for example to serve summons, subpoenas and other documents. Trainee judges have the same responsibility as judges but they do not have competence to deal with difficult cases. They are always appointed for a fixed term period (one year). In the courts of appeal, the
administrative courts, the Supreme Court, the Supreme Administrative Court, the Labour Court and the Market Court a referendary prepares and presents a case to the judges but the final judgment is decided by the judges. The tasks of trainee judges and referendaries correspond to the categories 1 and 2.

Q052 (2021): The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1530, summoners 269, trainee district judges 131 and referendaries 278. 1. “Rechtspfleger (or similar bodies)”: The senior judge of a district court may appoint in writing a member of the office personnel at the district court who has given an affirmation corresponding to the judge’s affirmation, who has received sufficient training and who has sufficient skills to attend to the duties: (1) in cases referred to in Chapter 5, section 3 of the Code of Judicial Procedure: (a) to give judgments by default; (b) to give, on the basis of Chapter 21, section 8(c) of the Code of Judicial Procedure, decisions and judgments on court costs, if the respondent has conceded the claim; (c) to decide on the staying of an action if the plaintiff
has withdrawn the action and the respondent does not call for a decision in the case; (2) to decide on applications for divorce on the basis of section 25, subsection 1 of the Marriage Act (234/1929) if both spouses are domiciled in Finland. If the case to be decided by office personnel, as referred to in subsection 1, proves to be extensive, subject to interpretation or otherwise difficult to decide, the case shall be transferred for a decision of a notary or a legally trained judge at the district court. The chief judge of a district court may appoint in writing a member of the office personnel at the district court who has sufficient skills, to issue summons and certificates, to effect service of documents and to attend to other duties connected to the preparation, consideration or enforcement of administration of justice matters. Before taking such tasks the staff member must give an oath. (Courts Act, Chapter 19, Section 6).

Q052 (2020): The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1477, summoners/process serves 273, trainee district judges 137 and referendaries 275. 1. “Rechtspfleger (or similar bodies)”: The senior judge of a district court may appoint in writing a member of the office personnel at the district court who has given an affirmation corresponding to the judge’s affirmation, who has received sufficient training and who has sufficient skills to attend to the duties: (1) in cases referred to in Chapter 5, section 3 of the Code of Judicial Procedure: (a) to give judgments by default; (b) to give, on the basis of Chapter 21, section 8(c) of the Code of Judicial Procedure, decisions and judgments on court costs, if the respondent has conceded the claim; (c) to decide on the staying of an action if the plaintiff has withdrawn the action and the respondent does not call for a decision in the case; (2) to decide on applications for divorce on the basis of section 25, subsection 1 of the Marriage Act (234/1929) if both spouses are domiciled in Finland. If the case to be decided by office personnel, as referred to in subsection 1, proves to be extensive, subject to interpretation or otherwise difficult to decide, the case shall be transferred for a decision of a notary or a legally trained judge at the district court. The chief judge of a district court may appoint in writing a member of the office personnel at the district court who has sufficient skills, to issue summons and certificates, to effect service of documents and to attend to other duties connected to the preparation, consideration or enforcement of administration of justice matters. Before taking such tasks the staff member must give an oath. (Courts Act, Chapter 19, Section 6).

Q052 (2019): The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1455, summoners 267, trainee district judges 135 and referendaries 271

Q052 (2018): The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1435, summoners 263, trainee district judges 136 and referendaries 297.

Q052 (2017): Office staff 1440, summoners 263, trainee judges 122, referendaries 312

Q052 (2016): office staff 1473, summoners 248, trainee district judges 136, junior district judges 1, referendaries 312

Q052 (2015): office staff 1428, summoners 265, trainee district judges 138, junior district judges 5, referendaries 309

Q052 (2014): For the 2014 exercise the total of 2 161 subsumes 1 434 office staff, 266 summoners, 136 trainee district judges, 7 junior district judges and 318 referendaries.

Q052 (2013): For 2013, the total of 2 196 subsumes 1445 office staff, 265 summoners, 133 trainee district judges, 7 junior district judges, 346 referendaries.

Q052 (2012): For 2012, the total of 2 214 subsumes 1447 office staff, 264 summoners, 129 trainee district judges, 9 junior district judges, 365 referendaries.

Q055 (General Comment): The National Prosecution Authority comprises the Office of the Prosecutor General that acts as the general administrative unit, and five prosecution districts: Southern Finland, Western Finland, Northern Finland, Eastern Finland and Åland. The National Prosecution Authority has 34 offices around Finland. The Prosecutor General is the supreme prosecutor and the head of the prosecution service. The Prosecutor General directs and develops prosecutorial activity by issuing general instructions and guidelines to the prosecutors. She/he also appoints district prosecutors. The Prosecutor General may take over a case from a prosecutor, but cannot order a prosecutor to decide the case in any given manner. She/he can also self-decide on the bringing of charges and designate a prosecutor to pursue the case in the courts. The Deputy Prosecutor General decides the matters in his/her competence on the same authority as the Prosecutor General. He/she also acts as a deputy for the Prosecutor General when necessary. For regular prosecutorial tasks, the Office of the Prosecutor General has state prosecutors whose jurisdiction covers the entire country. Most criminal matters (89 256 cases annually) are dealt with by the prosecution areas. The Office of the Prosecutor General deals mainly with criminal cases with wider significance to society as a whole, a few dozen every year. Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances, and every prosecutor is expected to, in a normal situation, to handle and prosecute the criminal case all the way to the Supreme Court, if needed.

Q055 (2020): Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

Q060 (2021): In 2021, more staff was hired.

Q060 (2018): More staff has been recruited.
The number of males has increased.

Q132 (General Comment): In Finland, there are several salary categories for judges. The salary depends also on the years of work experience. At the end of 2021 first instance judge is in a salary category T11 in which the gross salary is from 4847,68 €/month to 6301,98€/month depending on his/her experience. A permanent first instance judge has usually at least nine years of work experience which means the salary is 5918,33 €/month. In Finland, the taxation is progressive so the information on net salary varies from person to person and is not available. Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

Q132 (2020): Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

Q132 (2016): In Finland there are several salary categories for judges. The slary depends also on the experience. A first instance judge has a category of T 11 for which the gross salary is from 4501,79 €/month to 5627,24 €/month depending on his/her experience. A permanent 1st instance judge has usually at least 9 years experience which means the salary is 5177,06 €/month. In Finland we have progressive taxation so the information on net salary is not available.

Q144 (General Comment): In Finland, anyone who suspects that a public authority or an official has not observed the law or failed to perform a duty may file a complaint with the Ombudsman or with the Chancellor of Justice. Anyone can complain in a matter concerning themself, but a complaint can also be made on behalf of someone else. Most of the complaints initiating disciplinary proceedings do not call for any action. Accordingly, there is a considerable difference between the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings and the number of sanctions.

Q144 (2021): Judges: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office registered 254 new proceedings. However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently. Cases that relate to, for example, tax cases in administrative courts, dept recovery proceedings in the district courts, cases in Insurance Court and land cases are filed under the relevant substance matter and not court cases. Therefore, the Ombudsman handles more court related cases that it statistically looks. The Chancellor of Justice received 237 complaints against the general courts, 50 against the administrative courts and 19 against the specialist courts. So in total he received 306 complaints. He also randomly checked 3 930 criminal judgments, out of which 65 were looked at more closely. In addition, he received 31 notifications of suspected crime in office related to a judge. In addition, on his own initiative, he looked into 2 cases related to conduct of the court. Prosecutors: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office registered 107 new proceedings in 2021. However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently and some cases that relate also to prosecutors are filed under the police or court cases. Chancellor of Justice received 85 complaints against the prosecutors in 2021.

Q144 (2020): Judges: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office registered 257 new proceedings. However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently. Cases that relate to, for example, tax cases in administrative courts, dept recovery proceedings in the district courts, cases in Insurance Court and land cases are filed under the relevant substance matter and not court cases. Therefore, the Ombudsman handles more court related cases that it statistically looks. The Chancellor of Justice received 274 complaints against the general courts, 67 against the administrative courts and 19 against the specialist courts. So in total he received 360 complaints. He also randomly checked 3 106 criminal judgments, out of which 43 were looked at more closely. In addition, he received 55 notification of suspected crime in office related to a judge. Prosecutors: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office registered 96 new proceedings. However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently and some cases that relate also to prosecutors are filed under the police or court cases.
Chancellor of Justice received 163 complaints against the prosecutors.

Q144 (2018): The Parliamentary Ombudsman initiated 199 disciplinary proceedings against judges and the Chancellor of Justice 466 (out of which 356 complaints, 80 disciplinary proceedings initiated after randomly checking criminal judgments and 30 notifications from the police and the courts of appeal to the Chancellor of Justice regarding suspected criminal offences committed by judges). The category 'criminal offence' includes notifications from the police and the courts of appeal to the Chancellor of Justice regarding suspected criminal offences committed by judges. The category 'other' includes all the other cases for which exact data on which grounds they were initiated is not available.
The Parliamentary Ombudsman initiated 47 disciplinary proceedings against prosecutors , The Chancellor of Justice 101 and the Office of the Prosecutor General 37.

Q144 (2016): The number of initiated cases was 737 from which 30 was criminal offence. The category other includes all the other cases for which exact data on what ground they ware initiated is not available. Among the 737 disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges or courts, 404 were before the Chancellor of Justice and 333 before the Parliamentary Ombudsman. However, the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was: the Chancellor of Justice: 10, the Parliamentary Ombudsman: 10. In most of the cases no measure is taken.
Total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors were 165 (The Chancellor of Justice: 91, the Parliamentary Ombudsman: 72, the Prosecutor General: 2) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was (The Chancellor of Justice: 5, the Parliamentary Ombudsman: 4, the Prosecutor General: 2) . In most of the cases no measure is taken.

Q144 (2014): In 2014, the total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges or courts were 620 (376 by the Chancellor of Justice; 244 by the Parliamentary Ombudsman) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was 28. Likewise, the total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors was 160 (86 by the Chancellor of Justice; 74 by the Parliamentary Ombudsman) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was 7.

Q144 (2012): In 2012, the total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges or courts were 642 (372 by the Chancellor of Justice; 270 by the Parliamentary Ombudsman) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was 13. Likewise, the total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors was 173 (87 by the Chancellor of Justice; 786 by the Parliamentary Ombudsman) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was 4.

Q145 (General Comment): Most of the complaints initiating disciplinary proceedings do not call for any action. Accordingly, there is a considerable difference between the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings and the number of sanctions.

Q145 (2021): Judges: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office gave 283 decisions in 2021. Ombudsman has issued a decision with his position on the matter as well as the steps to be taken in 11 cases. One of those was a reprimand and 9 were opinion which can be either guidance (ohjaava) or reprehension (moittiva). In addition, 1 case lead to rectification (korjaus). However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently. Cases that relate to, for example, tax cases in administrative courts, dept recovery proceedings in the district courts, cases in Insurance Court and land cases are filed under the relevant substance matter and not court cases. Therefore, the Ombudsman handles more court related cases that it statistically looks. The Chancellor of Justice issued 33 reprimands and 49 instructions. In six cases he applied the Supreme Court to nullify a decision.
Prosecutors:The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office gave 105 decisions in 2021. Ombudsman has issued a decision with his position on the matter as well as the steps to be taken in 2 cases. Those were guidance (ohjaava).
Chancellor of Justice issued 2 reprimands and 1 other action. The Office of the Prosecutor General publishes summary descriptions of cases where the decision taken by a prosecutor or their action has resulted the Prosecutor General to take action. In 2021 there were 20 of such published cases. More here (in Finnish):
https://syyttajalaitos.fi/kanteluratkaisuja?tab=2020

Q145 (2020): Judges:
The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office gave 228 decisions. Ombudsman has issued a decision with his position on the matter as well as the steps to be taken in 16 cases. 12 of those were guidance (ohjaava) or reprehension (moittiva). In 2 cases he gave a recommendation (esitys) and 2 cases lead to other action (muu toimenpide). However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently. Cases that relate to, for example, tax cases in administrative courts, dept recovery proceedings in the district courts, cases in Insurance Court and land cases are filed under the relevant substance matter and not court cases. Therefore, the Ombudsman handles more court related cases that it statistically looks. Chancellor of Justice issued 22 reprimands and 29 instructions. In six cases he applied the Supreme Court to nullify a decision. He notified the Ombudsman of 14 cases concerning the courts.
Prosecutors:
The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office gave 98 decisions. Ombudsman has issued a decision with his position on the matter as well as the steps to be taken in 5 cases. Those were guidance (ohjaava) or reprehension (moittiva).
Chancellor of Justice issued 3 reprimands and 13 instructions. He transferred 1 case to the Ombudsman.
The Office of the Prosecutor General publishes summary descriptions of cases where the decision taken by a prosecutor or their action has resulted the Prosecutor General to take action. In 2020 there were 30 of such published cases. More here (in Finnish): https://syyttajalaitos.fi/kanteluratkaisuja?tab=2020

Q145 (2018): The Parliamentary Ombudsman pronounced 11 sanctions against judges and the Chancellor of Justice 36.
The Parliamentary Ombudsman pronounced 4 sanctions against prosecutors, the Chancellor of Justice 3 and the Office of the Prosecutor General 5.

Q146 (General Comment): As of 2014, only attorneys-at-law, public legal aid lawyers and licenced legal counsels are allowed to represent a client in court. In addition, in-house lawyers can represent their company in court. Lawyers working for trade unions can represent a client in a district court and in the Labour Court in disputes regarding employment relationship. Lawyers working for public authorities can represent the public authority in court.
In order to qualify as an attorney-at-law, a lawyer needs to have at least four years of work experience and must pass the demanding three-part professional qualification test known as the bar examination. The titles of attorney-at-law and attorney's office are protected by law and can only be used by lawyers accepted into the Finnish Bar Association. Attorney's offices employ also associate lawyers, that is lawyers who are not yet members of the bar.

Q146 (2021): The total number of lawyers includes 2230 attorneys-at-law, 1738 licensed legal counsels and 205 public legal aid lawyers. These lawyers can represent a client in court. The title of attorney-at-law is protected by law and can only be used by lawyers accepted into the Finnish Bar Association.
The total number of in-house lawyers, trade union lawyers and lawyers working for public authorities is not available.

Q146 (2020): In 2020, the total number of lawyers includes 2211 attorneys-at-law, 1664 licensed legal counsels and 212 public legal aid lawyers. These lawyers can represent a client in court. The title of attorney-at-law is protected by law and can only be used by lawyers accepted into the Finnish Bar Association.
The total number of in-house lawyers, trade union lawyers and lawyers working for public authorities is not available.

Q146 (2019): It is estimated that there are 16.000 people with law degree in Finland – it is no possible to provide an exact number of "legal advisors".
Approx. 4.000 lawyers can represent their clients in Court. These consist of 1631 licensed legal councels, 2177 members of the Finnish Bar Association (attorneys-at-law) and 214 public legal assistants in state legal aid offices.
The Finnish Bar Association states that 66% are men and 34% women. However, 52% of their new members are women.

Q146 (2018): In 2018, the total number of 3965 lawyers includes 2143 attorneys-at-law, 1603 licensed legal counsels and 219 public legal aid lawyers. These lawyers can represent a client in court. The title of attorney-at-law is protected by law and can only be used by lawyers accepted into the Finnish Bar Association.
In addition, in-house lawyers can represent their company in court. Lawyers working for trade unions can represent a client in a district court and in the Labour Court in disputes regarding employment relationship. Lawyers working for public authorities can represent the public authority in court. The total number of these in-house lawyers, trade union lawyers and lawyers working for public authorities is not available.

Q146 (2017): The total number of lawyers 3,846 includes 2,137 members of the Finnish Bar Association, 1,588 licensed lawyers and 228 public legal aid lawyers. 107 legal aid lawyers were also members of the Finnish Bar Association.

Q146 (2016): The number of lawyers indicated for 2012, 2013 and 2014 refers to members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional titles advokat (advocate). Law firms (firms owned by members of the Bar) employ also associates. Besides, legal aid offices employ also legal advisers who are not all members of the Bar Association. Till 2014, jurists (persons who have a Master's Degree in law) could offer similar legal services than members of the Bar. From the beginning of the year 2014, only advocates, public legal aid attorneys and counsels who have obtained the license referred to in the Licensed Counsel Act are allowed to represent a client in the court.
In 2016,the total number of lawyers 3,791 includes 2,119 members of the Finnish Bar Association, 1,540 licensed lawyers and 229 public legal aid lawyers (97 public legal aid lawyers are also members of the Finnish Bar Association). Only members of the Finnish Bar Association are entitled to use the professional title "advocate".

Q147 (2019): The Association of Finnish Lawyers, which is the only association in Finland for all lawyers, has approximately 16.000 members. 55% of their lawyer members are women, and 57% of the student members are women. (https://www.lakimiesliitto.fi/liitto/jasenet/)
Q148 (2018): The exact number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court is not available.

France

Q004 (2021): The exact data are 37 742,7

Q004 (2020): The exact figure is 34,494.5_x000D_
Source INSEE
Q046 (2021): Data taken from an extraction of the LOLFI SIRH - Number of professional judges on 31/12/2021. The values are expressed in FTEs. Source DSJ
Administrative justice data: 1. total number of professional judges at first instance: 899(463 men, 436 women); 2) Number of professional judges in the courts of appeal (2nd instance): 304 (163 men, 141 women); 3. number of professional judges in the Supreme courts: 128 (81 men, 47 women). 1+2+3. Total number of professional judges: total 1331 (707 men, 624 women).
The figures are expressed in physical numbers as at 31/12/2021. The members of the National Court of Asylum (CNDA) and the Paid Parking Litigation Commission (Commission du contentieux du stationnement payant) are counted under the first instance.
Source: Council of State
The gender distribution is based on the number available in FTE for all professional judges except for administrative judges for whom the distribution is available in FTE only for the total.

Q046 (2020): "Here are the details:
With respect to the judiciary. The data are expressed in full-time equivalent. These figures concern only judges (and not paralegals) who sit in court (magistrates seconded to the central administration are not counted). In the table above, the figures have been rounded up when the decimal is greater than or equal to 0.5:
Total number of professional judges: total 6177.9; men 1725.5; women 4452.4
1. Number of first instance professional judges: total 4378.6; men 1133.7; women 3244.9
2. Number of second instance professional judges : total 1577.8; men 503.8; women 1074
3. Number of Supreme Court professional judges : total 221.5; men 88; women 133.5
Source: LSB
For the administrative order, the data include the National Court of Asylum (CNDA) and the Commission du contentieux du stationnement payant (CCSP). In FTE, only the total is available. The detail in physical staff is as follows:
Total number of professional judges: total 1357; men 727; women 630
1. Number of first instance professional judges : total 920; men 487; women 433
2. Number of second instance professional judges : total 306; men 156; women 150
3. Number of Suprem Court professional judges : total 131; men 84; women 47
Source: EC
"

Q046 (2019): Data are presented in full time equivalent, part-time employees being counted, which explains the possible horizontal and vertical inconsistencies in the table. For information: number of judges from civil society (first instance): Total: 19,002 (489 temporary judges (MTT) + 13,277 labor judges (conseillers prud'hommes ((CPH) + 1,832 Assessors of the Social Centres (APS) + 3,404 Consular Judges of the Commercial Courts (JC) Men: 11,249 (243 MTT + 6,902 CPH + 1,294 APS + 2,810 JC); Women: 7,753 (246 MTT + 6375 CPH + 538 APS + 594 JC). Source: LOLFI. Number of judges on duty in the courts.
The data do not encompass "public prosecutors and their staff". All judges in courts are counted, including presidents of courts, as the latter perform judges' duties.

Q046 (2018): With regard to administrative justice, in 2018, it should be noted that the number of judges sitting in specialised courts increased due to the very sharp increase in the number of appeals to the National Court of Asylum (CNDA) and the creation of the Commission du contentieux du stationnement payant (CCSP).
In the area of judicial justice, the increase is due to the filling of vacancies in the courts and the decrease in the number of departures of judges.
Q046 (2014): The 2014 data on number of judges of courts of law subsumes also the presidents appointed by 31 December 2014.
Q046 (2013): In 2013, in first instance, there are 161 presidents of ordinary courts of law and 42 presidents of administrative courts. In second instance, there are 37 first presidents of courts of law and 8 presidents of administrative courts. They are encompassed in the indicated figures. However, presidents of administrative courts of appeal are not included (being members of the State Council, they are included within the number of Supreme court judges).

Q046 (2012): The 2012 data is expressed in FTE, for positions actually filled on 31 December 2012 within courts of law and administrative courts. For the latter, data in FTE concerning the distribution between men and women is not available. Out of the 1377 first instance and appeal judges, there are 816 men and 561 women. Data on men-women distribution for the State Council is not available in FTE: there were 105 men and 47 women. For courts of law, there were in FTE: total: 5771 FTE (2066 men/3705 women); first instance professional judges (1326 men/2804 women); appeal court professional judges (622 men/795 women); Supreme court professional judges (118 men/106 women).The State Council used different calculation methods for 2010 and 2012.

Q046-2 (2021): Non-specialised judges, who account for approximately 45% of the staff of the civil and criminal courts, are required to work in both criminal and civil matters. As a result, the distribution between the different types of litigation is not quantifiable, as these assignments fall within the organisational powers of the head of court.
Similarly, certain specialised judges (juvenile judges and liberty and custody judges) are also likely to intervene in both civil and criminal cases due to their areas of competence.
Source DSJ. Data have been rounded up from 0.5, down below. Source: Council of State for the administrative part (data have been rounded).

Q046-2 (2020): "The distinction by type of case is not possible in the justice of the judicial order.
Note: the distribution of the processing of civil and criminal cases within the tribunals and courts, which depends on the organization of the jurisdictions, does not allow us to fill in this table. For the administrative courts, the FTEs have been rounded up. The precise non-rounded data can be made available if necessary. "
Q052 (General Comment): "Other non-judge staff" refers to legal assistants and specialised assistants who do not work for the public prosecution service. For the other subcategories (2, 3 and 4) it is not possible to distinguish between staff working for the courts and those working for the public prosecution services.

Q052 (2021): Concerning the total of 22 115, it should be noted that this figure includes 597 legal assistants and specialised assistants working for the courts and 939 contractual staff recruited in the framework of local justice. The "other non-judge staff" correspond to legal assistants and specialised assistants who do not work for the prosecution services. The category "non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars" includes the category B contractual staff recruited under the support plan for justice implemented since the second half of 2020 on the sole basis of Article 7 bis of Law No. 84-16 of 11 January 1984 on the statutory provisions relating to the State civil service, created by the law on the transformation of the civil service of 6 August 2019, which institutes the project contract. These contractual employees are recruited for three years. The significant increase in the number of these contractual staff (240 more than in 2020), combined with the increase in the number of court clerks (+221 compared to last year) and the increase in the number of other non-judge staff (+210 compared to last year), contributes to the increase in the overall figures communicated for the year 2021. As on 31 December 2021, 1 666 category A and B staff (including 1 383 women) were undergoing initial training at the “École nationale des greffes”, most of them on practical training in the courts. These staff will join the courts in 2022 or 2023, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and the regional administrative services.
Source DSJ

Q052 (2020): "Non-judge staff" correspond to legal assistants and specialized assistants who do not work for the prosecution service. Unlike in previous years, this distinction could be made for the numbers in 2020, which explains the decrease in the figures provided compared to the previous year. The category "Non-judicial staff responsible for assisting judges, like registrars" includes the category B contractual employees recruited under the plan to support justice, implemented since the second half of 2020 on the sole basis of article 7bis of the law n°84-16 of January 11, 1984, concerning statutory provisions relating to the State civil service, created by the law on the transformation of the civil service of August 6, 2019, instituting the project contract. These contract employees are hired for 3 years.
As of 12/31/2020, 1,699 category A and B agents (including 1,388 women) were undergoing initial training at the National School of Clerks, most of whom were on practical training in the courts. These personnel will join the courts during 2021 or 2022, which will significantly increase the number of agents working in the courts and regional administrative services.
The data compiles data from the judicial and administrative justice systems. Interns are not included. "

Q052 (2019): As of 31/12/2019, 1,693 category A and B staff (including 1,408 women) were undergoing initial training at the “Ecole nationale des greffes”, most of them on practical training courses in the courts. These staff will join the courts in 2020 or 2021, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative departments.
Other non-judge staff includes specialised assistants (106, 48 men and 58 women) and legal assistants (422, 93 men and 329 women) working in the civil and criminal courts. The increase in the number of legal assistants between 2018 and 2019 is due to the creation of new budgetary posts obtained.

Q052 (2018): With the exception of heading 5 "Other non-judge staff", the distinction between staff attached to judges and staff attached to prosecutors is not possible
At the date of 31/12/2018, 1,173 category A and B staff (including 1,003 women) were in initial training at the National School of Registries, most of whom were on practical training in the courts. These staff will join the courts in 2019 or 2020, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative services.
"Other non-judge staff" includes specialised assistants and assistant lawyers who assist non-judge prosecutors in their duties.
The detail by function and gender is as follows:
Categories Total Male Female
Specialized assistants 23 13 10 10
Assistant lawyers 245 53 192
Total 268 66 202

Q052 (2017): The distinction between staff attached to judges and staff attached to prosecutors is not possible. Namely, the sub-category 2 encompasses specialised assistants (31) and assistant lawyers (242), who assist civil and penal judges or prosecutors in the preparation of case files.
Q052 (2016): No distinction is possible between staff attached to courts and staff attached to public prosecution services. The category “Other non-judge staff” refers to specialized assistants (18) and legal assistants (111) who work in civil and penal courts.
Q052 (2015): It should be noted that as of 31 December 2015, 1013 categories A and B staff (including 886 women) were in initial training at the Ecole nationale des greffes (French National School for Registrars), most of them in practical training in courts. This high volume of staff has joined the courts in 2016 or will do so in 2017, which will increase the number of staff actually working in the courts and regional administrative offices.

The distinction between staff in charge of assisting judges and staff in charge of assisting prosecutors is not possible. The latter are therefore part of the figures provided.

Q052 (2013): The 2013 data encompasses non-judge staff appointed to judges and public prosecutors. On 31 December 2013, 1064 agents were in initial training. They joined courts of law in 2014 or will do in 2015. Among the 21946 non-judge staff, 1911 were appointed to administrative courts. The 274 agents of the State Council counted in 2012 were appointed to a support function and are therefore excluded from the 2013 figures. The size of the litigation section of the State Council represents 87 FET. The staff of the National Court for asylum right has also been taken into account in categories 2, 3 and 4 for a total of 325 FET (not counted until 2013). In 2013, the State Council distributed non-judge staff which was before included in the category "other" in the proposed categories.

Q052 (2012): On 31 December 2012, 1039 staff were in initial training at the National School for Registrars, most of them in practical training in courts. They joined the tribunals in 2013 or will do so by 2014, which will increase the number of agents actually in office in courts and regional administrative services. Data pertaining to administrative courts is classified within the category "other" because of the versatility of their staff (1,505.5 FTE). As for the State Council, the number in FTE of the non-judge staff is 274.

Q052-1 (2021): It has not been possible to exclude the legal assistants and specialised assistants working for the public prosecution services for the breakdown of the data provided in the table above (359 in total for the First instance courts, Courts of appeal and Supreme courts, at national level). Also included in these numbers are the 'justice de proximité' contract staff whose recruitment has been authorised from 2020 onwards on the basis of the project contract (see comment of Q52). On the other hand, staff working in the SAR are excluded (contrary to Q52), i.e. 1 766 staff.
Source DSJ

Q055 (2021): Data taken from an extraction of the LOLFI SIRH - Number of public prosecutors on 31/12/2021. The values are expressed in FTEs.
Source DSJ
The data have been rounded upwards from 0.5 and downwards below, with the exception of the data relating to the number of male prosecutors at the Courts of appeal (the exact figure is 249.6) in order to ensure vertical consistency.

Q055 (2020): Only the judicial order is concerned

Q055 (2014): For 2014, State prosecutors, heads of public prosecution services, are included.

Q055 (2012): For 2012, only prosecutors of courts of law appointed by 31 December 2012 were counted.

Q060 (2021): 359 = legal assistants and specialised assistants
Source DSJ

Q060 (2016): It should be recalled that court staff are assigned to the services of judges and public prosecutors, and details of this breakdown are not available. For very specific staff, the data are nevertheless known: 60 specialised assistants and 49 legal assistants.

Q060 (2014): Staff assisting the public prosecution office are comprised in the whole of the registry staff under the direction of a registry director. The latter works closely with the chairman of the court and the public prosecutor at the court. Therefore, data on staff of the public prosecution office are, to this date, indistinct from those of court staff (question 52). Moreover, some very specialised public prosecution services can be assigned to specialised assistants, sometimes from other jurisdictions, to help them deal with the most complex proceedings. These specialised assistants are at number 44 (including 23 women) in 2014.

Q132 (General Comment): First-instance professional judge (civil and criminal courts) at the beginning of his/her career: judge at the 3rd step of the second grade - lump-sum compensation: 35% - flexible bonus 12%.
Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career: prosecutor of the Public Prosecutor's Office at the 3rd step of the second grade - lump-sum compensation: 38% - flexible bonus 12%.
Judge of the Court of Cassation: President of Chamber CC (F: 1369) - flexible bonus 14%.
Prosecutor at the Court of Cassation: First Advocate General CC (F: 1369) - flexible bonus 14%.

Q132 (2021): The data filled in the table are those of the civil and criminal justice, source DSJ.
Concerning the administrative justice, the data are as follows: professional judge of first instance, beginning of career: 50 200, 41 300; judge of the Supreme court or of the last instance of appeal: 95 100, 76 900. Source – Council of State

Q132 (2020): "The completed table concerns only magistrates of the judicial order.
For the administrative order: -gross annual salary in euros of a professional judge of 1st instance at the beginning of his career: 47,100 euros
-gross annual salary in euros of a Supreme Court judge: 94,000 euros
-net annual salary in euros of a professional judge of first instance at the beginning of his career: 38,700 euros
-net annual salary in euros of a supreme court judge: 76,000 euros.
sources DSJ and CE."

Q132 (2014): In 2014, the annual gross salary of administrative judges was 42,615€ and the annual net salary was 36,318€. At the State Council, the annual gross salary was 108,881€.

Q133 (2020): Pursuant to the provisions of the order of April 5, 2017, establishing the lists of functions of the State services of the Ministry of Justice provided for in Articles R. 2124-65 and R. 2124-68 of the General Code of the Property of Public Persons that may give rise to the granting of a concession of housing by absolute necessity of service or of a precarious occupation agreement with penalty, certain heads of courts and jurisdictions benefit from a precarious occupation agreement with penalty._x000D_
A fee is charged to the beneficiary of this agreement. It is equal to 50% of the real rental value of the occupied premises._x000D_

Q144 (2021): The data filled in the table are those of the civil, criminal and administrative justice.
Source: DSJ and Council of State
Q144 (2020): Four of these magistrates have been the subject of a procedure of prohibition from exercising their functions (precautionary procedure taken in the interest of the service)_x000D_
Data from the judicial order.
Q144 (2014): In 2014, with regard to administrative judges, there was an ethical misconduct (counted in the table).

Q145 (General Comment): Suspension ("temporary ban on performing duties") is a temporary measure, pronounced in case of emergency. It is a measure taken in the interest of the service and is not a sanction as such. It is intended to be followed by a decision on the merits of the case, concerning the disciplinary fault found.

Q145 (2021): The data filled in the table are those of the civil, criminal and administrative justice.
Source: DSJ and Council of State
Q145 (2020): The disciplinary sanctions applicable to magistrates are: 1° a reprimand with entry in the file; 2° compulsory removal; 3° removal from certain functions; 3° bis prohibition from being appointed or designated as a single judge for a maximum of five years; 4° lowering of step; 4° bis Temporary exclusion from office for a maximum of one year, with total or partial deprivation of salary; 5° Demotion; 6° Automatic retirement or admission to cease his or her duties when the judge is not entitled to a retirement pension; 7° Removal from office._x000D_
Other prosecutor: compulsory retirement_x000D_
Other judge: refusal of honorary status_x000D_
NB: in France, geographical transfer can be combined with another sanction and this was done on 3 occasions in 2020._x000D_
Data from the judicial order

Q145 (2014): In 2014, the category "others" includes temporary exclusion from functions without pay for an administrative judge and two "admissions to leave office", sentence close to dismissal.
There is a difference between the number of disciplinary proceedings initiated and the number of sanctions imposed because of procedural delays. Indeed, sanctions are not necessarily imposed the year of referral to the disciplinary body.

Q145 (2012): In 2012, another sanction imposed on a public prosecutor is the sanction of "denial of honorary", sanction applicable against retired judges at the time of the disciplinary decision. The disparity between the number of disciplinary proceedings and the number of penalties imposed results in the absence of obligation on the HJC to rule in the year of referral. It should be noted that in 2012, the Minister of Justice withdrew its request for disciplinary proceedings in a case against a judge.
Q146 (2021): Source DACS

Q146 (2020): source DACS

Q146 (2018): data at the date of 1st of January 2018

Q146 (2017): Data as at 1 January 2018

Q146 (2016): data as at 1 January 2017

Q146 (2014): The 2014 data refers to the number of lawyers on 1 January 2015.

Q146 (2012): The 2012 data reflects the number of lawyers in January 2012.

Q147 (2019): This category does not exist. The profession of legal adviser was integrated into the legal profession by the law of 31 December 1990. The activity of legal advice is open to certain professionals by virtue of their status but also to other professionals after an approval has been issued by the Ministry of Justice.
Q148 (2021): Source DACS

Q148 (2018): There is no regulated profession in France for lawyers who cannot represent clients in court.

Germany

Q004 (2021): The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 49 202 EUR)
Special payments are any payments outside of the regular remuneration. Typical examples of such payments are Christmas bonuses/end-of-the year bonuses, holiday bonuses, payments for jubilees, bonuses for the fulfilment of target agreements.

Q004 (2020): figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time

Q004 (2019): With regard to this question, no data are available for 2019. The data from 2018 have therefore been included.

Q004 (2018): With regard to this question, no data are available for 2018. The data from 2017 have therefore been included.

Q004 (2016): The circumstances have changed since the last campaign

Q046 (General Comment): 1. There is a "court-staff statistic" ("Personalbestand") of the Länder that reports the number of judges in full-time equivalent as of 31 December of the reference year. This statistic also shows the number of female judges but it is not possible to allocate the judges to the different instances/stages of appeal. This statistic does not include the judges at the Federal Courts ("Supreme Courts").
2. The "staff-assignment statistics" ("Personalverwendung") of the Länder basically reports the average number of personnel actually deployed during the reference year (full-time equivalent). For example, employees who were not present for more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training are excluded. The staff- assignment statistic offers the possibility to allocate the judges to the different instances but it does not show the number of female judges. It does not include the Federal judges either.
3. The "judiciary-staff statistic" ("Richterstatistik") combines the number of the judges of the Länder from statistic No 1 (court staff statistic) with the number of judges at the Federal Courts (full-time equivalent as of 31 December 2020). This statistic is not published every year but every two years. It differentiates between the judges of the Länder and the judges of the Federal Courts (highest instance) and includes the number of female judges.
Regarding Q46 the figures under "1. Number of first instance professional judges" and "2. Number of second instance (court of appeal) professional judges" were taken from statistic No 2 (staff-assignment) because statistic No 1 does not offer the possibility to allocate personnel to the different instances. The figures under "3. Number of Supreme Court professional judges" were taken from statistic No 3 because the Federal judges only appear in that statistic. "Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
These numbers will not be reflected directly in the answers to Q 46, because the figures represent the average value of the actual personnel deployed during the reference year (in full-time equivalents).
It should also be noted that one of goals of the ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’ is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

Q046 (2021): 1. and 2.: Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder. It is derived from a complex calculation key as an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training). The staff-assignment statistics do not distinguish between male and female jugdes. The "regular" court-staff statistics of the Länder distinguish between "total" and "female" but do not allow for a diffentiation between the instances. According to the regular court-staff statistics as of 31 December 2021 there were 22 006 judges in total, 10 626 female and 11 380 male (full-time equivalents).
3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in full time equivalents as of 31 December 2020. The number of judges at the Federal Courts is published every second year (see General Comment).

Q046 (2020): 46.1 and 46.2: Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder. It is derived from a complex calculation key as an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training). The staff-assignment statistics do not distinguish between male and female jugdes. The "regular" court-staff statistics of the Länder distinguish between "total" and "female" but do not allow for a diffentiation between the instances. According to the regular court-staff statistics as of 31 December 2020 there were 21.944 judges in total, 10.418 female and 11.526 male (full-time equivalents)
46.3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in full time equivalents as of 31 December 2020.
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a 'Pact for the Rule of Law'. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
These numbers will not be reflected directly in the data given above, because the figures represent the average value of the actual personnel deployed during the reference year (in full-time equivalents).
It should also be noted that one of goals of the 'Pact for the Rule of Law' is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

Q046 (2019): The number of supreme court professional judges is based on judicial statistics. These data are collected and collated every two years (last updated 31/12/2018).
Q046 (2018): The number of supreme court professional judges is based on judicial statistics. These data are collected and collated every two years (last updated 31/12/2018).
Q046 (2017): Comment - Please provide any useful comment for interpreting the data above: The information provided counts the number of full-time equivalent staff. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons making up this staff. A judge working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). A judge working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for a judge working half the usual number of hours). Re 1 and 2: Information based on staffing overviews. These data are ascertained according to a complex calculation mechanism as an annual average of the actual personnel deployed (for example: minus the number of staff absent for more than 20 working days in a single quarter for reasons other
than vacation and/or further-training). Re 3: The number of supreme court professional judges is based on judicial statistics. These data
are collected and collated every two years (last updated 31/12/2016).

Q046 (2016): The information provided counts the number of full-time equivalent staff. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons making up this staff. A judge working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). A judge working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for a judge working half the usual number of hours). Re 1 and 2: Information based on staffing overviews. These data are ascertained according to a complex calculation mechanism as an annual average of the actual personnel deployed (for example: minus the number of staff absent for more than 20 working days in a single quarter for reasons other than vacation and/or further-training). Re 3: The number of supreme court professional judges is based on judicial statistics. These data are collected and collated every two years (last updated 31/12/2016).

Q046 (2015): The data refer to the year 2014. At present, no more recent data are available.

Sources: Federal Office of Justice (Bundesamt für Justiz), Schöffenstatistik (statistical information on lay judges) as per 31 December 2014 as well as information provided by the Federal Länder

Q046-2 (2021): "Other" includes: familiy cases (at the Local and Higher Regional Courts), cases at the Labour Courts, Social courts, Finance courts
"First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder. It is derived from a complex calculation key as an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training).
"Surpreme Court": the figures are taken from the court-staff statistics and represent the number (FTE) of judges at the Federal Courts (Federal Court of Justice, Federal Patent Court, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Finance Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court, Federal Consitutional Court, Military Disciplinary Courts) as of 31. December 2020. The statistic is published every second year. It shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (152) but includes no information on their assignment to civil or criminal cases. According to the website of the Federal Court of Justice, there are currently 113 judges (headcount) assigned to the civil panels and 46 to the criminal panels.

Q046-2 (2020): "Other" includes: familiy cases (at the Local and Higher Regional Courts), cases at the Labour Courts, Social courts, Finance courts
"First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder. It is derived from a complex calculation key as an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training).
"Surpreme Court": the figures are taken from the court-staff statistics and represent the number (FTE) of judges at the Federal Courts (Federal Court of Justice, Federal Patent Court, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Finance Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court, Federal Consitutional Court, Military Disciplinary Courts) as of 31. December 2020. The statistic shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (152) but includes no information on their assignment to civil or criminal cases. According to the website of the Federal Court of Justice, there are currently 114 judges (headcount) assigned to the civil panels and 47 to the criminal panels.
Slight horizontal and vertical inconsistencies are caused by rounding.

Q052 (General Comment): Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder and represents an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training). The staff-assignment statistics do not distinguish between male and female staff.

Q052 (2021): These figures denote the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel

Q052 (2020): These figures denote the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel

Q052 (2019): These figures denote the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel

Q052 (2017): This figures denotes the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel

Q052 (2016): This figures denotes the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel
Comments:
These are personnel-deployment figures denoting the number of full-time equivalent employees not exercising judicial office. Personnel-deployment figures are not collected according to reference date. Instead, an annual average is calculated over four quarters. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons making up this staff. An employee working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). An employee working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for an employee working half the usual number of hours). Figures for the federal courts are not included.

Q052 (2014): The 2013 and 2014 data are the same due to the impossibility to obtain data for 2014. The trend observed since 2010 reveals stable figures.
Q052-1 (2021): Unlike in the case of judges (question 46), non-judge staff are not allocated to individual instances in the staff-assignment statistics of the Länder.
Q052-1 (2020): Unlike in the case of judges (question 46), non-judge staff are not allocated to individual instances in the staff-assignment statistics of the Länder.
Q052-1 (2018): Differentiating non-judge staff at first and second instance level based on their gender is not possible since the ordinary court system in Germany consists of three instances (local courts, regional courts and higher regional courts). At the same time, regional courts function as a court of appeal on fact and law but can also hear cases at first instance. Unlike in the case of judges (question 46), non-judge staff are not allocated to individual instances.

Q055 (General Comment): The information relates to the number of job shares for public prosecutors. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons. The information on the job shares count a judge working full-time as 1. A judge working part-time is counted as the fraction of 1 which corresponds to the proportion of his/her working hours to full-time (e.g. 0.5 for a judge working half the usual number of hours).

Q055 (2021): Figures represent full-time equivalents as of 31. December 2021
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
It should be noted that one of goals of the ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’ is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

Q055 (2020): Figures represent full-time equivalents as of 31. December 2020
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a 'Pact for the Rule of Law'. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
It should be noted that one of goals of the 'Pact for the Rule of Law' is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

Q055 (2016): Figures indicate the number of full-time equivalent staff (not the number of individuals). A prosecutor working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). A prosecutor working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for a prosecutor working half the usual number of hours).

Q060 (2021): This figure includes:
- The number of associate prosecutors (i.e. officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience only before the Local Courts – in German: "Amtsanwälte"), the staff at the public prosecution offices and associate prosecutors' offices based at the Regional Courts as well as the staff at the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (full-time equivalent staff as of 31. December 2021)
- The staff (222 in total, 140 female) at the Office of the Federal Prosecutor General (headcount as of 31. December 2021).

Q060 (2020): This figure includes:
- The number of associate prosecutors (i.e. officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience only before the Local Courts – in German: "Amtsanwälte" – see question 57), the staff at the public prosecution offices and associate prosecutors' offices based at the Regional Courts as well as the staff at the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (full-time equivalent staff as of 31. December 2020)
- The staff (207 in total, 135 female) at the Office of the Federal Prosecutor General (headcount as of 31. December 2020).

Q060 (2018): This figure indicates the number of full-time equivalent staff (not the number of individuals).
- It includes the number of associate prosecutors (i.e. officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience only before the
Local Courts – in German: "Amtsanwälte" – see question 57).
- It covers the public prosecution offices and associate prosecutors' offices based at the Regional Courts (1st instance), the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (2nd instance), and the Office of the Federal Prosecutor General (in this case:
number of individuals).

Q060 (2016): This figure indicates the number of full-time equivalent staff (not the number of individuals).
- It includes the number of associate prosecutors (i.e. officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience only before the Local Courts – in German: "Amtsanwälte" – see question 57).
- It covers the public prosecution offices and associate prosecutors' offices based at the Regional Courts (1st instance), the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (2nd instance), and the Office of the Federal Prosecutor General (in this case: number of individuals).

Q060 (2014): According to 2014 data, the indicated figure reflects job shares (not a number of heads). The data submitted relate to the cut-off date of 31 December 2013. No figures are available that are more up-to-date. The number refers to the staff of the public prosecutor's offices and the offices of associate public prosecutors at the local courts (courts of first instance), of the public prosecutor's offices at the higher regional courts (courts of second instance), and of the office of the federal prosecutor (Public Prosecutor General at the Federal Court of Justice; in the latter case, the figure reflects the number of heads).

Q132 (General Comment): No information on annual net salary is available on the basis of the personal circumstances of judges and public prosecutors. The federal average was calculated unweighted: the annual salaries of the Federal Länder were added and divided by the number of Länder, regardless of how many judges and prosecutors work in the respective Federal Land (the corresponding data are not known).

Q132 (2021): Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the Länder. Judges and public prosecutors may be entitled to additional payments depending on -
their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children)
- position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
The conditions and amount of any additional payments are determined by the remuneration laws of the Länder.

Q132 (2020): Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the Länder. Judges and public prosecutors may be entitled to additional payments depending on -
their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children)
- position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
The conditions and amount of any additional payments are determined by the remuneration laws of the Länder.

Q132 (2016): The salaries calculated were based on the following assumptions:
Outset of the career (judge / public prosecutor): remuneration pursuant to R1, salary bracket 1, single, no children
The average was formed as a simple average of the Länder, without weighting the numbers based on the number of judges active in them, since the corresponding data are not known. The figure given as the salary of a judge or public prosecutor of the Supreme Court is the basic salary R6 without any allowance for working at one of the highest federal courts and without family allowance.
No Information on annual net salary is available on the Basis of the personal circumstances of judges and public prosecutors.

Q132 (2014): The salaries calculated for 2014 were based on the following assumptions: outset of the career (judge/public prosecutor): remuneration pursuant to R1, salary bracket 1, single, no children. The figure given as the salary of a judge or public prosecutor of the Supreme Court is the basic salary R6 without any allowance for working at one of the highest federal courts and without family allowance.

Q132 (2012): The figure given for 2012 as the salary of a judge or public prosecutor of the Supreme Court is the basic salary R6 without any allowance for working at one of the highest federal courts and without family allowance.

Q144 (General Comment): Not all Länder collect data on disciplinary measures. Data are available only in individual cases, meaning that no representative result can be reported.

Q144 (2021): Five Länder could not provide any data on the disciplinary proceedings and selected "NA". Three Länder reported "0" for all categories (judges and prosecutors). Therefore, no reliable numbers for the whole of Germany are available.
Länder that could provide data, mentiones the following "other" proceedings: Violation of the duty to provide truthfull information toward the employer.

Q144 (2020): Violation of the duty to provide truthfull information toward the employer
These figures were provided by the Länder of Baden-Württemberg, Bayern, Brandenburg, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Nordrhein-Westfahlen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt and Schleswig-Holstein. Other Länder could not provide any relevant data.

Q144 (2018): - stating incorrect professional title on social media (Ordinary jurisdiction - judges)
- unspecified (3 cases)
These figures were provided by the Lander of Baden-Württemberg, Bavaria, Berlin, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, North Rhine-Westphalia, Rhineland-Palpatinate, Saxony and Thuringia.

Q145 (General Comment): Not all Länder collect data on disciplinary measures. Data are available only in individual cases, meaning that no representative result can be reported.

Q145 (2021): Four Länder could not provide any data on the number of sanctions and selected "NA". Seven Länder reported "0" for all categories (judges and prosecutors). Therefore, no reliable numbers for the whole of Germany are available.
Länder that could provide data, mentiones the following "other" sanctions: expression of disapproval with a warning.

Q145 (2020): - dicontinuation of the disciplinary proceeding
These figures were provided by the Länder of Baden-Württemberg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Nordrhein-Westfahlen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Sachsen, and Schleswig-Holstein. Other Länder could not provide any relevant data. This means that some of the Länder who had data on the number of disciplinary proceedings available, could not provide data on the number of sanctions.

Q145 (2018): Ordinary jurisdiction: disapproval
These figures were provided by the Lander of Baden-Württemberg, Bavaria, Berlin, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, North Rhine-Westphalia, Rhineland-Palpatinate, Saxony and Thuringia.

Q147 (General Comment): All lawyers in Germany are empowered to plead before court. No distinction is made between different groups of lawyers in Germany, such as between solicitors and barristers. The stated within question 146 include in-house lawyers according to section 46 para. 2 of the Federal Code for Lawyers (Bundesrechtsanwaltsordnung – BRAO). These are persons, who exercise their profession as salaried employees of persons or companies other than lawyers or patent attorneys or in a company for the joint practice of law or patent law. They shall be deemed to be practising as a lawyer if they are working as a lawyer for their employer under an employment agreement The conditions to be met with regard to the requirement "working as a lawyer" are set out in section 46 para. 3. Compared to lawyers, their powers to provide for legal advice and representation in court are restricted according to section 46 para. 5 (restriction to the employer's legal affairs) and according to section 46c para. 2 BRAO. Like lawyers, in-house lawyers have to be admitted to the legal profession by the competent regional bar association. There are 22 765 in-house lawyers admitted to the legal profession in Germany. In addition to lawyers, certain other individuals may also appear in court as legal advisers but there are no statistical data on these individuals.

Q147 (2021): See the general comments

Q147 (2020): See the general comments

Q147 (2019): See the general comments

Greece

Q004 (2021): Our service has the data of the structure and distribution of Remuneration Survey in enterprises on the structure of remuneration of employees(having a dependent employment relationship) in enterprises by Sector (B-S branches), excluding X (Public Administration and Defense, compulsory Social Security) based on the NACE Rev. 2. The survey is conducted on a four-year basis. Therefore, the latest available figures are of the year 2018. The results of the of the survey will be published in late 2024 to early 2025.

Q004 (2020): The data come from the Survey of the Structure and Distribution of Remuneration in Greece for the year 2018, from which the sector X is excluded (Public Administration and Defense, Compulsory Social Security) based on the classification of activities NACE Rev. 2 and relate to the average annual gross earnings in euros. Data is available by gender.The only one available at the moment.
Men 19 234 Average Women 15 947 Average

Q004 (2019): The competent authority for this data (see Hellenic Statistical Authority) provides the relevant numbers. The competent authority did not provide any numbers for this section.

Q004 (2016): The data provided correspond to those of 2014, since the statistics on this point are carried out every four years. Therefore, they are not absolutely accurate.

Q046 (2021): The answer came after the cooperation of the Directorate for the organization and operation of Justice with Juststat. The increase in the number of Supreme Court professional judges is explained by the fact that, the judges of the Court of auditors, who are all supreme, had not been previously counted, but now they are included.

Q046 (2020): Gender statistics are not kept. -Number of first instance professional judges :593 first-instance administrative judges,1167 first instance judges,916 judges of local courts and District Criminal Courts.
- Number of second instance (court of appeal) professional judges:336 second-instance administrative judges,598 second instance judges
- Number of Supreme Court professional judges:170 administrative judges of Council of State,5 of the General Committee of the Ordinary and Administrative Courts,76 judges of Areios Pagos(Supreme Court),
The methodology of replying changed. Differences in numbers with previous years cannot be explained as we don't have enough information about previous data.

Q046 (2018): There is not a specific reason for the discrepancy of point 3. The number 243 is a result of the subtraction of points 1 and 2 from the total number of professional judges (1+2+3), just as last year.

Q046 (2016): Previous data concerning the number of second instance judges did not, inadvertently, include all the ranks for penal, political and administrative justice. Accordingly, this year the number is higher and explains also the variation in the total.
It should be mentioned that the number of judges at the courts of Peace, which on 31/12/2016 was 880, is not taken into consideration since they have a separate procedure entering the judiciary and they are a separate category within it.

Q046 (2014): The decrease in the number of second instance judges between 2013 and 2014 is due to the fact that administrative judges are not counted in this category for 2014.

Q046 (2013): In 2013, justices of peace are included, while Court of Auditors' judges are not considered in the total.

Q046 (2012): For 2012, the total number subsumes judicial officials of the civil-penal and administrative courts. It should be noticed that 688 magistrates were not included, as well as Court of Auditors' judges.

Q046-2 (2020): There are two categories of judges, those dealing with criminal and civil justice and administrative judges. There is no data on the separation of cases

Q052 (2020): The above figures include civil servants, permanent and those with a private law relationship of indefinite duration

Q052 (2016): Previous data did not, inadvertently, exclude staff working for the public prosecution services.

Q052-1 (2021): At the highest level there is the Court of auditors, whose judicial officials have been included above, the total number of them is 637 and consists of 219 men and 418 women. The above data were provided by the Directorate of judicial officials with the cooperation of Juststat of the Ministry.

Q052-1 (2020): The above figures include civil servants, permanent and those with a private law relationship of indefinite duration

Q055 (General Comment): In the position of Paredron of the court of First Instance and prosecutor's office Of civil and criminal courts are appointed graduates of the National School of judges, according to what is defined in Article 36 of N. 4871/2021 (a' 246). The graduates from the directions of civil-criminal judges and prosecutors of the National School of judges are appointed in the order which have in the relevant tables and are placed preferably, respectively, in the courts of First Instance and in Public Prosecutors ' Offices In Athens, Piraeus, Thessaloniki, Patras, Heraklion and Larissa. The paredroi of First Instance and the prosecutor's office have ten (10) months trial service, during of which they have all the rights and obligations of the ordinary judicial officer and inspected, like regular judges. The reports of the paredroi of the court of First Instance on performance, statistics of their performance and any other useful information or information on the performance or their suitability are stored in a specialist individual file, which, after the end of the trial service the file is submitted to the Supreme Court Council through the Minister of Justice.

Q055 (2021): The above data are given by the Directorate of organization and operation of Justice with the cooperation of JUSTSTAT.

Q055 (2020): Positions by law have increased.Gender data are not kept.

Q060 (2021): The modified response came after the cooperation of the Directorate of judicial officials with Juststat.

Q060 (2020): The above figures include civil servants, permanent and those with a private law relationship of indefinite duration.

Q132 (2016): Data on net annual salaries of judges and prosecutors is not available. In fact, after subtracting from the gross salary the insurance contribution, the amount is still subject to further taxation (22%-35%), depending on the family status of each judge and prosecutor.

Q132 (2012): The decrease between 2010 and 2012 of the annual salaries (gross and net) of judges and public prosecutors at the Supreme Court level was a result of a fiscal policy due to the economic crisis.

Q133 (2021): judges, except salary, receive two allowances (Article 30 of N.3205/2003), the faster processing allowance and attendance costs. These are not taxed.Article 6, paragraph 6 subparagraph 4, of the decision numbered A.1275 (B ´6375/31.12.2021) indicating what is not included in the certificates of remuneration(page 81063 of the decision).However, if we are to be legally precise, the correct answer to the Cepej question is no. It is not a reduced taxation,but for sums granted, as to other classes of wage-earners, and they face expenses to which they are subjected for the exercise of their work.

Q144 (2021): The answers given by the courts are either numerical, or that the number of disciplinary procedures is zero or that the data is not available. It is noted that the supreme courts have answered numerically. Regarding the choice other to the above question the answer is the petitions of citizens against judicial officers.

Q144 (2020): From the majority of the courts, the answer that has been given is not available.

Q144 (2016): "Other": Dismissal due to serious illness: 1 Judge; Inadmissible case: 6 Judges

Q144 (2014): According to 2014 data, professional inadequacy is considered to be the delay in issuing decisions.

Q145 (2021): The answers given by the courts are either numerical, or that the number of penalties is zero or that the data is not available. It is noted that the supreme courts have answered numerically.

Q145 (2020): From the majority of the courts, the answer that has been given is not available.

Q145 (2016): - Dismissal due to Serious illness: 2 Judges
- Disciplinary offence not committed:5 Judges
- Disciplinary sanction not imposed:2 Judges
- Discussion postponed:5 Judges

Q145 (2012): For 2012, the category "other" subsumed 1 repetition of disciplinary proceedings and 1 declaration of a disciplinary action as unacceptable.

Q146 (2019): The number is indicative and constantly changing, in the absence of restrictions on the number of positions. Source: Plenary Session of the Presidents of Hellenic Bar Associations

Q146 (2018): The number is indicative and constantly changing, in the absence of restrictions on the number of positions. Source: Plenary Session of the Presidents of Hellenic Bar Associations

Q146 (2013): The 2013 data corresponds to the total number in the end of December 2013.

Q147 (2021): All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.

Q147 (2020): All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.

Q148 (2021): All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.

Q148 (2020): All lawyers can be legal advisors therefore they have the right to represent their clients in court.

Q148 (2019): All lawyers can be legal advisors therefore they have the right to represent their clients in court.

Q148 (2018): All lawyers can be legal advisors therefore they have the right to represent their clients in court.

Q148 (2016): All lawyers can be legal advisors therefore they have the right to represent their clients in court.

Hungary

Q004 (2021): In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the general development of Hungarian economy, to the increase in our GDP, as well as to the raising of the minimum wage.
See the most important annual data on the labour market on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office: https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html

Q046 (General Comment): Since 2012 and the establishment of the National Office for the Judiciary, the data collection methodology is the same. Accordingly, the number of first instance professional judges includes judges of the District Courts. As second instance judges are counted judges of the Regional Courts and the Regional Courts of Appeal. As concerning the Regional Courts, the distribution of first and second instance cases is based on the internal regulations which are renewed every year by the president of each court after consultation with the judicial council and the professional departments of the court. The number of Supreme Court judges is indicated in item 46.3.

Q046 (2019): There are additional 54 judges assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary (for work in accordance with judicial administration) and to the Ministry of Justice (to help the legislative work of the ministry). These judges do not hear cases while they are assigned.
Q046 (2018): There are additional 48 judges assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary (for work in accordance with judicial administration) and to the Ministry of Justice (to help the legislative work of the ministry). These judges do not hear cases while they are assigned.
Q046 (2017): There are additional 34 judges assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary (for work in accordance with judicial administration), and 4 judges assigned to the Ministry of Justice (to help the legislative work of the ministry). These judges do not hear cases during their assignment.
Q046 (2016): There are additional 35 judges assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary (for work in accordance with judicial administration), and 9 judges assigned to the Ministry of Justice (to help the legislative work of the ministry). These judges do not hear cases while they are assigned.
Q046 (2014): In 2014, 26 judges were assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary and 7 judges were assigned to the Ministry of Justice. These judges do not hear cases when carrying out their specific missions within the NOJ and the Ministry of Justice.
Q046 (2013): The number of Supreme Court female judges decreased between 2010 and 2012, while the number of Supreme Court male judges increased between 2012 and 2013. There is no specific reason in this respect, as the vacant positions are filled through an open application process, where the gender of the applicants is not taken into consideration in any way.

Q046 (2012): The number of Supreme Court female judges decreased between 2010 and 2012, while the number of Supreme Court male judges increased between 2012 and 2013. There is no specific reason in this respect, as the vacant positions are filled through an open application process, where the gender of the applicants is not taken into consideration in any way.

Q052 (General Comment): • Court secretaries („bírósági titkár”) are employees of the court that are similar to Rechtspfleger. They are lawyers, who after acquiring a degree at a law faculty have made the bar exam (which requires at least 3 years professional practice). They are enabled to perform duties of judges in cases specifically defined by law.
According to the Constitution when a court secretary is dealing with a case he/she has the same independence as a judge. In criminal cases they can make out of trial decisions (e.g. order an expert to be included in the case), or they can hear witnesses on request of another court. This practically means they assist the judges in pre-trial phase of the case. In misdemeanour cases they adjudicate the case - this is an area of law in which mostly court secretaries deal with cases of first instance. In civil and labour cases they can make any decision that can be made without hearing the case. This practically means they assist the judges in pre-trial phase of the case. In administrative non-litigious cases they can make any decision that can be made without hearing the case. In company registry cases they can make every decision, as well in insolvency cases (with some exceptions).
• From 2012, the category "non-judge staff assisting judges" includes only staff directly assisting judges. • Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).

Q052 (2021): Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).
Q052 (2020): Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).
Q052 (2018): Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).
Q052 (2017): Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).
Q052 (2016): Other non-judge staff includes Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).
Q052 (2015): For the gender ratio we are only able to provide the total figures.

Other non-judge staff (5) includes Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).
Q052 (2014): In 2014, the category “other” includes “staff in charge of different administrative tasks”, “technical staff” and some of those judicial employees who in 2012 were counted as "non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges".

Q052 (2013): The methodology of presentation of data used in 2013 is different. Some of those judicial employees who in 2012 were included in the category “non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges” were taken into account in the category “other”. The latter includes in 2013 the total number of “staff in charge of different administrative tasks” and “technical staff” because these numbers could not be separated within the national database.

Q052 (2012): Court secretaries are enabled to perform duties of judges in cases specifically defined by law. The increase of the number of Rechtspfleger was mainly due to the expanding scope of their authority according to the amended procedural codes. More administrative tasks and cases of lesser difficultiesare dealt with by Rechtspfleger.The category "non-judge staff assisting judges" includes in 2012 only staff directly assisting judges while in 2010, it encompassed other staff as well. In 2012, staff whose task does not consist in directly assisting judges was included in the item “other”.

Q055 (2021): On 31 December 2021, two prosecutors were serving in the Ministry of Justice, on a temporary basis. They are included in the total number of prosecutors; however, they are not taken into account when giving the number of prosecutors serving at different instances (court levels). All prosecutors are appointed to a full-time job; however, it occurs that some prosecutors perform part-time service on a temporary basis for various reasons, such as raising children.
The 'number of prosecutors at first instance level' is an aggregate of the number of prosecutors serving at district-level prosecution services and other prosecution services equivalent to that level, as well as the number of prosecutors serving at high prosecution services. A part of the prosecutors serving at high prosecution services proceed also at second instance (high court) level. The number of prosecutors serving at high prosecution services is 520 (226 males, 294 females), while the number of prosecutors serving at district-level prosecution services (other prosecution services equivalent to that level) is 1210 (439 males, 771 females).
The 'number of prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level' means the number of prosecutors serving at appellate prosecution services.

Q055 (2016): Another 9 prosecutors were temporarily serving in the Ministry of Justice. They are included in the total number of prosecutors, but we did not take them into account at each level.
Q132 (2020): At its December 2019 session, the National Assembly passed a law increasing the salaries of judges by 32 percent and that of prosecutors by 21 percent.

Q132 (2018): The reason for the increase of judicial salaries is the increase of the base salary of judges by 15% in 2017-2018.

Q144 (2021): Other for judges: breach of the rules of court management as a court executive

Q144 (2020): Prosecutors: In 3. A crime has been suspected and the cases are still under investigation.
Judges: Other category includes a case when a judge carried out an activity for remuneration that (s)he was not allowed by the law.

Q144 (2018): "other": the case covered ethical and professional issues as well

Q144 (2016): Prosecutors: "Other" - the authority of the profession is violated or threatened by the prosecutor's conduct or behaviour
Judges: A judge commits a disciplinary breach if he/she violates the obligations stemming from his/her service relationship, or his/her lifestyle and/or his/her behaviour harms or jeopardises the reputation of the judiciary.
"Other": 11 procedures were initiated because of the violation of the obligations stemming from the judicial service; 3 procedures were initiated because of the violation of the obligations stemming from the judicial service and also breaching professional ethics.

Q144 (2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been specified that item 3 refers to criminal offences for which a disciplinary action can be ordered pursuant to the UJT, 82 § 1 b) (abusive or threatening lifestyle to the profession prestige). The sum of the subcategories does not correspond to the total due to the fact that the number of criminal offenses (2) is also included in the third category "professional inadequacy" (3). As a general rule, in case of criminal offense, the disciplinary action can be ordered on the basis of the Law on prosecutors, article 82 §(1) b) (abusive or threatening lifestyle to the profession prestige).

Q144 (2012): In 2012, the category “other” included in respect of judges misdemeanour proceedings. Besides, the attention was drawn on the fact that the proceedings encompassed in items 1 and 2 are the same that the proceedings subsumed in items 3 and 4. As to the disciplinary proceeding against a public prosecutor for professional inadequacy, the penalty was imposed in 2013.

Q145 (2021): Under the Act on Prosecutors, the so-called 'reproof' is a disciplinary sanction less severe than reprimand. In the reference year, 2 cases were ended with reproof. Another less severe disciplinary sanction is the written warning which is given in case of minor disciplinary offences. In the reference year, 8 cases were finished with a written warning. As to the 2 disciplinary cases that ended with dismissal, one case was initiated in 2020 but was finished in 2021.
Judges: Other category includes 4 cases in which the Service Tribunal finished the case without establishing any disciplinary liability of
the judge.
In the light of the coronavirus epidemic, strict protective measures have been introduced within the Hungarian Prosecution Service in order to protect the health of the prosecution staff and to ensure their operational efficiency. A significant part of the increase in disciplinary sanctions indicated by the CEPEJ was due to minor breaches of these protective measures. The disciplinary sanctions listed as possible replies to be indicated in the CEPEJ questionnaire, namely the disciplinary sanctions of 'suspension', 'withdrawal from the case', 'fine', 'transfer to another (prosecution) geographical location' and 'resignation', do not correspond to any of the disciplinary sanctions listed in our Status Act, hence the indicated possible disciplinary sanctions are not applicable. The disciplinary sanctions of ‘downgrading by one pay grade’ and ‘downgrading by two pay grade” corresponding to 'temporary reduction in salary' and ‘downgrading to inferior position or release from managerial position’ corresponding to ‘downgrading of position’ were not imposed in 2021. Nor was the disciplinary sanction of 'withdrawal of an award, including a title, conferred by the Chief Public Prosecutor' applied.

Q145 (2020): Prosecutors: In 1. and 10.: one case was initiated in 2019, ie it does not belong to the above 9 proceedings, but due to the issue it had to be included.
Of the 9 proceedings against prosecutors in 2020, three were discontinued, three, as criminal proceedings were also instituted in the case, were suspended, and in 2021 a written warning was applied in 2021 instead of a disciplinary sanction. The remaining two cases are the above-mentioned one-stop and one office-closed procedure.
In the case of prosecutors, no disciplinary proceedings were initiated in a further 11 minor disciplinary cases, and a written warning, which does not constitute a disciplinary sanction, was applied. The reason for the measure was the guilty breach of official duty in 9 cases, and the certification of an act violating or endangering the authority of his profession with his lifestyle and behavior in 2 cases.
Judges: Other category includes 4 cases in which the Service Tribunal finished the case without establishing any disciplinary liability of the judge.

Q145 (2018): "Other": In one case the sanction for a court executive was removal from his/her court executive position, altough he/she remained in his/her judicial position. Five cases were finished without any sanction (e.g. the judge resigned before the end of the case).

Q145 (2016): Prosecutors: - 2 disciplinary proceedings were completed by using a written warning that was not a disciplinary punishment.
- Other: dismissal as a disciplinary sanction
Judges:
Disciplinary sanctions that may be imposed on judges committing disciplinary breaches: reprimand, censure, demotion by one pay grade, demotion by two pay grades, exemption from the court executive position, motion for dismissal from the judge's position.

Q145 (2014): The figure provided for 2014 excludes those who are currently suspending their attorney practice and the so called trainee lawyers (persons who have graduated from law school, work for a law firms but have not passed the BAR exam yet). The figure also excludes the European community lawyers and the foreign legal advisors working in Hungary (the number of such lawyers is insignificant).
In 2014, concerning judges, in 11 cases the proceeding either was dismissed or no sanction was applied against the judge. In respect of prosecutors, in two cases the proceeding was discontinued and in one case it was suspended.

Q146 (2020): A new act on the attorneys (Act LXXXVIII of 2017) entered into force on 1 January 2018.
https://njt.hu/translated/doc/J2017T0078P_20180101_FIN.pdf

Q146 (2018): A new act on the attorneys (Act LXXXVIII of 2017) entered into force on 1 January 2018.
https://njt.hu/translated/doc/J2017T0078P_20180101_FIN.pdf
Q146 (2017): A new act on the attorneys entered into force, as of January 1, 2018. The next year's report will reflect the changes.

Q146 (2016): A new act on the attorneys will enter into force, as of January 1, 2018. The next year's report will reflect the changes.

Q147 (General Comment): Legal advisors (jogtanácsos) facilitate the functioning of the organisation by which they are employed. They conduct legal representation within the organisation, provide legal advice and information; prepare applications, contracts and other documents; participate in organising legal work. As a general rule, legal advisors, in contrast to attorneys, discharge their duties (which are not as extensive as those of attorneys) as employees. Their compensation is based on the regulations concerning employment. Any person entered in the register maintained by the county court in Budapest can become a legal advisor. Besides, applicants must hold citizenship in one of the member States participating in the Agreement on the European Economic Area; have no criminal record; hold a university degree; have passed the Hungarian professional examination in law.

Q147 (2020): Legal advisors (jogtanácsos) facilitate the functioning of the organisation by which they are employed. They conduct legal representation within the organisation, provide legal advice and information; prepare applications, contracts and other documents; participate in organising legal work. As a general rule, legal advisors, in contrast to attorneys, discharge their duties (which are not as extensive as those of attorneys) as employees. Their compensation is based on the regulations concerning employment. Any person entered in the register maintained by the county court in Budapest can become a legal advisor. Besides, applicants must hold citizenship in one of the member States participating in the Agreement on the European Economic Area; have no criminal record; hold a university degree; have passed the Hungarian professional examination in law.

Ireland

Q004 (2021): Year 2021 is the latest data available. The figure of €44,912.24 was taken from Q4 but it should be noted that the annual gross salary fluctuated during the course of 2021.
https://www.cso.ie/en/releaseandduplications/en/elcq/earningsandlabourcostsq42021final/2022premliminaryestimates.
According to preliminary estimates of the Earnings and Labour Costs Quarterly release, the average weekly earnings were €880.3 in Q1 2022, an increase of 2.3% from €860.19 one year earlier and an increase of 10.0% from the same period in 2020. This represents average earnings of those in employment in the Irish economy in Q1 2022, including those supported by the Employment Wage Subsidy (EWSS).
https://www.cso.ie/en/releaseandduplications/en/elcq/earningsandlabourcostsq42021final/2022premliminaryestimates.

Q004 (2020): Year 2019 is latest data available

Q004 (2019): Comments Taken from Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2019 release of 26 June 2020
https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2019/
Q004 (2018): Taken from Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2018 release of 11 June 2019
https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2018/

Q004 (2016): Average annual earnings increased by 1.1% to €36,919 in 2016, from €36,519 in 2015.
Taken from CSO release of 29 June 2017 - Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2016. See link http://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2016/

Q046 (2021): Figures as of 31/12/2021.
At that time there were 6 vacancies in total.
First Instance Courts – District Court, Circuit Court, High Court = total 3
Second Instance Court – Court of Appeal = total 1
Highest Instance Court – Supreme Court = total 1

Q046 (2020): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the circuit court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents.
An amendment was made in 2019 to the number of judges in the court of appeal due to workload of the court.

Q046 (2019): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the Circuit Court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents.
An amendment was made to the number of judges in the court of appeal due to workload of the court.

Q046 (2018): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the Circuit Court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents.

Q046 (2017): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the Circuit Court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents. As at 31 December 2017 there were three serving female Supreme Court judges.
Q046 (2016): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the Circuit Court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents. As regards the number of Supreme Court judges, the figures reflect a reduction in the actual number of judges compared to the number reported in the previous reporting cycle.
Q046 (2015): The discrepancy between the total figures and the figures for gender is explained by vacancies in the judiciary's establishment, as follows: Supreme Court: 1; High Court: 1; Circuit Court: 2.

First instance judges are judges of the High Court, Circuit Court and District Court. The High Court and Circuit Court also exercise appellate jurisdiction.

Numbers above include Court Presidents.
Q046 (2014): In 2014, data on 2nd instance judges is available, since the new Court of Appeal was established only in 2014.

Q046-2 (2021): Judges can be assigned to both criminal and civil cases. Although in some jurisdictions, mainly the High Court and Circuit Court, Judges might specialise for a period (sometimes for a period of years) in criminal and civil matters. All Judges can administer all types of cases within their jurisdiction. Administrative cases are not a separate category in Ireland.

Q046-2 (2020): Judges deal with both criminal and civil and commercial proceedings. Number of Judges would be the same across all headings (except administrative as already explained) - Court Service
Q052 (General Comment): Staff numbers in the Irish Courts Service are computed on the basis of "Full-time equivalent" resources, requiring that staff numbers include decimal points, reflecting part-time, work-sharing and other reduced time working arrangements. As decimal points are not imputtable to this question in the data base, it has been necessary to round up or round down figures.
Q052 (2021): The discrepancies with previous data are explained by staffing fluctuations.
Q052 (2017): As concerns the increase observed in the number of female staff in charge of different administrative tasks, additional staff have been employed since the last reporting cycle.
Q052 (2016): With regard to the category "staff in charge of different administrative tasks", additional staff have been employed since the last reporting cycle.
Q052 (2015): Figures have rounded up or down to adjust for the fact that actual personnel resource numbers are calculated to decimal points to reflect employment of part of a full-time personnel resource (e.g. where work-sharing arrangements are in place).
Q052 (2013): The reduction in the number of Rechtspfleger since 2012 reflects in part the appointment of number of County Registrars falling within the Rechtspfleger category as Specialist Judges of the Circuit Court. There were also a number of vacant posts at the end of 2013.
Q052-1 (2021): The discrepancies with previous data are explained by staffing fluctuations.

Q052-1 (2020): The total non-Judge staff working in the courts includes staff of the Office of the CEO, Corporate Services staff, Strategy and Reform staff, ICT staff, Regions & C&D Operations, Superior Court Operations staff, as well as quasi-judicial and technical staff. These staff members work throughout the system, and not just in one of the district, circuit, high or supreme courts.
Q052-1 (2018): Question 52 - 1 was answered to provide a breakdown of staff working as registrars and in offices and other support staff in those offices. The reason the figures would not add up to the total is because the figures exclude administrative staff who are employed by the Courts Service in administrative areas away from front line offices, and who cannot be distributed between instances. The wording in the column for the total of such staff (1049) was given on the basis that this column used the same wording as the previous table which presumably covered all Courts Service staff.

Q055 (General Comment): Allocation of prosecutors work is not in all instances divided as per the questions above. The sub-categories at 1, 2 and 3 of the question posed do not apply in the Irish system.

Q055 (2020): Our court going staff number at the 31st December 2020 is 128 - (50 male / 78 female). This figure includes our Prosecutors and Technical staff - Legal Executive. It also includes 1 Trainee Solicitor. In our Office our Technical Staff and Trainee Solicitors are court going staff and manage the running of a prosecution at trial in the same manner as some of our Prosecutors. In relation to the increase in staff resources for the ODPP, and the context for same, please see the forewords of our Annual Report 2020 and our Annual Report 2019 available at https://www.dppireland.ie/publication-category/annual-reports/.
Q055 (2018): There were 108.7 fulltime equivalent lawyers (fte) (headcount 111) on the payroll of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at 31 December 2018 – 65.6 fte (67 headcount) of these were female and 43.1 fte (44 headcount) were male.
Q055 (2016): Of the staff complement in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at the end of the reference year, 102 were of professional or technical grade at Prosecutor equivalent level or above.

Q055 (2014): Parts' of Full Time Equivalents were counted in decimal figures and have been rounded up. The total represents the number of qualified Solicitors and Barristers employed directly in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). A proportion of these lawyers represent the DPP in the District Court. Members of the police force also prosecute in this court within a prescribed 'delegated authority' from the DPP. Members of the independent Bar act on behalf of the DPP, on a self-employed basis, in first instance and appellate courts. There are a further 32 State Solicitors contracted to provide a solicitor service to the DPP in cases heard outside of the capital.

Q060 (2018): There were 95.25 fulltime equivalent (fte) administrative/technical staff (headcount 102) on the payroll of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at 31 December 2018 – 54.85 fte (61 headcount) of these were female and 40.40 fte 41 headcount) were male.
Q060 (2016): Of the staff complement in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at the end of the reference year, 77 were administrative grades.
Q060 (2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, parts of Full Time Equivalents were counted in decimal figures and have been rounded up or down as appropriate.
Q132 (2021): The information you are seeking has been retrieved from sources which are available to the public. For figures relating to judicial remuneration please see Association of Judges Ireland and for figures relating to the salaries of other civil servants which includes prosecutors see publicjobs.ie
Q132 (2020): The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2020.
Statutory deductions such as PAYE, USC, pension contributions will vary according to personal circumstances. In every case these will
be charged in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions. Prosecuting in the Superior Courts is not necessarily linked to grade

Q132 (2019): The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2019.
Statutory deductions such as PAYE, USC, pension contributions will vary according to personal circumstances. In every case these will
be charged in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions. Prosecuting in the Superior Courts is not necessarily linked to grade
Q132 (2018): The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2018.
Statutory deductions such as PAYE, USC, pension contributions will vary according to personal circumstances. In every case these will be charged in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions. Prosecuting in the Superior Courts is not necessarily linked to grade
Q132 (2016): The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2016.

Q132 (2014): The Judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court at December 2014 who were appointed to that courts on or after 1 January 2012. It is noteworthy that following a constitutional amendment in 2011, legislation was passed to allow for the reductions in the remuneration of judges. The Financial Emergency Measures in the Public Interest legislation refers.

Q132 (2013): There is no equivalent of a public prosecutor of the Supreme Court and so a summary of all lawyer grade salaries are provided below: Director of Public Prosecutions (€176,350); Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions (€156,380); Head of Directing Division (€142,199 (modified scale)); Professional Officer Grade II (€119,572); Professional Officer Grade III (€81,080); Professional Officer Grade IV (€67,434); Chief Prosecution Solicitor (€149,499); Principal Prosecution Solicitor (€85,127); Senior Prosecution Solicitor (€79,401); Prosecution Solicitor AP1 (€67,434); Prosecution Solicitor (€30,218 (new entrant from 1 January 2013)).

Q132 (2012): The Judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court at December 2012. Salary for prosecutor reflects the salary of a new entrant solicitor and the salary of a principal Prosecution Solicitor. In line with the Government's fiscal policy the salary or remuneration of public service staff and office holders has been reduced since the 2010 statistics. Following a constitutional amendment, legislation was passed to allow for the reductions in the remuneration of judges. The Financial Emergency Measures in the Public Interest legislation refers.

Q144 (2021): The judicial conduct regime as set out in the Judicial Council Act 2019 has not yet commenced. Draft Guidelines on Conduct and Ethics have been submitted by the Judicial Conduct Committee to the Board of the Council in accordance with this legislation and once adopted by the Council as a whole, the relevant sections of the Act may then be commenced. The legislative timeframe provides that adoption by the Council be done by the end of June 2022

Q144 (2020): The judicial conduct regime as set out in the Judicial Council Act 2019 has not yet commenced. Draft Guidelines on Conduct and Ethics have been submitted by the Judicial Conduct Committee to the Board of the Council in accordance with this legislation and once adopted by the Council as a whole, the relevant sections of the Act may then be commenced. The legislative timeframe provides that adoption by the Council be done by the end of June 2022

Q144 (2018): There is currently no mechanism in Ireland for disciplinary proceedings against judges. The Judicial Council, when established will provide such a mechanism.

Q145 (2021): The judicial conduct regime as set out in the Judicial Council Act 2019 has not yet commenced. Draft Guidelines on Conduct and Ethics have been submitted by the Judicial Conduct Committee to the Board of the Council in accordance with this legislation and once adopted by the Council as a whole, the relevant sections of the Act may then be commenced. The legislative timeframe provides that adoption by the Council be done by the end of June 2022

Q145 (2020): The judicial conduct regime as set out in the Judicial Council Act 2019 has not yet commenced. Draft Guidelines on Conduct and Ethics have been submitted by the Judicial Conduct Committee to the Board of the Council in accordance with this legislation and once adopted by the Council as a whole, the relevant sections of the Act may then be commenced. The legislative timeframe provides that adoption by the Council be done by the end of June 2022

Q145 (2018): There is currently no mechanism in Ireland for issuing sanctions against judges. The Judicial Council, when established will provide such a mechanism.

Q146 (2021): As of 31 December 2021, there were 11,316 practicing solicitors in Ireland. 5,319 male, 5971 female and 26 undefined. For the undefined classification, this is due to the Society not being provided with information on the solicitor's gender. These statistics include solicitors with a practicing certificate in the Republic of Ireland, including practicing solicitors employed by the State. Reply from the Law Library: total n: 2118; males 1354; female 764. Please note that the numbers above are as at June 2021 and per our Annual Report https://www.lawlibrary.ie/about/governance/annual-report/ The figures only relate to barristers who are members of the Bar of Ireland, and do not include barristers operating outside of the Bar of Ireland. The Roll of Barristers, held by the LSRA, contain that list. Further the above does not include solicitor numbers, which are available via the Law Society of Ireland and the LSRA.

Q146 (2020): The above figure is the sum membership of the Bar of Ireland and the Law Society. Total figure includes 24 lawyers with a gender reported as "Unknown".

Q146 (2019): This figure represents the current membership of the Bar Council of Ireland and the Law Society of Ireland.

Q146 (2018): This figure represents the current membership of the Bar Council of Ireland and the Law Society of Ireland.

Q146 (2017): This figure represents the total number of barristers practising as members of the Law Library/Bar of Ireland and the total number of solicitors who held practising certificates for 2017.

Q146 (2016): This figure represents the current membership of the Bar Council of Ireland and the Law Society of Ireland.

Q146 (2014): The number of lawyers comprises Solicitors and Barristers in the end of December 2014.

Q147 (2021): Traditionally, solicitors in Ireland could only represent their clients at the District Court and Circuit Court and would be required to engage a barrister to advocate on behalf of their clients at the higher courts. However, this has changed in recent years, and practicing solicitors are now entitled to a rights of audience and may argue cases at all courts. More information is available here:
https://mcmahonsolicitors.ie/parties/#:~:text=Originally%2C%20only%20barristers%20had%20rights,majority%20of%20Circuit%20Court%20cases.
https://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/justice/courtroom/solicitors.html

Q148 (2021): Solicitors may represent their clients in all court. However, many prefer to engage a barrister to do so on behalf of their client particularly in the higher courts. The Society is not aware of any exact figure of legal advisors who are prevented from representing their clients in court.

Italy

Q046 (General Comment): Apart from Administrative Justice, other specialized first instance courts that are not administered and financed by the Ministry of Justice (i.e. regional audit commissions, local tax commissions and military courts) are not taken into consideration at question 46.
Q046 (2018): Since 2018, the figures have also included judges belonging to Administrative Justice. The above figures include 6634 ordinary judges and 381 administrative judges.
Q046 (2017): An upward trend in respect of the number of female judges in the Supreme Court: in Italy, the High Council of the Judiciary is competent for the transfers of judges from one office to another. This transfer procedure generally takes place once or twice a year. The number of open positions for each court is proportional to the percentage of vacancies in that particular court. During the last few years, there were occasions where the positions made available at the court of cassation were a bit higher than number one would have expected according to the percentage of vacancies. Hence, more judges applied for the vacancies at the court of cassation compared to other courts. To date the vacancies at the court of cassation are about 4% of the total number of positions. As a matter of fact the penetration of female judges shows a positive trend. In first and second instance courts the penetration is already over 50%. At court of cassation level there is much room for improvement.

Q046 (2015): The overall reduction of judges between 2014 and 2015 is partly due to the effect of the recent labor reform that lowered the mandatory retirement age for judges from 75 to 70.
Q046 (2013): In the last few competitive exams held in Italy, the percentage of female candidates was higher than this of male candidates. Accordingly, a positive variation can be observed in respect of the number of female judges between 2010 and 2013.
Q052 (General Comment): The category “other non-judge staff” encompasses assistants, receptionists, porters and other judicial staff. As a general remark, it should be stressed that the high percentage of “other non-judge staff” in Italy is due to a very strict interpretation of the definition of the main categories. The specialized first instance courts that are not administered and financed by the Ministry of Justice (regional audit commissions, local tax commissions and military courts) are not taken into consideration at question 52.
Q052 (2021): The number of staff has increased due to the hiring of new personnel through public competition.

Q052 (2018): Since 2018, the figures have also included court staff belonging to Administrative Justice.

Q052 (2016): According to the data provided for 2014, 2015 and 2016, we can notice a downward trend as concerns the number of technical staff (a decrease of 28% between 2014 and 2015 and a decrease of 26% between 2015 and 2016), especially the number of female staff (a decrease of 33% between 2014 and 2015 and of 32% between 2015 and 2016). An explanation of these variations is not available at this stage.
Q052 (2015): 'Other non-judge staff' includes: assistants, receptionists, porters and other judicial staff.
The high percentage of “other non judge staff” in Italy is due to a very strict interpretation of the definition of the main categories.
Q052-1 (2018): Since 2018, the figures have also included court staff belonging to Administrative Justice.

Q055 (2016): There is no specific explanation concerning the increase in the total number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level. However, numbers are small and therefore percentage changes vary more harshly.
Q060 (2021): The number of staff has increased due to the hiring of new personnel through public competition.

Q132 (General Comment): It is noteworthy that the salaries of judges and public prosecutors do not depend on the position held but rather on the experience (i.e. years of service). That means that the salary of a judge working in the lowest courts can be the same as the salary of a judge working in the Highest Appellate Court.
Q144 (General Comment): Figures at Q.144 do not include disciplinary proceedings against administrative judges

Q144 (2021): The total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated in Italy in 2021 is 148. Unfortunately, we cannot distinguish neither between judges and prosecutors nor by type of proceeding.
In Italy both judges and prosecutors are governed by the same body, and they are seen as a whole (magistrates). For this reason, when it comes to disciplinary proceeding judges and prosecutors follow the same procedures, hence our statistics do not distinguish between judges and prosecutors. For this cycle the High Judicial Council has only provided the total.

Q144 (2018): The above figures do not include 2 disciplinary proceedings against administrative judges.

Q144 (2016): "Other" refers to disciplinary proceedings which involve more than one category (e.g. "Breach of professional ethics" and "Professional inadequacy").
Q145 (General Comment): Figures at Q.145 do not include sanctions against administrative judges

Q145 (2018): The above figures do not include 3 sanctions to administrative judges.

Q146 (2013): For 2013, the number of practicing lawyers was not available. The provided figure corresponds to the number of lawyers in 2012, assuming that data should be almost the same for both years.

Latvia

Q004 (General Comment): After 2012, the minimum monthly salary increased, which could have had an effect on the average gross annual salary.
Q004 (2021): The data provided by the Central Statistical Bureau.

Q004 (2020): The data provided by the Central Statistical Bureau.

Q004 (2016): on 2016

Q046 (2017): The changes in the number of judges at the Supreme Court are the outcome of the court reform developing pure three instance level court system. Until 2014 there were both appellate and cassation courts within the Supreme Court. Until end of 2014 and 2016 respectively there were additional appellate chambers dealing with criminal and civil cases. Since beginning of 2017 the number of judges at Supreme Court (cassation instance) is stable – 36.

Q046 (2014): The number of male judges in the Supreme Court decreased per 5 judges between 2012 and 2014 due to various reasons: three male judges retired; two male judges returned to regional courts (because they worked in the Supreme Court temporarily); one male judge passed away in 2014; one new male judge came to work in the Department of Civil Cases of the Supreme Court.
Q046-2 (General Comment): The courts of first instance of general jurisdiction do not explicitly distinguish between the specialisation of judges on the basis of the main types of cases, therefore there is not possible to distinguish the data between civil and or commercial cases and criminal cases.
Q046-2 (2021): For Supreme Court - within the number of judges is not indicated number of President of the Supreme Court.

Q046-2 (2020): The courts of first instance of general jurisdiction do not explicitly distinguish between the specialisation of judges on the basis of the main types of cases, therefore there is not possible to distinguish the data between civil and or commercial cases and criminal cases.
Q052 (2021): Other non-judge staff: Supreme Court - Division of case-law an research, Division of provision of regime of secrecy, Staff of secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary.
In general at the end of 2021, there were many vacancies for court staff for the first and second instance courts, therefore also there are differencies in the number of court staff. In the previous cycles, the numbers for court staff for the first and second instance courts were calculated a little bit different, there were included also vacancies.

Q052 (2020): The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.
Other for Supreme Court - Division of case-law and research, Division of provision of regime of secrecy, Staff of the Secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary. Trainees are not included in the number provided of the non-judicial staff.

Q052 (2019): Other non - judge staff: Staff of the Division of case-law and research, Division of provision of regime of secrecy and Secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary, as well consultants (desk officers) of the Supreme Court of Latvia.
The overall discrepancies starts from 2018 due to court reform (Land Registry offices integrated in general jurisdiction courts and historically high turnover rate). The data between 2018 and 2019 are very similar.

Q052 (2018): Discrepancy due to court reform (Land Registry offices integrated in general jurisdiction courts and historically high turnover rate).

Q052 (2017): Other non-judge staff- this satff is for Supreme Court - Staff of Division of case-law and research staff, Division of provision of regime of secrecy staff, the Supreme Court of Latvia consultants and Secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary

Starting from 2015 till March, 2018 there were introduced court reform where the judicial map was revised. In the course of the court reform, several courts were merged, legally creating one larger court. On the other hand, in this new territory, the existing courts continue operating as the new body of the joint court, providing the opportunity for citizens to submit the documents at any place of the court. The court reform affected also the changes in the number of court staff, some positions were combined, some positions changed.

Q052 (2014): The category “other” includes employees from the Division of Provision of Secrecy Regime and the Supreme Court Division of Case-Law. The latter is a unit of the Supreme Court responsible for the compilation, analysis and publication of court opinions, as well as for summarizing, selecting, processing and publishing in the case-law database court rulings. For 2014, it also subsumes consultants of the Supreme Court.

Q052 (2013): The category “other” includes employees from the Division of Provision of Secrecy Regime and the Supreme Court Division of Case-Law. The latter is a unit of the Supreme Court responsible for the compilation, analysis and publication of court opinions, as well as for summarizing, selecting, processing and publishing in the case-law database court rulings.

Q052 (2012): The category “other” includes employees from the Division of Provision of Secrecy Regime and the Supreme Court Division of Case-Law. The latter is a unit of the Supreme Court responsible for the compilation, analysis and publication of court opinions, as well as for summarizing, selecting, processing and publishing in the case-law database court rulings.

Q052-1 (2021): In general, at the end of 2021, there were many vacancies for court staff for the first and second instance courts, therefore also there are differences in the number of court staff. In the previous cycles, the numbers for court staff for the first and second instance courts were calculated a little bit different, there were included also vacancies.

Q052-1 (2018): Discrepancy due to court reform (Land Registry offices integrated in general jurisdiction courts and historically high turnover rate)
Q055 (2020): The increase in the number of prosecutors in court district level prosecutor's offices is related to the imposition of an obligation on the prosecutor of the court district level prosecutor's office, and not on the chief prosecutor of the district (city) prosecutor's office to perform the duties of a higher prosecutor.
Regarding the decrease in the number of women working in the Prosecutor General's Office, it must be concluded that in total the number of women working has decreased by 8 persons. One of the reasons could be reaching the maximum age for performing the duties prescribed by law or the death of a person.

Q055 (2012): During 2011 and 2012, prosecutors’ offices increased the number of posts which resulted in the appointment of new prosecutors. In order to decide on the promotion of prosecutors, their professional qualification has been evaluated and their quality of work performance analysed, as well as their participation in trainings, work statistical indicators, etc. Pursuant to the collected data, more male prosecutors have been promoted to higher posts.

Q060 (2021): Total number of staff working at the Prosecution Office is 357 (103 male employees, 254 female employees): 187 employees (35 male and 152 female) are staff in charge of administrative functions and management of Prosecution Office. 75 employees (40 male and 35 female) perform technical duties. 95 employees are prosecutor assistants (28 male and 67 female). We would like to emphasize that in Latvia assistant prosecutors do not perform the functions of drafting procedural documents. Main duties of assistant prosecutors are preparation of criminal case material copies; drawing up of the case list documents, sewing and numbering of the case materials; preparation of materials to be issued to the process participants; certification of the correctness of document derivatives; delivery of the prepared materials to the addressees and reception of the documents.

Q060 (2014): The 2014 data encompasses the administrative director, deputies of the administrative director and other staff of the administrative director office – staff of the Chancellery, interpreters, IT specialists, personal specialists, car drivers, auditors (in total 318 employees, among which 232 women), as well as prosecutors’ assistants (in total 74 assistants, among which 55 women). Assistants to prosecutors have no prosecutorial procedural powers. Their competence and jurisdiction are strictly limited. For example, an assistant is entitled to receive visitors, to take action in connection with the preparation of the case (prepare copies of criminal case materials, to produce the list of documents) etc.

Q060 (2012): The 2012 data encompassed the administrative director, deputies of the administrative director and other staff of the administrative director office - staff of the Chancellery, interpreters, IT specialists, personal specialists, car drivers, auditors (in total 321 employees, among which 234 woman), as well as prosecutors' assistants (in total 72 assistants, among which 53 women). Prosecutors' assistants have no prosecutorial procedural powers. Their competence and jurisdiction are strictly limited. For example, an assistant is entitled to receive visitors, to take action in connection with the preparation of the case (prepare copies of criminal case materials, to produce the list of documents) etc.

Q132 (2020): Prosecutors shall be entitled to a supplement for the ranking of the public prosecutor, depending on the degree of office assigned. The ranking of a public prosecutor shall be assigned according to the position, professional knowledge, qualifications and experience of work.
Question 132 indicates the minimum gross and net public remuneration.
Discrepancies with data from the previous cycle are connected with changes in the Law On Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities. Between 2019 and 2020 a gradual increase in salary has been introduced, the gross salary has been increased per EUR 1764 and the net annual salary increase per EUR 1203. The salaries for judges are reviewed annually according to the law.

Q132 (2019): Discrepancies with data from the previous cycle are connected with changes in the Law On Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities.
Comments on salaries of prosecutors: The increase in salaries is related to changes in the regulatory framework for prosecutors remuneration, which entered into force on 01.01.2019. The discrepancies in the section of salary for public prosecutor at the beginning of his or her career is connected to that in previous cycle the maximum salary was indicated which first instance prosecutor could get, but now it is indicated the salary at the beginning of the career.

Q132 (2018): The changes are related to the Law On Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities, which increased the judge's monthly salary to EUR 1966, and the salaries of judges increased significantly in 2018 compared to 2016. Same for prosecutors.
Comment for prosecutors: Prosecutors shall be entitled to a supplement for the ranking of the public prosecutor, depending on the degree of office assigned. The ranking of a public prosecutor shall be assigned according to the position, professional knowledge, qualifications and experience of work. Question 132 shows the maximum gross and net public remuneration.

Q132 (2016): Prosecutors, depending on the grade assigned, are provided with an allowance for a post of prosecutor from 7 to 35 percent of the monthly salary. The position of a prosecutor is assigned according to the occupation, professional knowledge, qualification and work experience.
In above stated amount special additional payment to judges depending of their time of service (starting from 7% after 3 years of service, until 35% - after 20 years of service) is already included.

Q132 (2012): During the economic crisis, starting from 01.07.2009, the salaries of judges were reduced by 15% and starting from 01.01.2010, they were reduced by 27 %. Starting from 01.01.2011, the determination of the salaries of judges and prosecutors is a part of the unified remuneration system for the officials and employees of the State and local government institutions. Besides, as the consequences of the crisis diminished, the salaries of judges increased.

Q144 (2020): Other of prosecutors: By 1 July 2020, the public prosecutor had been held to disciplinary action for the commission of an administrative violation, such as non-compliance with road traffic rules.
Q144 (2018): Other for prosecutors - A public prosecutor shall not be held liable for disciplinary action for committing a criminal offence, but shall be held liable for disciplinary action for committing an administrative violation, for example, failure to comply with road traffic regulations.

Q144 (2016): not intentionally breach of law, but negligence (breach of procedural terms, accidentally has not observed criminal procedure norms or substantive legal norms).
Q144 (2014): According to 2014 data and pursuant to the Judicial Disciplinary Liability Law, a judge may be held liable for: intentional breach of law in adjudication of cases – 14 cases in 2014; non-execution of job responsibilities or gross negligence committed during adjudication – 4 cases in 2014; disrespectful action or gross violation of norms of the Code of Judicial Ethics; administrative violations - 4 cases in 2014; refusal to suspend association with political party or political organisation – no cases in 2014; non-observance of restrictions and prohibitions stipulated in the Law on Prevention of Conflict of Interests in Activity of the State Officials – no cases in 2014.
As to public prosecutors, the category "other" encompassed not intentionally breaches of law, but negligence (breach of procedural terms; the prosecutor has accidentally not observed criminal procedure norms or substantive legal norms).

Q144 (2012): For 2012, the category "other" referred to reprimands in respect of judges. As to public prosecutors, the same category encompassed not intentionally breaches of law, but negligence (breach of procedural terms; the prosecutor has accidentally not observed criminal procedure norms or substantive legal norms).

Q145 (2021): „Other" cases. For judges - no sanction imposed, only examination of the matter. Article 7, para 8 of the Judicial Disciplinary Liability Law: (8) In exceptional cases, the Judicial Disciplinary Committee may restrict themselves to examination of a disciplinary matter at a sitting, without the imposition of a disciplinary sanction. Even without specific sanction this type of decision of the Disciplinary Board is regarded as sanction because the violation is established. The judge has a disciplinary record about this decision
If a significant difference exists between the number of disciplinary proceedings and the number of sanctions, please indicate the reasons: 3 cases: in two cases the case was dismissed: 1) no violation of law; 2) initialization of wrong proceedings (disciplinary instead of administrative); in one case the judge died

Q145 (2020): Section 44 of the Prosecutor's Office Law defines the disciplinary sanctions applicable to the public prosecutor: (1) note; (2) reprimand; (3) reduction of the monthly salary of the public prosecutor to 20 per cent for a period not exceeding six months; (4) demotion; (5) dismissal.
The Other column contains a disciplinary sanction - note (Reproof).
Other for judges- as additional sanction was imposed an extraordinary assessment of the professional work of a judge.
One case was terminate, in 4 cases no sanction was imposed.

Q145 (2018): Comment for judges - 3 cases pending; 2 cases – examination (discussion) in disciplinary board. Dismissal means that the application for disciplinary proceedings was dismissed. In 2018 there were no cases examined by the Disciplinary court. One appeal was received. Comment for prosecutors - Section 44 of the Prosecutor's Office Law defines the disciplinary sanctions applicable to the public prosecutor: (1) note; (2) reprimand; (3) reduction of the monthly salary of the public prosecutor to 20 per cent for a period not exceeding six months; (4) downgrades; (5) dismissal.
The column "Other" contains a disciplinary sanction - note (Reproof).

Q145 (2016): The disciplinary sanctions applicable to the prosecutor by Section 44 of the Office of the Prosecutor Law: 1) an annotation; 2) a reprimand; 3) reduction of the base salary of the prosecutor up to 20 per cent for a period not exceeding six months; 4) reduction in the grade of office; 5) demotion in office; 6) dismissal from employment.
We note that in the box Other is a disciplinary penalty – an annotation.
2 judges received a remark

Q145 (2014): In 2014, the examination of 8 cases against judges was postponed to 2015. The other sanctions pronounced included 2 removals from office; 2 remarks; 6 disciplinary cases were dismissed; in one case the Disciplinary Committee confined itself to the examination of the disciplinary case in the sitting of the disciplinary committee. As for public prosecutors, the category "other" referred to annotations.
Q145 (2013): For 2012, the category "other" subsumed with regard to judges 1 formal warning; one terminated disciplinary proceeding and disciplinary cases pending in 2013. As for public prosecutors, the same category referred to annotations.

Q146 (2017): This number includes sworn advocates and assistants to sworn advocates.
Q146 (2013): There were 1 336 sworn lawyers in Latvia on December 31, 2013, of which 70 - assistants to lawyers and 13 - lawyers from other countries. 116 State legal aid providers have been concluded contracts with the Legal Aid Administration about State-guaranteed legal assistance in civil cases, administrative cases, cross-border disputes and provision of out of court legal assistance. State provided legal assistance in criminal matters in Latvia is provided by sworn lawyers, not by legal aid providers.
Q147 (2017): According to Advocacy Law of the Republic of Latvia in accordance with the procedures specified by this Law, the following persons may work as advocates in Latvia:
1) sworn advocates;
2) assistants to sworn advocates;
3) citizens of European Union Member States who have obtained the qualification of an advocate in one of the European Union Member States (hereinafter - advocates of European Union Member States).
Foreign advocates, except for advocates of European Union Member States, may practice in Latvia in accordance with the international agreements on legal assistance binding to the Republic of Latvia. Solicitors, in-house counsellors and others is an unregulated profession in Latvia and consequently is not counted, controlled or otherwise supervised.

Q148 (2017): Solicitors, in-house counsellors and others is an unregulated profession in Latvia and consequently is not counted, controlled or otherwise supervised. Also, for example, Civil Procedure Law provides that in some case categories/the Supreme Court persons can conduct cases by themselves or with the intermediation of an advocate. Due to this it is not possible to count persons who cannot represent their clients in court.

Q148 (2016): There was a mistake in last cycle. Not all legal advisors can represent their clients in court, for instance, in criminal cases only sworn advocate can represent their clients in court.

Lithuania

Q004 (2021): From the 1st January, 2021 the minimum monthly salary was increased, the base salary of state politicians, judges, state officials, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions was increased, the procedure for calculating the amount of tax-free income was changed and other reasons.
https://osp.stat.gov.lt/informaciniai-pranesimai?articleId=9732032

Q004 (2020): Annual salary growth has been affected by the increase in the minimum monthly salary since the beginning of the reference year, the base salary of state politicians, judges, state politicians, judges, civil servants, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the procedure for calculating tax-free income and other reasons.

Q004 (2019): The increase in wages in 2019 was caused by changes in the tax system: an increase in the basic salary of politicians, judges, civil servants, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions, an increase in the minimum monthly salary, a revision of the new salary system for civil servants, a change in the procedure for calculating exemptions and other reasons.

Q004 (2018): The state budget and salary increased due to the growth of the economy.

Q004 (2016): The state budget and salary increased due to the growth of the economy (after recovering from crisis before).

Q046 (General Comment): The methodology of presentation of data reflects the peculiarities of the Lithuanian court system. Namely, as the regional courts function not only as courts of appeal, but also as courts of first instance (Article 19 of the Law on Courts of the Republic of Lithuania), the number of judges of these courts is included in the 1st section. Accordingly, the latter indicates the number of judges of district courts, regional courts and regional administrative courts. Likewise, given that the Supreme Administrative Court is the court of appeal (although the rulings of the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania are final and not subject to appeal) the number of judges of this court is encompassed in the 2nd section. The latter indicates the number of judges of the Court of Appeal of Lithuania and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania. The 3rd section indicates the number of judges of the Supreme Court of Lithuania.

Q046 (2017): Please see general comments.

Q046-2 (2020): the first instance indicates the number of judges of district courts, regional courts and regional administrative courts. Likewise, given that the Supreme Administrative Court is the court of appeal (although the rulings of the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania are final and not subject to appeal) the number of judges of this court is encompassed in the 2nd instance. The latter indicates the number of judges of the Court of Appeal of Lithuania and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.

Q052 (General Comment): The category “other” includes translators, court psychologists, it encompasses also other helping staff (civil servants and working under the labour agreement).

Q052 (2021): Psychologists and translators.

Q052 (2020): Other staff – translators and psychologists.
There is no such a position as trainee judges in the Lithuanian court system.

Q052 (2019): Other staff - translators and psychologists.

Q052 (2018): Other non-judge staff – translators and psichologists.

Q052 (2017): Other staff – translators and psychologists.

Q052 (2016): In 2015 the number of technical staff has decreased while at the same time the number of staff assisting judges has increased.

Q052 (2014): The National Courts Administration has never collected data on statistics of court personnel according to the gender. The data, which was provided in earlier evaluation cycles, was preliminary data, manually gathered.

Q055 (2020): After the reorganization of the prosecution service in 2011, 5 second instance prosecutors' offices were merged with 51 separate first instance prosecutor's office in their area of operation, and thus 5 regional first-second instance prosecutor's offices were established.

Q055 (2014): In 2012, the 56 territorial prosecutor’s offices have been reorganised into 5 regional prosecutor’s offices with 10 district prosecutor’s offices functioning inside them (first instance and second instance levels have been combined). Currently, only two instances exist.

Q055 (2012): In 2012, after reorganization of the prosecution service, the first and the second instances have merged. Currently, two instances exist instead of three. Besides, the total number of prosecutors has decreased because some prosecutors have left the service, but no new prosecutors have been recruited.

Q060 (2021): The decrease in staff numbers is due to:
- natural rotation of human resources (various reasons: career, dissatisfaction with salary or duties, etc.);
- implementation of changes in work organisation;
- a higher number of persons left the institution than were recruited.

Q060 (2020): Number of staff does not include trainee prosecutors, only assistants, specialists and other employees. A person, who has been admitted to the service as prosecutor, must complete an assigned traineeship of up to two years. During the traineeship, the trainee prosecutor performs all duties of a prosecutor, but is obliged to coordinate draft procedural decisions and resolutions with the internship supervisor.

Q060 (2016): The provided data on the number of prosecution staff includes assistants and lawyers who work directly with prosecutors (total 363: 81 males and 282 females).

Q132 (2020): From the 1 January 2019 the official salary ratio of district court judges was increased. In 2019 and in 2020 a higher base amount of official salary (salary) was also applied, which is used to calculate the remuneration of judges and public procesutors (2018 - 132,5; 2019 - 173, 2020 - 176)

Q132 (2019): From 2019 January 1 the salaries of district court judges increased due to an increase in their official salary coefficients (the official salary ratio of the president of the court increased from 0.5 to 1.5 basic amounts; deputy chief judge - from 1.2 to 1.9 basic amounts, judge - by 2 basic amounts).
From 2019 January 1 the basic amount of the official salary, which is used to calculate the salaries of both prosecutors and judges, was also increased: in 2018 this basic amount was 132.5 euros, in 2019 - 173 euros.

Q132 (2018): In 2017 prosecutors' salaries were increased.

Q132 (2016): The salary of public prosecutors at the beginning of the carrier was increased.

Q133 (2019): no other financial bennefit.

Q144 (2021): note as a sanction.

Q144 (2020): 2 cases where disciplinary proceedings have not been instituted without evidence of disciplinary action, and 1 case when the disciplinary proceedings were terminated without the subject of disciplinary liability (the judge reached seniority and was dismissed).
in two cases a violation (professional inadequacy) was established, but limited to its consideration, no disciplinary proceedings were instituted; two cases (pbreach of professional ethics) were referred to the Juditial Court of Honor.

Q144 (2018): Concerning judges: only 2 of the initiated disciplinary proceedings (16) have been brought to the Judicial Court of Honor. Concerning prosecutors: the decrease of the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings (comparing with 2016) was the outcome of the fact that there were received fewer requests to initiate the inspection of prosecutor's activity or to conduct an investigation at the Prosecutor's Ethics Commission.

Q144 (2012): In 2012, the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission instituted 9 disciplinary actions (4 on the ground of breach of professional ethics and 5 on the ground of professional inadequacy).

Q145 (2020): other for judges - note as a sanction.
other for prosecutors - 6 admonition - the least severe disciplinary sanction, which have been pronounced against prosucutors in 2020.

Q145 (2018): Concerning judges: in 2018 the Judicial Court of Honor adopted 2 decisions: in one disciplinary case it was limited to the review of a disciplinary action, in the second - one the part of the case was terminated, in the other part of the case as the sanction a censure (less severe sanction than a reprimand) was pronounced. Concerning prosecutors:
9 admonitions - the least severe disciplinary sanction – have been pronounced against prosecutors in 2018. Disciplinary sanctions that may be imposed on prosecutor in Lithuania (starting from least severe): 1. Admonition (9 in 2018);
2. Reprimand (5 in 2018); 3. Position downgrade (0 in 2018) 4. Dismissal (3 in 2018) The increase of the number of sanctions in 2018 (comparing with 2016) was due to the complexity of the inspections, also investigations carried out by the Prosecutor's Ethics Commission because of the gravity and nature of the violations committed.

Q145 (2016): Disciplinary sanctions that may be imposed on prosecutors (starting from least severe):
1. Admonition (6 sanctions pronounced in 2016);
2. Reprimand (2 sanctions pronounced in 2016) ;
3. Qualification rank downgrade (1 in 2016);
4. Position downgrade (1 in 2016);
5. Dismissal (0 in 2016).

Q145 (2014): In 2014, the following sanctions have been pronounced against prosecutors: 1 censure; 3 reprimands; 0 qualification rank downgrade; 1 position downgrade; 1 dismissal. There was no qualification rank downgrade.
The Judicial Court of Honour has decided on 5 cases that were initiated by the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission and imposed these sanctions on judges: 1 censure; 2 reprimands. In one case, the Court limited itself to the review of a disciplinary action and with regard to another case, it dismissed the disciplinary action.
It is noteworthy that in 2014, the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission received 272 complaints, out of which 249 requests were refused for examination (lack of motivation, requests for evaluation of judgments or trials, questions that were raised not on judicial ethics). Besides, the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission has decided on 9 requests of judges to provide consultations on whether some of their actions would be treated as violation of ethics of judges.

Q145 (2012): In 2012, the following sanctions have been pronounced against prosecutors: 4 admonitions; 1 reprimand; 2 position downgrades; 2 resignations. There was no qualification rank downgrade.
There were 8 decisions of the Judicial Court of Honour in respect of judges: 3 decisions imposing a disciplinary sanction (censure); 3 decisions limited to the review of a disciplinary action; 2 decisions dismissing the disciplinary action.

Q146 (2019): There are also 1008 lawyers' assistants (449 males, 559 females). They can provide some legal service but are not included in the number of lawyers above.
Q146 (2018): There are also 943 lawyers' assistants. They can provide some legal service but are not included in the number of lawyers above.
Q146 (2017): The number is provided by the Lithuanian Bar Association (the number of practising lawyers (advocats) - 2207. Also there are 925 lawyers' assistants who provide legal service).
Q146 (2016): The number is provided by the Lithuanian Bar Association (the number of practising lawyers (advocats). Also there are 870 lawyers' assistants who provide legal service also.
Q146 (2015): Numbers are taken from the List of Practising Advocates of Lithuania. The list is regulated by the Law on the Bar and administered by Lithuanian Bar Association. The assistants of advocates is not presented in the data.

Q147 (2015): Numbers are taken from the List of Practising Advocates of Lithuania. The list is regulated by the Law on the Bar and administered by Lithuanian Bar Association. The assistants of advocates is not presented in the data.

Luxembourg

Q004 (2020): The 2019 data has been tentatively provided, pending the official release of the 2020 data.

Q004 (2019): This figure represents the average gross salary for the "Industry and Service" sector, according to the NACE Rev 2 code.
(https://statistiques.public.lu/stat/ReportFolders/ReportFolder.aspx?IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=3&FldrName=1&RFPath=30).
Q004 (2016): The variation between the different cycles (44% between 2014 and 2016) comes from a difference between gross salary (which was given for this cycle) and net salary (which was given for the previous cycles).
Q046 (General Comment): Section 1: The number of first instance professional judges includes judges of the district courts, judges of the justices of the peace and judges of the administrative tribunal.
section 2: The number of second instance professional judges includes judges of the Court of appeal of the Superior court of justice and judges of the Administrative court.
Section 3: The number of professional judges at the Supreme court level includes only judges of the Court of cassation.

Q046 (2018): The staff of the judicial and administrative courts has grown steadily in the recent years, as established by the amended law of 7 March 1980 on judicial organization. This explains the significant variations observed between 2016 and 2018 in the judiciary and non-judge staff. According to the judicial organisation of Luxembourg, there is a Superior Court of Justice, composed of the Court of Cassation and the Court of Appeal. The judges of the Superior Court of Justice belong to both the Court of Cassation and the Court of Appeal. If, legally speaking, these are separate positions, in practice the five judges of the Superior Court of Justice occupy two positions and they are therefore counted among the judges of the Court of Appeal as well as at the level of the Superior Court of Justice .
The figures differ from those indicated in the last data collection campaigns on two points. 1) concerning the number of judges at the highest level: starting with 2016, we have distinguished between the judges sitting at the court of appeal and those of the Cour de cassation, which is the highest court in Luxembourg. Until 2016, and as the two courts taken together form the Cour supérieure de Justice (which as such has some very specific competences), we indicated only the total of the judges affected to the Cour supérieure. It might be useful for statistical purposes to distinguish between the two levels. 2) concerning the number of judges at the first level: the figures indicated until 2016 were superior to the real figures, as, erroneously, the prosecutors (which by law are also magistrates affected to these courts) had been included. We corrected this error in 2016.
There has been a major modification in june 2017, by the law of 27th of June 2017 adopting a multiannual program of recruitment into the judiciary and amending the amended law of 7th of March 1980 on judicial organisation, programming the future changes in the staff at the different entities. This law provides for a multiannual program of recruitment of judges and prosecutors during the years 2017-2020. It entered into force in july 2017.

Q046 (2017): The Act of 27 June 2017 introducing a multiannual programme for recruitment to the judiciary and amending the amended Act of 7 March 1980 on the organisation of the judiciary, defines the number of posts in the various instances.
The indicated data correspond to the number of permanent positions actually held in 2017.

Q046 (2016): The figures differ from those indicated in the last data collection campaigns on two points.
1) concerning the number of judges at the highest level: starting with 2016, we have distinguished between the judges sitting at the court of appeal and those of the Cour de cassation, which is the highest court in Luxembourg. Until 2016, and as the two courts taken together form the Cour supérieure de Justice (which as such has some very specific competences), we indicated only the total of the judges affected to the Cour supérieure. It might be useful for statistical purposes to distinguish between the two levels.
2) concerning the number of judges at the first level: the figures indicated until 2016 were superior to the real figures, as, erroneously, the prosecutors (which by law are also magistrates affected to these courts) had been included. This error has now been corrected.

Q046 (2015): In 2014, the judges of the Administrative Court were included in the number of judges in the Supreme Court but in 2015 these judges were accounted as second instance judges.

Q046 (2014): In 2014, the judges of the Administrative Court were included in the number of judges in the Supreme Court but in 2015 these judges were accounted as second instance judges.

Q046 (2013): To the total number of judges, should be added 4 trainees ("attachés de justice"). The increase in the number of female judges at all instances between 2010 and 2013 is explained by the special attraction for a profession that allows to combine work and family life. Judges of second instance and those of the Court of Cassation are all part of the Superior Court of Justice.

Q046 (2012): The total number of professional judges does not correspond to the sum of the number of judges before each instance because some judges have jurisdiction in two courts (e.g. the Constitutional Court is composed of judges of the Court of Cassation and the Administrative Court).

Q052 (General Comment): With regard to question 52, all non-judge staff is in charge of assisting judges (except at the administrative courts). Therefore, starting from 2017, we do no longer distinguish between staff in charge of administrative tasks and staff assisting judges. Only at the administrative courts there are few persons not assisting judges.

Q052 (2021): The category “other non-judge staff” refers to the “référendaires” and the data protection compliance officer of the administrative courts.
The number of “other non-judge staff” has increased by 125% in absolute terms, which corresponds in fact to an increase of 5 persons, representing 5 posts of “référendaires”. Judicial and administrative courts are making greater use of “référendaires” to relieve judges of certain tasks.

Q052 (2020): The other non-judicial staff consists of three legal secretaries and a data protection compliance officer from the administrative courts.

Q052 (2018): Regarding the category "other non-judge staff", it includes non-judge staff working for administrative courts. The increase of the non-judge staff is due to the fact that we no longer distinguish between the staff in charge of administrative tasks and the staff assisting the judges as court clerks, since all the non-judge staff is in charge of assisting the judges. We interpreted this differently in the previous years. Previously some of the staff was considered as not assisting the judges, because of their statute, this appeared as not correct since none of them is limited to administrative tasks, except at the administrative courts, where six persons are in charge of purely administrative tasks. The revised 2017 data shows an increase of the total non-judge staff assisting the judges of 9.95%.

Q052 (2017): With regard to question 52, all the non-judge staff is in charge to assist the judges (except at the administrative courts). Therefore for the year 2017, we did no longer distinguish between staff of administrative tasks and the staff assisting the judges. Only at the administrative courts are 6 persons not assisting the judges.

Q052 (2016): Last year the separation of the sections 1, 2 and 3 was not done correctly. This year this task was made by the parquet general RH office.

Q052 (2014): The overall administrative tasks concerning ordinary courts are centralized at the level of the Prosecutor General Office. The same applies to technical staff. Among the 192 non-judge staff assisting judges, 117 are women. The category "staff in charge of different administrative tasks" (3 women, 2 men) and the category "technical staff" (1) refer exclusively to the Administrative Court (which was not the case for 2012). The 2014 data reflects the administrative reality, the staff that cannot be categorized to one specific task being attached to the State Prosecutor General. The total remains stable; slight variations are due to temporary replacements. The category "other" does not subsume external staff hired on contractual basis, e.g. in IT matters (as in 2012).

Q052 (2013): The overall administrative tasks concerning ordinary courts are centralized at the level of the Prosecutor General Office. The same applies to technical staff. Among the 192 non-judge staff assisting judges, 117 are women. The category "staff in charge of different administrative tasks" (3 women and 2 men) and the category "technical staff" (1) refer exclusively to the Administrative Court staff. The 2013 data reflects the administrative reality, the staff that cannot be categorized to one specific task being attached to the State Prosecutor General. The total remains stable; slight variations are due to temporary replacements. The category "other" does not subsume any more external staff intervening on contractual basis, for example in IT matters.

Q052 (2012): Except for categories 1 ('Rechtspfleger') and 2 (non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges), all others carry on their work in the interest of the whole judicial system, that is to say, both for judges and prosecutors.

Q052-1 (2021): The 27% increase in the number of second instance non-judge staff is explained in particular by the hiring of additional “référendaires”. At the Supreme Court, the number of non-judge female staff decreased by 50% in relative terms; in absolute terms, this corresponds to one woman being replaced by a male member of staff.

Q055 (General Comment): The figure in point 3 includes both second instance and Supreme Court prosecutors, as they are grouped together in the Superior Court of Justice, which is subdivided into the Court of Appeal and the Court of Cassation.

Q055 (2018): Le personnel des juridictions judiciaires et administratives a connu une croissance soutenue ces dernières années, tel que prévu par la loi modifiée du 7 mars 1980 sur l'organisation judiciaire. Ceci explique les variations importantes observées entre 2016 et 2018 au niveau du personnel de la magistrature et du personnel non-juge. Les magistrats appartenant à la cellule de renseignement financier (CRF) sont dorénavant exclus de la question 55.1 (suite au détachement de la CRF du Parquet de Luxembourg) puisqu’ils n’exercent plus de fonction juridictionnelle proprement dite. Au total, la CRF compte 4 magistrats et un attaché de justice en 2018. L’effectif du Parquet d’arrondissement reste toutefois inchangé suite à la création des nouveaux postes affectés à la CRF
Les magistrats du pool de complément sont inclus dans les chiffres de la question 55.3.

Q055 (2016): The number of prosecutors indicated here as working at the Supreme Court corresponds to the number of prosecutors working at the Superior Court of Justice (which includes prosecutors intervening at the Court of Appeal and Court of Cassation level).
Q055 (2014): The number of male public prosecutors decreased between 2012 and 2014, while the number of female public prosecutors increased for the same period. These variations have for sole explanation the normal progress of career of magistrates of the public prosecution office at first instance.

Q060 (2020):
"The staff of the judicial and administrative jurisdictions has grown steadily in recent years, as provided for by the amended law of March 7, 1980 on judicial organization. This explains the significant variations observed between 2018 and 2020 at the judicial and non-judicial personnel.
In 2018, the FIU was administratively attached to the Parquet Général du Luxembourg. Due to the FIU's functional independence, analysts (13 positions) and administrative staff (6 positions) are no longer counted among the staff of the public prosecutor's office."

Q060 (2018): Le personnel des juridictions judiciaires et administratives a connu une croissance soutenue ces dernières années, tel que prévu par la loi modifiée du 7 mars 1980 sur l'organisation judiciaire. Ceci explique les variations importantes observées entre 2016 et 2018 au niveau du personnel de la magistrature et du personnel non-juge. En 2018, la CRF a été rattachée administrativement au Parquet général du Luxembourg. En raison de l'indépendance fonctionnelle de la CRF, les analystes (8 postes) et le personnel administratif (5 postes) ne sont dorénavant plus comptés parmi le personnel du ministère public. L'effectif du Parquet d'arrondissement reste toutefois inchangé, par rapport à 2017, suite à la création des nouveaux postes remplaçant les postes auparavant affectés à la CRF auprès du Parquet.

Q060 (2012): The methodology of presentation of data changed between 2010 and 2012 which partly explained the considerable increase observed for this period. Besides, in 2012, there was a general increase of the number of public servants at all levels.

Q132 (2021): As a starting salary (professional judge of first instance or prosecutor) we consider the salary of the "attachés de justice" after their first appointment. The salary scale of the magistrates provides for 380 index points as a basis, a possible professional experience can be added to it but is not taken into account by our calculations.
As a theoretical basic salary for a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal we consider the grade M4, level 4, which corresponds to 455 points and to the average seniority of a magistrate appointed to the Court (Court and General Prosecutor's Office). However, it should be taken into account that this salary is strongly influenced by the family situation of the person concerned.
To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point. Between January and September 2021, the value of the index point for a civil servant was 20.17893; after 1 October, the value of the index point was 20.6831871. Taking into consideration these elements, a 12-month salary corresponds to 92 591€ for a first instance professional judge, respectively a salary of 110 865€ for a judge or prosecutor at the Supreme Court. These figures do not include any bonuses, allowances or benefits that may be added to the basic salary depending on the magistrate concerned.
More explanations on the calculation of civil servants' salaries, which also apply to the M career of magistrates, can be found on the civil service website (https://fonction-publique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html).

Q132 (2020): "As a starting salary (professional judge of first instance or prosecutor) we consider the salary of the judicial attachés after their first appointment. The salary scale of the magistrates provides for 380 index points as a basis, a possible professional experience can be added to it but is not taken into account by our calculations.
As a theoretical basic salary for a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal we consider the grade M4, step 4, which corresponds to 455 points and to the average seniority of a magistrate appointed to the Court (seat and General Prosecutor's Office). However, it should be taken into account that this salary is strongly influenced by the family situation of the person concerned.
To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point. In December 2020, the value of the index point for a civil servant was 20.17893, which corresponds to a 12-month salary of 92.016€ for a professional judge of first instance, respectively a salary of 110.177€ for a judge or prosecutor at the Supreme Court. These figures do not include any bonuses, allowances or benefits that may be added to the basic salary depending on the magistrate concerned. More explanations on the calculation of civil servants' salaries, which also apply to the M career of magistrates, can be found on the civil service website (https://fonction-publique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html)."

Q132 (2019): As a salary at the beginning of the career (first instance professional judge or prosecutor) we consider the salary of the "attachés de justice" after their first appointment. The salary scale for judges and prosecutors is based on 380 points, any professional experience can be added but is not taken into account in our calculations. To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point. In December 2019, the value of the index point of a civil servant was 20,17893, which corresponds to a salary of €92,016 over 12 months. In 2016, this figure corresponded to €84,185 and in 2018 to €89,771. More explanations on the calculation of civil servants' salaries, which also apply to the M career of magistrates (judges and prosecutors), can be found on the civil service website: https://fonction-publique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html.

Q132 (2016): The salary are those of the Court President and the Prosecutor General as no average salary can be calculated.

Q144 (2021): Since disciplinary proceedings may also be initiated for acts relating to the magistrate's personal (non-professional) behaviour, the category "other" has been used to take account of such situations.

Q144 (2020):
Since disciplinary proceedings may also be initiated for facts relating to the magistrate's personal (non-professional) conduct, the heading OTHER has been used to take account of such situations.

Q145 (2021): The law still provides for the penalty of a warning as a first level of sanction as well as compulsory retirement. Disciplinary sanctions against magistrates (judges and prosecutors) are listed exhaustively in Article 156 of the Law on Judicial Organisation. Withdrawal from a specific case, position downgrade and transfer to another geographical (court) location are not included in this list.

Q145 (2020): The law still provides for a warning as the first level of sanction, as well as compulsory retirement. Disciplinary sanctions against magistrates (judges and prosecutors) are listed exhaustively in Article 156 of the Law on Judicial Organization. Withdrawal from a specific case, retroaction of position and geographical transfer are not included in this list.

Q145 (2018): L'unique procédure entamée contre un magistrat du siège pendant la procédure de référence s'est terminée par une décision de classement émanant de la formation de discipline de la Cour supérieure de justice.

Q145 (2016): In 2016 there have been two disciplinary actions. One of the cases was dismissed as not sufficiently founded, in the second case the perpetrator was revoked from office.

Q146 (2021): The Diekirch Bar did not provide details on the breakdown of the number of lawyers by gender. Among lawyers registered at the Luxembourg Bar, who represent 98% of the lawyers registered at the two Luxembourg Bars, 52% were male and 48% were female.

Q146 (2015): The number indicated includes the number of lawyers, trainee lawyer, lawyers practising under their home-country professional titles and independent lawyers at September 1st, 2016.

Malta

Q004 (2021): The figure quoted above relates specifically to the Average Annual BASIC salary as provided by the National Statistics Office of Malta. The NSO do not collect the Average Annual Gross salary.

Q004 (2018): This data has been provided by NSO based on as yet provisional estimates.

Q046 (General Comment): In Malta there is no Supreme Court, the Court of Appeal being the Court of second instance. The Constitutional Court, then, is presided over by the 3 judges who compose the Court of second instance also known as the Court of Appeal in its Superior Jurisdiction. It is interesting to notice that 2 judges presiding over the Second Instance Courts also preside over the Civil Court, First Hall and the Family Court (which are specialised 1st instance courts).
The number of 1st Instance 'judges' also includes magistrates that preside over 1st Instance Courts.

Q046 (2021): During 2021, 4 new magistrates and 2 new judges were appointed to the bench, thereby increasing the judicial complement by the same number. 2 judges were also appointed to the bench, but given that they were previously magistrates, their appointment did not increase the judicial complement.

Q046 (2019): For Number of first instance professional judges, the difference in nominal figures is of 4 male magistrates compared to previous cycle. This is mainly due to retirement and the appointment of 2 male magistrates to judges. 3 new magistrates have been appointed in 2019, only 1 of which is male.
For the Number of second instance professional judges, Madame Justice Lorraine Schembri Orland has been appointed Judge elect in respect of Malta on the European Court of Human Rights. Given that she did not serve in Malta at the end of 2019, she does not feature in the above data.

Q046 (2017): Despite the categorical manner in which the Maltese judiciary have been classified for the purpose of this exercise, it is important to note that the roles of some of the judges are very fluid. Hence, some of the 1st Instance judges preside, when the need arises, over 2nd Instance courts, whilst 2nd Instance judges hear cases at 1st Instance such as at the Civil Court, First Hall or the Civil Court, Family Section.
Throughout 2017, 1 male 1st Instance Judge passed away at the beginning of the year, whilst another 2nd Instance Judge retired towards the end of the year. 1 female Magistrate has been appointed. Care is being taken in order to ensure an equal gender representation in the appointments of the judiciary.

Q046 (2016): Despite the categorical manner in which the Maltese judiciary have been classified for the purpose of this exercise, it is important to note that the roles of some of the judges are very fluid. Hence, some of the 1st Instance judges sit, when the need arises, in 2nd Instance courts, whilst 2nd Instance judges hear cases at 1st Instance such as at the Civil Court, First Hall or the Civil Court, Family Section.
There has been an increase of 3 female judges at 1st instance since 2014. There was an increase from 15 to 17 female judges at 1st instance in 2015 and a further increase of 1 female judge at 1st instance in 2016. Care is being taken in order to ensure an equal gender representation in the appointments of the judiciary.

Q046 (2015): Regarding the number of judges, the high percentage variations that might be observed results from the small absolute number of judges that Malta has. Malta has been trying, and there are still on-going efforts, at increasing the number of judges. If between 2010 and 2015 the number of male judges decreased (by 1), this was complemented by an increase in the number of female judges (also by 1).

Q046-2 (2021): Some judges in the Maltese judicial system preside over both civil and criminal courts. In this instance, such judges have been distributed evenly between the 2 courts.
Administrative cases at first instance are heard by the Administrative Review Tribunal, presided over by 3 magistrates. If appealed, such cases are heard by the Court of Appeal Inferior Jurisdiction presided over by a judge who hears and decides cases appealed from a number of first instance courts (not only the Administrative Review Tribunal). Given that these cases constitute only a fraction of the caseload of this judge, it would be misleading to indicate him as a 2nd Instance judge over appeals from administrative cases.

Q046-2 (2020): Some judges in the Maltese judicial system preside over both civil and criminal courts. In this instance, such judges have been distributed evenly between the 2 courts.
Administrative cases at first instance are heard by the Administrative Review Tribunal, presided over by 3 magistrates. If appealed, such cases are heard by the Court of Appeal Inferior Jurisdiction presided over by a judge who hears and decides cases appealed form a number of first instance courts (not only the Administrative Review Tribunal).

Q052 (2019): For Technical Staff: This is an issue of recruitment and given the change from a Department to an Agency, the Court Services will be issuing new calls in line with the requirements of the Agency.
Q052 (2018): Other non-judge staff include:
- Director Civil Courts and staff
- Director Criminal Court and staff
- Registry Criminal Court
- Chief Marshal
- Senior Marshal
- Marshals
- Judiciary Drivers
- Subasti Personnel

Q052 (2017): Other non-judge staff includes:
- Director Civil Courts and staff
- Director Criminal Court and staff
- Registry Criminal Court
- Chief Marshal
- Senior Marshal
- Marshals
- Judiciary Drivers
- Subasti staff

Q052 (2016): Other non-judge staff includes:
- Director Civil Courts and staff
- Director Criminal Court and staff
- Registry Criminal Court
- Chief Marshal
- Senior Marshal
- Marshals
- Judiciary Drivers
- Subasti staff

Concerning "Technical Staff", 2 technical staff were employed. Between 2014 and 2015, there was a decrease in the number of tradesman employed with the court administration.

Q052 (2015): In the 2015 data, the category 'Non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges' includes 13 Court Attorneys that have been introduced for the first time in October 2015. This staff is meant to assist the judges in the drafting of the sentences and other related matters. However the Court Attorneys are not autonomous and the responsibility for the sentences that they draft ultimately lies with the presiding judge.
The differences noted between 2014 and the previous regarding the categories "staff in charge of administrative tasks" and "other non-judge staff" is due to a change in the distribution. After 2014, some non-judge staff who were included in the category "staff in charge of administrative tasks" were integrated in "other non-judge staff".
The decrease between 2014 and 2015 in the number of "technical staff" is due to a decreases in the number of tradesman.

Q052 (2014): The differences noted between 2014 and the previous regarding the categories "staff in charge of administrative tasks" and "other non-judge staff" is due to a change in the distribution.

Q052 (2013): In 2013, the number of non-judge staff was detailed as follows: staff assisting judges – deputy registrars (67), court messengers (19), judicial assistants (30), clerical staff (141), ushers (25), senior court recorders (12), court recorder in charge (1), and Children's advocate (2); staff in charge of administrative tasks – Directorate Support Services (86), Directors and staff (12), Asset Management unit (3), Archives (3), one stop shop (7), Subasti (3), Library (1), Publications (3) technical staff – tradesmen (7), Bookbinder (1);
"other" – cleaners (8), Chief Marshal (1), Marshals (20). An exercise at beefing up the Court administration staff was undertaken by the Government in 2013, fas a result of which, the figures for different sub-categories have increased considerably.

Q052 (2012): In 2012, the number of non-judge staff was detailed as follows: staff assisting judges – deputy registrars (65), court messengers (19), judicial assistants (30), clerical staff (59), ushers (25), senior court recorders (12), court recorder in charge (1), and Children's advocate (2); staff in charge of administrative tasks – Directorate Support Services (83), Directors and staff (13), Asset Management unit (3), Archives (3), one stop shop (4), Subasti (2), Library (1), Publications (2); technical staff – tradesmen (7), Bookbinder (1); "other" – cleaners (7), Chief Marshal (1), Marshals (20).

Q052-1 (2020): It is not possible to differentiate the non-judge staff according to these criteria.

Q052-1 (2018): It is not possible, at the moment, to differentiate the staff working at first instance from that working at second instance.

Q055 (General Comment): All the lawyers working in the Office of the AG prosecute cases in the criminal courts, but it is not possible, as yet to distinguish between 1st and 2nd Instance Courts. All full-time lawyers have been included in the above figure except the AG herself.

Q055 (2020): The increase in the number of lawyers working at the Office of the AG follows the reform in 2020 whereby the AG has taken up exclusively the role of prosecutor general (the advisory role to government has been vested in the State Advocate). Given this special focus, the Office of the AG has been recruiting more lawyers in order to meet the case demands of the courts.

Q055 (2016): All the lawyers at the Office of the Attorney General work both in Court as well as advisers to the various Ministries and Departments. All prosecuting officers at the Office of the Attorney General act at all court levels. Thus, prosecutors are not classified according to the case instance.

Q055 (2014): These past few years there has been an increase in the number of female law graduates, which will definitely reflect in the employment trends within this sector.

Q060 (2016): This data relates specifically to the staff working int he Office of the AG.

Q060 (2014): The number of non-public prosecutors staff declared for 2014, is categorised as follows: supporting paralegal clerical staff – 17 (6 Male/11 Female); civil lawyers acting as attorneys – 13 (11Female/2 Male), legal prosecutors – 3 Female.

Q132 (2020): Wages for the lawyers of the AG were improved following a revision of salaries.

Q132 (2019): Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career: Actually there was an increase in the gross annual salary which is also reflected in the net annual salary. The difference in the net annual salary is then due to the different tax brackets that apply.

Q132 (2018): In 2018, following discussions with the Judiciary Association, the Ministry substantially increased the wage package of the members of the judiciary across all grades (Magistrates, Judges and Chief Justice). The agreement saw an increase in the basic salary and allowances received by the judiciary, with further increases planned over the coming 3 years. This improvement in the wage package reflects the commitment of the current administration to improve the working conditions of the judiciary, and continues to build on the reforms already brought into effect by the Constitutional Reforms (Justice Sector) Act of 2016.

Q132 (2014): The 2014 figures include the allowances over and above the 'basic' wage. A Magistrate has competence to hear all civil cases up to a value of €11,650 and criminal cases up till an imprisonment of 10 years whilst Judges hear all the other cases. The data provided relates to the salary of a Magistrate (in respect of first instance professional judge) and a Judge (in respect of Judge of the Supreme Court). The Net Annual Salary varies according to the Income Tax Bands announced, from time to time, and therefore it is not possible to indicate the amounts. The figures provided for as net income were calculated on the salary above-indicated for a married person.

Q132 (2012): In terms of the Judges and Magistrates Salaries Act, the gross annual salary of the Chief Justice for 2012 was €46 456, this of a judge was €40 221, whilst this of Magistrates was €34 188. A Magistrate has competence to hear all civil cases up till a value of €11,650 and criminal cases up till an imprisonment of 10 years whilst Judges hear all the other cases. The figure mentioned relates to the initial salary of Judge, though the beginning of one's career in the judicial field is as a Magistrate. The Net Annual Salary varies according to the income tax bands announced, from time to time, and therefore it is not possible to indicate the amounts. The figures provided for as net income were calculated on the salary above-indicated for a married person.

Q133 (General Comment): Act 44 Constitutional Reforms (Justice Sector) Act of 2016 also enhanced the independence of the judiciary through the introduction of an adequate pension scheme that respects the service that has been offered by the retired judiciary, as well as their widows/ widowers.
The special pension was introduced in 2016 for the judiciary, so it was not present in the previous cycles and it is not applicable to the lawyers working in the Office of the Attorney General.

Q133 (2020): In respect of 'Special Pension' for Public Prosecutors, The Pensions Ordinance, Chp 93 of the Laws of Malta, stipulates a special pension for the Attorney General only.
Q133 (2018): Act 44 Constitutional Reforms (Justice Sector) Act of 2016 also enhanced the independence of the judiciary through he introduction of an adequate pension scheme that respects the service that has been offered by the retired judiciary, as well as their widows/ widowers.
The special pension was introduced in 2016 for the judiciary, so it was not present in the previous cycles and it is not applicable to the lawyers working in the Office of the Attorney General.
Q133 (2016): Act 44 Constitutional Reforms (Justice Sector) Act of 2016 also enhanced the independence of the judiciary through he introduction of an adequate pension scheme that respects the service that has been offered by the retired judiciary, as well as their widows/ widowers.
The special pension was introduced in 2016 for the judiciary, so it was not present in the previous cycles and it is not applicable to the lawyers working in the Office of the Attorney General.

Q144 (General Comment): This data is not available due to issues of professional secrecy.

Q144 (2018): This information is not made publicly available.

Q145 (General Comment): This data is not available due to issues of professional secrecy.

Q145 (2018): This information is not made publicly available.

Q145 (2016): The only case mentioned above is know because it was leaked to the local media. The magistrate in question was reprimanded by the Commission for the Administration of Justice for breaching the judicial code of ethics.

Q146 (2021): The answer to Q146 represents the warranted lawyers who have registered themselves in the Register of Legal Professionals and Law Firms as per Act XIX of 2021. As from this evaluation onwards, the number of lawyers quoted will always be sourced from this official register.
Q146 (2017): The number of lawyers quoted in this answer refers to the number of warranted lawyers at the end of 2017. This data is based on a list of warranted lawyers practicing in Malta, compiled by the Department of Justice. Work on this list is ongoing but it is important to note that the figure quoted above, reflects a more faithful representation of the number of warranted lawyers in Malta.
Q146 (2016): The number of lawyers quoted in this answer refers to the number of warranted lawyers who are also members of the Chamber of Advocates, at the end of 2016. Throughout 2016, the Chamber of Advocates has been updating their list of members in order to clear the names of the lawyers who have either retired or have passed away. Furthermore, it is important to note that at present membership with the Chamber of Advocates, which is the sole Bar Association in Malta, is not mandatory. Hence over the past few months, the Department of Justice is drawing up the first complete list of warranted and non-warranted lawyers in Malta. Work is still underway so it is important to note that the figure quoted above, which is less than that submitted in the previous evaluation, reflects a more faithful representation of the number of warranted lawyers in Malta.

Q146 (2015): The number of lawyers quoted in this answer refers to the number of warranted lawyers on the list of advocates at the end of 2015. It is possible that some of these lawyers have retired so whilst the warrant remains valid, it does not necessarily mean that all 1569 lawyers are practising the profession. At present there does not exist any mechanism wherein lawyers register once they are given the Warrant to practice, and membership with the Chamber of Advocates, which is the sole Bar Association in Malta, is not mandatory to practice as a lawyer.

Q148 (General Comment): This data was not available prior to 2014. It started being collected by the Department of Justice in 2015.
Q148 (2021): Throughout 2021, 4 new applications have been submitted out of which 3 were accepted.

Q148 (2019): Throughout 2019, only 5 EU legal professionals were granted the respective certificate of registration with the limitation that they cannot represent their clients in court. Many more applications are pending evaluation.

Q148 (2018): The figure of 135 legal advisors is derived form the composite of 101 legal advisors at the end of 2017 and 34 new applications throughout 2018. hence at the end of 2018, there were 135 legal advisors who could practice with an established lawyer in Malta but cannot represent clients in court.
Q148 (2017): In 2017, there have been 25 newly registered legal advisors.

Netherlands

Q004 (General Comment): These are provisional numbers; definitive numbers (available next year) may differ slightly from those provided here. The data specifies ‘reward per working year’ as salary. This reward consists of salary (gross salary, including taxes and social contributions/premiums), rewards like holiday stipends, payment in kind, expense allowances tied in with work (e.g. travel allowances), and social premiums for the employer (payments for lawful and contractual social security, like pension contributions).

Q004 (2020): These are provisional numbers and the definitive numbers (available in 2022) may differ slightly from these provided here. The data specifies 'reward per working year' as salary. The reward consists of salary (gross salary, as it includes taxes and social contributions/premiums), rewards like holiday stipends, payment in kind, expense allowances that tie in with work (like travel allowances that cover costs to and from work), and social premiums that are for the employer (payments for lawful and contractual social security, like pension contributions).

Q004 (2019): The Statistics Bureau only had numbers for 2018. 2019 data was not available at the moment of data collection.

Q004 (2018): This is average salary of all employees; the number includes money that employers pay for pension plans, social security (money that is paid directly to employees). The statistic does not include the income of people who are not employees (people without work, employers).
Q004 (2016): Compared to previous questionaires (before 2014) these figures have been adjusted according to new rules of the european system of national accounts (illegal activities are now included)
Q046 (General Comment): Since 2020, new methodology of presentation of data is used, allowing distinguishing between first and second instance for the specific group of judges who were previously all counted as first instance judges ('overig RA'). For all cycles, court presidents are taken into consideration in the figures

Q046 (2021): Numbers are on posts filled, not fte. Total fte is 2416.
Total fte for first and second instance was given in 2021, but information on fte was NA for the rest of the categories and the detail required cannot be provided.
For the Supreme court, fte and posts filled are the same.

Q046 (2020): These numbers are on posts filled, not fte. The total fte for first and second instance together is 2372, but information on fte is NA for the rest of the categories and detail required for this question. These numbers include court presidents.
In the previous cycles, due to an inability to differentiate between first or second instance for a certain group of judges, they were counted as first instance judges. This inflated the first instance numbers and underreported the second instance numbers. This problem was present in the data up until the 2019 survey. For the 2020 data, this problem has been solved, and the data is now correct.
Q046 (2018): We did not receive information on the number of judges (in fte) working at the High Court. There are 33 judges at the High Court (people, not fte), 20 male / 13 female. Since this concerns only 1% of all judges, we'd suggest to work with these numbers (and accept the small deviation in the calulated total number)
Q046 (2017): these are number of people (posts); the total number of fte is 2315, this can not be separated for 1st and 2nd instances
NB: data on the number of Supreme Court judges is provided in fte. More precisely, according to the annual report of the Council of State https://jaarverslag.raadvanstate.nl/2017/ the number was 37.9 fte in 2017.
Q046 (2016): All data in number of persons. FTE data are only available for the total: 2148.
Supreme Court NA
Q046 (2015): Number of deputy judges courts in 2015 = 1.100
The numbers provided in the table are posts. The FTE is avaialble only for the total and it is 2.169. Other categories are NA.

Q046 (2014): In 2014, the number of first instance judges does not include judges of the Trade and Industry Tribunal, the Supreme Court and the Council of State. The number of second instance judges includes magistrates of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal and the Administrative High Court, excluding these of the Supreme Court and the Council of State.

Q046 (2013): In 2013, the total in fte is 2 181. This was excluding the Supreme Court. The number of first instance judges excludes judges of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, the Supreme Court and the Council of State. The number of second instance judges includes magistrates of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal and the Administrative High Court, excluding these of the Supreme Court and the Council of State.

Q046 (2012): In 2012, the total in fte is 2 194, excluding the Supreme Court. The number of first instance judges excludes judges of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, the Supreme Court and the Council of State. The number of second instance judges includes magistrates of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal and the Administrative High Court, excluding these of the Supreme Court and the Council of State.
Q046-2 (General Comment): Judges often work more than one case type. There is a large overlap, but in the administrative system, only one sector can be registered. Therefore, making a distinction would not be a fair reflection of the true situation and the information is not easily available. This comment does not generally apply to the High Court.

Q046-2 (2021): Numbers are on posts filled, not fte. FTE for first and second instance is 2416.
For SC fte and posts filled are the same. Note that the 11 judges under the category 'Administrative' (Supreme Court) refer to the judges in the tax chamber of the Dutch Supreme Court. With regard to administrative law, the Dutch Supreme Court only handles tax cases and some social security cases. There is no third instance court for other administrative cases in The Netherlands.

Q046-2 (2020): Judges often work with more than one case type. There is a large overlap, but in the administrative system, only one sector can be registered. Therefore, while this information is not easily available, making this distinction would also not be a fair reflection of the true situation.
These are positions filled, not fte (like Q46).

Q052 (General Comment): Only the total of non-judge staff working in courts is available.

Q052 (2021): The Council of the Judiciary is not able to make a distinction between different types of non-judge staff working in courts, and thus, the entry is NA. The Supreme Court can make a distinction for the number of non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges (fte = 110), and staff in charge of different administrative tasks (fte = 148). The first and second instance court cannot (total fte = 7395).

Q052 (2017): the number given is the number of people (posts), the fte is 6719; these can not be separated by gender or line in the table

Q052 (2016): Number of FTE = 6530.

Q052 (2015): FTE in 2015 is 6.497

Q052 (2014): The figure 7 287 pertains to persons; data in FTE is 6 495.

Q052 (2013): According to 2013 data, the figure 7.287 pertains to persons, data in fte is 6.495.

Q052-1 (2021): Comments from the SC:
1.Note that the above also includes the judicial and other staff working for the office of the Procurator General and Advocates General at the Dutch Supreme Court (who are not part of the Dutch public prosecution office).
2.Note that the Dutch Supreme Court has outsourced various tasks such as building maintenance, technical services, facility management, reception, security, cleaning and catering. The individuals performing these services are therefore not included in the numbers above.

Q052-1 (2018): The total of non-judge staff does not include staff of the High Court.

Q055 (General Comment): The Dutch Supreme Court does not have public prosecutors. The office of the Procurator General and Advocates-General at the Dutch Supreme Court is separate from Dutch public prosecution and the Ministry of Justice. They have a different function.

Q055 (2020): The Supreme Court does not have (public) prosecutors. The office of the procurator general and attorneys general that the Supreme Court houses, is separate from the public prosecution and does not function as prosecution. They have a different function.

Q055 (2016): total 927,5 358,12 569,38
1 842,25 312,72 529,53
2 85,25 45,40 39,85

Q055 (2014): For 2014, the number of prosecutors at first instance level includes 8 prosecutors who are still in education (7 females; 1 male). Prosecutors at Supreme Court level are not employees of the National Prosecution Service and therefore not included in the total.

Q132 (General Comment): Salary of judge / prosecutor 'at the beginning of career': the salary used is the one for a starting judge / prosecutor, after finalizing a training period of several years. During the training there is a fixed saraly, lower than the salary of a fully functional judge / prosecutor.

Q132 (2021): Public prosecution: Numbers are including a vacation stipend and 13th month. There is no new collective labour agreement as of yet, so these numbers are the same as last year. As soon as a new agreement is reached, the salary may change retroactively.
Concer
Courts: Salary of a judge / prosecutor 'at the beginning of career': the salary used is one for a starting judge / prosecutor, after finalizing a training period of several years. During the training, there is a fixed salary, lower than the salary of a fully functional judge/prosecutor. Salary includes a holiday stipend, as well as a 13th month.
Supreme Court: the above amount is the average gross salary (11.163,63 euro per month) for a regular Supreme Court judge and includes a holiday allowance (8% of annual salary) and a so-called 13th month (8.3% of annual salary). Please refer to legislation (https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0008365/2021-07-01) on this subject as well as the salary scheme (https://nvvr.org/uploads/documenten/Salaristabellen-RM-juli-2021.pdf).

Q132 (2020): Public prosecutor at the beginning of his / her career: The recent salary table RM of the end of 2020 is used (Scale 9, first step). On top of this the holiday stipend and end of year stipend is calculated. The 42.900 is a rough estimate of the net annual salary, after taxes, pensions etc.

Q132 (2016): The discrepancy of the answers for gross salary is not clarified.

Q133 (2021): SC: Other financial benefits for a regular Supreme Court judge would be a tax free monthly allowance for expenses of 1.502 euro. Please refer to the legislation (https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0008365/2021-07-01) and regulation (https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0031765/2021-01-23) on this subject.

Q144 (2021): Courts: There was one disciplinary proceeding for a replacement-judge (these are usually lawyers, professors, etc. and replace judges when they are absent, ill, etc.), not counted here.
SC: the two disciplinary proceedings concerned a dismissal of a deputy judge. Deputy judges usually perform a main position outside the judiciary. The law has provided for the possibility of the dismissal of a judicial official by the Supreme Court if the judicial officer has not been called upon to perform activities by his or her court leadership for two years. In addition, there should be a sufficiently compelling reason justifying the request for dismissal. In one of the cases, the deputy judge had systematically failed to respond to call notices asking for her availability to perform judicial duties. Nor had she responded to other correspondence. In the other case, the appointment to the position of deputy judge was related to the individual's main position as civil-law notary. Disciplinary measures were imposed on the individual in question. A Disciplinary Court disqualified the individual from acting as a civil-law notary. As a result, this individual lacked authority and credibility. In both cases, the Supreme Court held that there was a sufficiently compelling reason for dismissal.

Q144 (2020): A combined integrity issue in work and private life

Q144 (2018): private use of a company car

Q145 (2021): Prosecutors – other sanctions: one was handled as a type of complaint, and the other was a conditional dismissal for 2 years.
Q145 (2020): Resignation: whether or not at the insistence of the board (head of the court administration). Technically judges cannot be fired, as they are appointed for life.
Q145 (2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been explained that the sanctions enumerated in items 2 to 7 were not available yet in the Dutch legislation. As to the item "resignation", it subsumes dismissal upon request -early retirement- on a combination of a work and private related integrity issue. In 2010 and 2012, the only possible disciplinary measures were the written warning (for example, in the case of neglect of the dignity of the office and duties) and the dismissal. A dismissal is possible in the case of damaging a good state of affairs in the administration of justice and in its trust.
In 2012, there were 49 reported suspicions of integrity violations, 41 of them were actually fixed (39 prosecutors were involved). Most integrity violations had to do with improper use of service resources and the crossing of internal rules (e.g. unauthorized recording leave and undesirable use of the internet or social media). There was a rise in the number of suspected and confirmed integrity violations due to the increased awareness around integrity. Furthermore, in 2012, an Integrity Agency (BI-to) started working. It is a national expertise centre with an advisory, stimulating and controlling role in the area of integrity. Besides, in 2012, the renewed code of conduct was introduced focusing on five core values: professionalism, environmental focus, integrity, openness and diligence.

Q146 (2021): On 1-1-2021: 17 964 (9 837 male, 8 127 female)

Q146 (2020): This is the number of lawyers on 1-1-2021
Number of lawyers on 1-1-2020: 17.829 (total), 9867 (males), 7962 (females)

Q146 (2019): Numbers on 1/1/2020

Q146 (2017): Annual report NOVA 2017

Q147 (2017): NA

Q147 (2016): NA.

Poland

Q004 (2021): data source - Central Statistical Office
The wage increases linked to economic changes.
Q004 (2016): NA

Q046 (General Comment): The Polish court structure is characterized by four levels of courts but only three instances. Basically, there are district courts which are first instance courts, regional courts which are first and second instance courts, and appellate courts which are second instance courts. The highest instance courts are the Supreme Court, the Supreme Administrative Court and the Constitutional Tribunal. Owing to this peculiarity, some judges sit as first and second instance magistrates. According to the methodology of presentation of data that has been chosen, judges of regional courts are counted as first instance judges together with judges of district courts and judges of first instance administrative courts. Only judges of appellate courts are considered as second instance magistrates. The Supreme Court operates under the Constitution of the Republic of Poland and the Supreme Court Act. It is established to:
- exercise supervision over the activities of common and military courts in the area of adjudication - this is the so-called judicial supervision (Article 183(1) of the Constitution). The means used to exercise such supervision include:
- recognition of extraordinary complaints, cassations and other appeals (instance supervision),
passing resolutions resolving legal issues (extra-institutional supervision) Resolutions of the entire chamber or a larger body of judges have the force of law and are binding on all Supreme Court formations. A panel of 7 judges may decide to give the resolution the force of legal principle.
Competence of the Constitutional Tribunal
The Constitution of 2 April 1997 includes four areas within the jurisdiction of the Constitutional Tribunal:
1) control of norms (abstract and concrete; a posteriori and a priori - Art. 188 items 1-3, Art. 122 items 3 and 4, Art. 133 item 2 of the Constitution); a special procedure for the control of norms is the consideration of constitutional complaints (Art. 79 and Art. 188 item 5 of the Constitution)
2) adjudication of competence disputes between central constitutional organs of the state (Article 189 of the Constitution);
3) adjudicating on the compatibility with the Constitution of the objectives or activities of political parties (Article 188, item 4 of the Constitution)
4) recognising the temporary inability of the President of the Republic to discharge his office (Article 131, paragraph 1 of the Constitution).
Of the four areas of the jurisdiction of the Tribunal indicated above, the control of norms is undoubtedly a fundamental task.

Q046 (2021): Common courts:
The number of judges of district courts: 6046 (3938 women, 2108 men)
The number of judges of regional courts : 2684 (1550 women, 1134 men)
The number of judges of the appeal courts: 459 (239 women, 220 men)
The numbers are higher because the president appointed a lot of court assessors as judges in 2021. In addition, there were more appointments to the regional and appeal courts than retirements of judges from these courts.
The Supreme Court : 93 (73 men, 20 women)
The Administrative Supreme Court: 102 (62 men, 40 women);
Administrative courts first instance: 431 (192 men, 239 women);

Q046 (2020): The number of judges of district courts: 6036 (3922 women, 2114 men)
The number of judges of regional courts : 2544 (1462 women, 1082 men)
The number of judges of the appeal courts: 417 (220 women, 197 men)
The number of judges of the first instance administrative courts : 454 (260 women, 194 men)
Supreme courts:
The number of judges of the Supreme Administrative court: 102 (62 women, 40 men)
The number of judges of the supreme court: 97 (75 women, 22 men)
Military courts:
The number of judges of district military courts: 18 (1 woman, 17 men)
The number of garrison judges: 27 (5 women, 22 men).
*Starting from 2020 the number of Supreme court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court

Q046 (2019): Compared to the previous edition, the number of judges of the supreme court was also given.
The number of Supreme court is 99: 25 (civil chamber), 27 (criminal chamber) 14 (labour law and social security chamber), 20 (extraordinary control and public affairs chamber), 13 (disciplinary chamber).
Females: 21 (total)
11(civil chamber)
3 (criminal chamber)
3 (labour law and social security chamber)
3 (extraordinary control and public affairs chamber)
1 (disciplinary chamber)
Males: 78 (total)
14 (civil chamber)
24 (criminal chamber)
11 (labour law and social security chamber)
17 (extraordinary control and public affairs chamber)
12 (disciplinary chamber)

Q046-2 (General Comment): It is noteworthy recalling that the Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance.
Q046-2 (2020): 1. Supreme Court - the 13 judges of the Supreme Court Chamber of Labour Law and Social Insurance appear in the column “other” together with the 18 judges of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber and the 13 judges of the Disciplinary Chamber.
Q052 (2021): •Members of the Research and Analyses Office of the Supreme Court (Biuro Studiów i Analiz SN);
Data also includes staff from The Supreme Administrative court and The Supreme court of justice
Q052 (2020): probation officers, Specialists of Opinion Teams of Forensic Specialists
*the presented data does not include court assessors (trainee judges). The question should only indicate the number of court employees who are not judges. According to Article 2 § 1a of the Act of 27 July 2001. Law on the Common Court System (Journal of Laws of 2020, item 2072), in district courts, tasks related to the administration of justice are also performed by court assessors/trainee judges, with the exception of:
1) applying temporary detention in pre-trial proceedings in relation to a detainee handed over to the court's disposal together with a request to apply temporary detention;
2) examining complaints against decisions on refusal to initiate an investigation or enquiry, decisions to discontinue an investigation or enquiry and decisions to discontinue an enquiry and on decisions to discontinue an investigation and enter the case in the register of crimes
3) deciding family and juvenile cases.
Since in the remaining scope court assessors perform tasks related to the administration of justice - just like judges - they should be deemed to belong to the professional group of judges. At the same time I would like to inform you that as at 31 December 2020 there were 486 trainee judges employed in district courts, including 317 women and 169 men. 1. number of rechtspflegers of 16 voivodeship administrative courts included (males 23, females 34);
2-4. - In 2020 data include also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court;

Q052 (2019): - professional probation officers;
- employed in Consultative Team of Judical Specialist
Q052 (2018): Other non-judge staff:
- professional probation officers
- employed in Consultative Team of Judical Specialists

Q052 (2017): Other non-judge staff -5790
of which:
Professional probation officers - 5188
Employed in Consultative Team of Judicial Specialists - 602.
Q052 (2016): Other non-judge staff - 5859
of which:
Professional probation officers - 5212
Employed in Consultative Team of Judical Specialists - 647.
Q052-1 (2020): Data from the supreme court's human resources Department.
In 2020 data include also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court

Q055 (General Comment): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. Whereas under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of a prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices, since according to Article 16 of the Law of 28 January 2016 - Law on Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66) the common organizational units of the prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices. All items (1-3) include prosecutors for military matters.
The inclusion of the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutors' offices only in the total number of prosecutors is due to the design of the table. The table allows prosecutors to be entered: 1. first level, 2. second level 3. highest level. The table does not provide an opportunity to depict the full structure of the prosecutor's office in Poland, which consists of four levels: district, circuit and regional prosecutor's offices and the National Prosecutor's Office with a rank equivalent to the Supreme Court. Regional prosecutors' offices are a separate ('third') level of prosecution and the number of prosecutors employed in them cannot be 'split into instances'.

Q055 (2021): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. In contrast, under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of prosecutor of the National Prosecuting Authority. The total is higher than the sum of the sub-categories, as it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 402 prosecutors (154 women and 248 men), as, pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2022, item 1247), the common organisational units of the public prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices.
All items (1 - 3) include military prosecutors, of whom 77 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 19 women and 58 men; at the regional prosecutor's office level, 45 military prosecutors, including 9 women and 36 men; and at the National Prosecutor's Office, 17 military prosecutors (4 women and 13 men).

Q055 (2020): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. Whereas under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of a prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 391 prosecutors (151 women and 240 men), since according to Article 16 of the Law of 28 January 2016 - Law on Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66) the common organizational units of the prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices. For 2020, all items (1-3) include prosecutors for military matters, who at the level of the district prosecutor's office are employed by 85, including 22 women and 63 men; at the level of the regional prosecutor's office - 38 prosecutors for military matters, including 8 women and 30 men, and at the National Prosecutor's Office - 13 prosecutors for military matters (2 women and 11 men).

Q055 (2018): Within the organizational structure of general organizational units of the prosecution office, there are Appellate Public Prosecutor’s Offices, which function as a third rank and employ altogether 367 prosecutors (149 women and 224 men). Additionally, 65 prosecutors of military affairs (including 16 women and 49 men) are employed at the level related to the Regional Public Prosecutor’s Office; 30 prosecutors of military affairs (including 6 women and 24 men) - at the level related to the District Public Prosecutor’s Office, and 5 prosecutors of military affairs (5 men) - in the National Public Prosecutor’s Office.

Q060 (2020): The table presents information available at the National Public Prosecutor's Office Human Resources Office [Biuro Kadr] and contains the numbers of persons actually employed in universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services, without conversion into full-time equivalents.
The Human Resources Office does not have detailed data on the number of employees in the universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution service who are employed on an indefinite or fixed-term basis. Organisational units of the public prosecution service provide the Human Resources Office with data on employees of the public prosecution service (military part is provided separately) in the following groups:
1)FTE [full time employment] limits,
2)use of the FTE limits (not counted in full-time equivalents and not broken down between men and women) rounded to two decimal places, the actual number of employees (broken down into male and female employees).
The data provided doesnt include trainee prosecutors.

Q060 (2018): In the table, were presented total numbers of employees. Personnel’s Office does not have detailed data connected with differentiation the number of workers per part time or full-time basis. The Personnel’s Office also does not have detailed data connected with the number of workers employed in general organizational units of the prosecution office, for an unspecified or specified period of time.

Q132 (2021): Judges: The basic salary of a judge is determined in rates, the amount of which is determined using multipliers of the basis for determining basic salary. The rates of basic salary in particular judge's positions and multipliers, used for determination of basic salary of judges in particular rates, are specified in the appendix to the Act.
A judge is entitled to a function-related allowance in connection with the performance of his duties.
Judges' remuneration is also differentiated by a long service bonus, amounting, beginning with the sixth year of service, to 5% of basic salary and increasing after each year by 1% until it reaches 20% of basic salary. No social security contributions are payable on judges' salaries. Prosecutors:
The base salary for public prosecutors of universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services shall be determined based on the table of base salary scale for public prosecutors of universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services Pursuant to Article 123 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office of 28 January 2016, the basis for determining the base salary of a public prosecutor in a given year is the so-called base amount, i.e. the average salary in the second quarter of the previous year, announced in the Official Journal of the Republic of Poland "Monitor Polski" by the President of the Main Statistical Office "Statistics Poland" [GUS]. At the same time, according to Article 124 § 11 of the quoted Act on Public Prosecutor's Office, a public prosecutor is entitled to an supplement for long-time service amounting to 5% of the base salary currently received by the public prosecutor, beginning from the 6th year of his/her employment, and increasing after each successive year of his/her employment by 1% of this salary, until reaching 20% of the base salary. After 20 years of service the long-service supplement shall be paid, irrespective of the length of service beyond that period, at the rate of 20% of the public prosecutor's current base salary.
Supreme court and Main Public Prosecutor Office: Pursuant to Article 124 § 1 of the above-mentioned Act, the base salary of public prosecutors of the National Public Prosecutor's Office is equal to the base salary of judges of the Supreme Court. Pursuant to Article 48 of the Act on the Supreme Court [Ustawa o Sądzie Najwyższym] of 8 December 2017 (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 154, as amended), the remuneration of a judge of the Supreme Court is determined at either the basic rate or the promotion rate. The promotion rate is 115% of the base rate. Upon taking up his/her post, a judge of the Supreme Court receives base pay at the basic rate. After 7 years of service in the Supreme Court, the base salary of a judge of the Supreme Court shall be increased to the promotion rate.

Q132 (2020): Judges: The basic salary of a judge is determined in rates, the amount of which is determined using multipliers of the basis for determining basic salary. The rates of basic salary in particular judge's positions and multipliers, used for determination of basic salary of judges in particular rates, are specified in the appendix to the Act.
A judge is entitled to a function-related allowance in connection with the performance of his duties.
Judges' remuneration is also differentiated by a long service bonus, amounting, beginning with the sixth year of service, to 5% of basic salary and increasing after each year by 1% until it reaches 20% of basic salary. No social security contributions are payable on judges' salaries. Prosecutors:
The base salary for public prosecutors of universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services shall be determined based on the table of base salary scale for public prosecutors of universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services Pursuant to Article 123 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office of 28 January 2016, the basis for determining the base salary of a public prosecutor in a given year is the so-called base amount, i.e. the average salary in the second quarter of the previous year, announced in the Official Journal of the Republic of Poland "Monitor Polski" by the President of the Main Statistical Office "Statistics Poland" [GUS]. At the same time, according to Article 124 § 11 of the quoted Act on Public Prosecutor's Office, a public prosecutor is entitled to an supplement for long-time service amounting to 5% of the base salary currently received by the public prosecutor, beginning from the 6th year of his/her employment, and increasing after each successive year of his/her employment by 1% of this salary, until reaching 20% of the base salary. After 20 years of service the long-service supplement shall be paid, irrespective of the length of service beyond that period, at the rate of 20% of the public prosecutor's current base salary.
Supreme court and Main Public Prosecutor Office: Pursuant to Article 124 § 1 of the above-mentioned Act, the base salary of public prosecutors of the National Public Prosecutor's Office is equal to the base salary of judges of the Supreme Court. Pursuant to Article 48 of the Act on the Supreme Court [Ustawa o Sądzie Najwyższym] of 8 December 2017 (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 154, as amended), the remuneration of a judge of the Supreme Court is determined at either the basic rate or the promotion rate. The promotion rate is 115% of the base rate. Upon taking up his/her post, a judge of the Supreme Court receives base pay at the basic rate. After 7 years of service in the Supreme Court, the base salary of a judge of the Supreme Court shall be increased to the promotion rate.

Q132 (2019): The base salary for public prosecutors of common organisational units of the prosecutor's office is determined on the basis of the table of base salary for prosecutors of common organisational units of the prosecutor's office and the Institute of National Remembrance - Commission for the Prosecution of Crimes against the Polish Nation, and the multipliers used to determine this salary, which constitutes appendix no. 1 to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 29 February 2016 on the base salary of the prosecutors and the amount of functional allowances to which the prosecutors are entitled. The above table sets out the rates of base salary for different prosecutorial positions and the corresponding multiplier, which is used to determine the base salary for this position.
Pursuant to Article 123 of the Act of 28 January 2016 – The Prosecutor's Office Law, the basis for determining the base salary of a prosecutor in a given year is the so-called base amount, i.e. the average salary in the second quarter of the previous year, published in the Official Journal of the Republic of Poland "Monitor Polski" by the President of the Central Statistical Office.
Pursuant to Article 124 § 1 of the abovementioned Act, the base salary of prosecutors of the National Prosecutor's Office is equal to the base salary of the Supreme Court judges. Pursuant to Article 48 of the Act of 8 December 2017 on the Supreme Court (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 5, as amended), the salary of a judge of the Supreme Court is determined at the base rate or the promotion rate. The promotion rate is 115% of the base rate. A judge of the Supreme Court, taking up a position, receives the base salary at the base rate. After 7 years of service in the Supreme Court, the base salary of a Supreme Court judge is increased to the promotion rate.
At the same time, pursuant to Article 124 § 11 of the quoted Act – The Prosecutor's Office Law, a prosecutor is entitled to an allowance for long-term work amounting to, starting from the 6th year of work, 5% of the base salary currently earned by the prosecutor and increasing after each consecutive year of work by 1% of this salary, until 20% of the base salary is reached. After 20 years of work, the allowance is paid, irrespective of the length of service beyond that period, in the amount of 20% of the base salary currently earned by the prosecutor.
Moreover, pursuant to Article 124 § 10 of the quoted Act – The Prosecutor's Office Law, in connection with the function of a prosecutor, the prosecutor is entitled to a functional allowance, which results from appendix no. 2 Table of functions and multipliers used to determine the amount of functional allowances to the Ordinance of the Council of Ministers of 29 February 2016 on the base salary of the prosecutors and the amount of functional allowances to which the prosecutors are entitled..
Additionally, pursuant to Article 111 § 2 and 4 of the abovementioned Act, due to the nature of work and the scope of tasks performed, a special bonus may also be granted to the prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office, in the amount not exceeding 40% of the total base salary and the functional allowance. The allowance shall be granted for a fixed period, and in justified cases - also for an indefinite period.

Q132 (2018): Base salary for prosecutors related to general organizational units of the prosecution office is determined by virtue of the Table regarding rates, connected with the base salary for prosecutors related to general organizational units of the prosecution office and for prosecutors related to the Nation's Memory Institute - Commission for the Prosecution of Crimes against Polish Nation. The aforementioned table also includes multipliers used for determining the aforementioned salary and it constitutes Schedule No 1 enclosed to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 29th February 2016 on the base salary for prosecutors and the amount of extra duty allowance for prosecutors. The aforementioned table determines rates of the base salary related to particular prosecutor's position and appropriate multiplier used for determining the amount of base salary connected with this position. Pursuant to art. 123 of the Law on Prosecution Act of 28th January 2016 (published in the Journal of Laws 2017, item 1767 and later amendments), the basis of the prosecutor's base salary in a given year shall be - so called - base amount, that is average salary related to second quarter of the previous year, published in the Official Journal of the Republic of Poland by the Chairman of the Central Statistics Office.
Pursuant to art. 124 § 1 of the aforementioned Act, base salary for prosecutors related to the National Public Prosecutor's Office is equal to base salary for the Supreme Court judges.
Pursuant to art. 48 of the Supreme Court Act of 8th December 2017 (published in the Journal of Laws 2018, item 5 and later amendments) salary for the Supreme Court judge is determined at the basic rate or promotion rate. The amount of a promotion rate constitutes 115% of a basic rate. The Supreme Court judge, while taking over the post, acquires base salary related to the basic rate. After seven years of duty connected with the Supreme Court, base salary for the Supreme Court judge is raised up to the promotion rate. At the same time, pursuant to art. 124 § 11 of the aforementioned Law on Prosecution Act, prosecutor is entitled to allowance connected with a long-term service. This allowance constitutes, starting with the 6th year of service, 5% of the base salary currently received by the prosecutor and it rises - after each following year of service - by 1% of the base salary, until it reaches the level of 20% of the base salary. After twenty years of service, the allowance constitutes, independently on the period of service exceeding this time, 20% of the base salary currently received by the prosecutor.
What is more, pursuant to art. 124 § 10 of the aforementioned Law on Prosecution Act, in connection with certain position, prosecutor in entitled to extra duty allowance, which stems from Schedule No 2 of the Table regarding positions and multipliers used for determining the amount of extra duty allowance, enclosed to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 29th February 2016 on the base salary for prosecutors and the amount of extra duty allowance for prosecutors.
Additionally, pursuant to art. 111 § 2 and 4 of the aforementioned Act, the National Public Prosecutor - due to the character of service and the scope of duties - can be entitled to the special allowance as well. The amount of the special allowance shall not exceed 40% of base salary and extra duty allowance altogether. The special allowance is granted for a specified period of time or - under particularly justified circumstances - for an unspecified period of time. Salaries of judges and public prosecutors of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance - we indicated average salary which contains base salary, allowance connected with a long-term service and allowance connected with occupying post.

Q133 (2021): 1.A judge/prosecutor who retires or is retired due to age, illness or physical incapacity is entitled to an emolument equal to 75 percent of the basic salary and seniority allowance received at the most recent post.
2) Financial support. A judge/prosecutor may be granted financial support, in the form of a loan, to satisfy their residential needs.
3) Paid health leave. A judge/prosecutor may be granted paid health leave to undergo the prescribed treatment if the treatment requires to refrain from carrying out service. The health leave cannot exceed six months ..
3) Annual additional leave. A judge/prosecutor is entitled to annual additional leave of:
–six business days – after ten years of work,
–twelve business days - after fifteen years of work.
4) Jubilee award. A judge/prosecutor is entitled to a jubilee award . 5) If a judge/prosecutor is posted to a locality other than the locality in which the judge's place of work is located, which is not the judge's place of permanent residence, the judge posted during the period of posting, as an employee on a business trip, is entitled to the following dues, compensating for the inconveniences resulting from the posting outside the permanent place of service: 1) the right to accommodation, free of charge; ; - a monthly lump sum - in an amount not exceeding 78% of the judge's basic salary; - reimbursement of costs of the first journey from the place of permanent residence to the place of secondment, reimbursement of costs of the last journey from the place of secondment to the place of permanent residence and reimbursement of the costs of journeys made not more often than once a week to the place of permanent residence and back under conditions' - a lump sum to cover the costs of travel by means of local transport, - reimbursement of costs incurred for the use of vehicles owned by the employee for business purposes, - reimbursement of costs of daily commuting to the place of delegation;

Q133 (2020): 1.A judge/prosecutor who retires or is retired due to age, illness or physical incapacity is entitled to an emolument equal to 75 percent of the basic salary and seniority allowance received at the most recent post.
2) Financial support. A judge/prosecutor may be granted financial support, in the form of a loan, to satisfy their residential needs.
3) Paid health leave. A judge/prosecutor may be granted paid health leave to undergo the prescribed treatment if the treatment requires to refrain from carrying out service. The health leave cannot exceed six months ..
3) Annual additional leave. A judge/prosecutor is entitled to annual additional leave of:
–six business days – after ten years of work,
–twelve business days - after fifteen years of work.
4) Jubilee award. A judge/prosecutor is entitled to a jubilee award . 5) If a judge/prosecutor is posted to a locality other than the locality in which the judge's place of work is located, which is not the judge's place of permanent residence, the judge posted during the period of posting, as an employee on a business trip, is entitled to the following dues, compensating for the inconveniences resulting from the posting outside the permanent place of service: 1) the right to accommodation, free of charge; ; - a monthly lump sum - in an amount not exceeding 78% of the judge's basic salary; - reimbursement of costs of the first journey from the place of permanent residence to the place of secondment, reimbursement of costs of the last journey from the place of secondment to the place of permanent residence and reimbursement of the costs of journeys made not more often than once a week to the place of permanent residence and back under conditions' - a lump sum to cover the costs of travel by means of local transport, - reimbursement of costs incurred for the use of vehicles owned by the employee for business purposes, - reimbursement of costs of daily commuting to the place of delegation;

Q133 (2019): retirement
Pursuant to Article 127 § 1 of the Act of 28 January 2016 – The Prosecutor’s Office Law in connection with Article 69 -71 and Article 100 of the Act of 27 July 2001 - Law on the system of common courts (Journal of Laws of 2020, item 365, as amended), the prosecutor shall retire when they reach the age of 65, unless, not later than six months and not earlier than twelve months before reaching this age, they declare to the General Prosecutor their willingness to continue holding the position and present a certificate stating that they are able, due to their health condition, to perform their prosecutorial duties, issued on the terms specified for a candidate for the prosecutor's position. A prosecutor shall, at their request, retire, with the right to the emolument referred to in Article 100 § 2 - in the amount of 75% of the base salary and the length of service allowance earned on their last position - after the age of 55 for a woman, if she has worked for not less than 25 years in the position of a judge or a prosecutor, and the age of 60 for a man, if he has worked for not less than 30 years in the position of a judge or a prosecutor. A prosecutor who is a woman shall, at her request, retire after reaching the age of 60, regardless of the period of service as a prosecutor or judge. A prosecutor who retires or is retired due to age, illness or loss of ability shall be entitled to an emolument of 75% of the base salary and the length of service allowance earned on their last position. The emolument shall be increased in accordance with changes in the base salary of active prosecutors. In addition, a retired prosecutor shall be entitled to a one-time severance payment of six months' salary.
Judges and prosecutors are not given housing, but have, for example, the possibility to apply for financial support - in the form of a loan - to meet possible housing needs.

Q133 (2016): A judge who retires or is retired due to age, illness or physical incapacity is entitled to an emolument equal to 75 percent of the basic salary and seniority allowance received at the most recent post.
The emolument is icresed in line with changes of the basic solaries of active judges. A judge who retires is entitled to a one-off severance payment in the amount of six months' remuneration.

Q144 (General Comment): A judge shall be disciplinarily liable for official (disciplinary) offences, including: - a manifest and flagrant violation of the law; - acts or omissions likely to prevent or substantially impede the functioning of the judicial authority; - actions that question the existence of the official relationship of a judge, the effectiveness of the appointment of a judge or the legitimacy of the constitutional organ of the Republic of Poland; - public activities incompatible with the principles of independence of courts and judges; - offence against the dignity of the office. A judge shall also be held disciplinarily liable for his conduct prior to assuming office if by such conduct he has breached the duties of the state office then held or has proved himself unworthy of the office of judge.
The disciplinary penalties shall be:
- admonition;
- reprimand;
- reduction of the basic salary by 5%-50% for a period from six months to two years;
- a pecuniary penalty in the amount of one month's basic salary, plus the judge's long-service allowance, function allowance and special allowance, payable for the month preceding the issuance of the final sentence; - removal from office (for example, chair of a division) ;
- transfer to another place of employment;
- dismissal of a judge.
A prosecutor is liable to disciplinary action for official (disciplinary) offences, including: - an obvious and gross violation of the law; - acts or omissions which may prevent or seriously obstruct the functioning of the body of justice or the public prosecutor's office; - actions that question the existence of the official relationship of a judge or prosecutor, the effectiveness of the appointment of a judge or prosecutor or the constitutional authority of the Republic of Poland; - public activity incompatible with the principle of independence of the prosecutor; - misconduct on the part of the judge or prosecutor. An act or omission of a prosecutor undertaken exclusively in the public interest shall not constitute a disciplinary offence.
A public prosecutor shall also be liable to discipline for his or her conduct prior to assuming office if he or she has breached the duties or the dignity of the public office then held, or has proved unworthy of the office of public prosecutor.
A public prosecutor shall be liable only to disciplinary action for abuse of freedom of speech in the performance of his or her official duties, constituting a privately prosecutable insult to a party, his or her agent or defence counsel, curator, witness, expert or interpreter.
The disciplinary penalties are:
- admonition;
- reprimand;
- reduction of basic salary by 5% - 50% for the period from six months to two years; - a fine in the amount of one month's basic salary plus the prosecutor's long-service bonus, function bonus and special bonus payable for the month preceding the final conviction; - removal from office;
- transfer to another official position;
- expulsion from the prosecution service.

Q144 (2021): "Other": excessive length of the proceedings.
Prosecutors Office: providing information on a common type of disciplinary proceedings is not possible as no statistics are kept in this area. Disciplinary proceedings are carried out at the level of regional public prosecutor's offices by deputies of the disciplinary spokesman.

Q144 (2016): The data concern reasons of undertaken disciplinary proceedings agains judges is not available.

Q145 (2021): other :
- acquittal;
- consideration of the objection to the remark;
- finding guilty and waiving disciplinary sanction;
- Referral to other courts with jurisdiction;
- pending cases;
- uphold the contested order;
Prosecutors Office: statistical data of the Disciplinary Courts at the Prosecutor General's Office

Q145 (2020): Penalties of judges-. Data collected from Disciplinary Courts at the Courts of Appeal in Poland. Disciplinary Court at the Court of Appeal in Wrocław - 2 penalties of admonition;
Disciplinary Court at the Court of Appeal in Gdańsk - 1 penalty of a warning; Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeal in Białystok - 5 decisions on discontinuance of proceedings and in one case the penalty was waived;
Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeals in Kraków - 2 pending proceedings; Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeals in Rzeszów - finding of guilt and waiver of punishment;
Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeals in Szczecin - 2 penalties of admonition and 1 proceeding has not been completed yet;
Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeal in Łódź - 1 withdrawal from imposing a disciplinary penalty Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeals in Warsaw - 1 reprimand;
Disciplinary Court at the Court of Appeals in Lublin - guilt found, penalty waived, transferred according to jurisdiction;

Q145 (2018): According to art. 142 par. 1 of the Law on Prosecution Act of 28th January 2016 (published in the Journal of Laws 2017, item 1767 and later amendments) disciplinary penalties include: admonition, reprimand, dismissal from function, transfer to another place of service, dismissal from prosecutorial service. In view of the above mentioned regulation “other type of sanctions” means admonition and dismissal from prosecutorial service.

Q145 (2016): 16- number of admonition of judges
1-suspension of increasing the salary of a judge in repose.

Q146 (2020): Number of advocates: total: 19954, male- 10513, female - 8845
Incomplete data: No information on sex of 596 advocates;
Number of legal counsels: total: 37411, male - 17746, female - 19665
It is noteworthy that legal advisers have the same powers as advocates.
Q146 (2019): It is the total number of legal advisers and advocates.
It is noteworthy that legal advisers have the same powers as advocates.
Q146 (2012): Since 2010, the part-deregulation (carried out in 2007/2008) of the lawyer’s profession has been implemented and resulted in a major change in the number of lawyers.
Q148 (2019): "0" in principle, however: 4078 advocates and 10449 legal advisers - because of their non-practition.
Non-practitioners who have not lost their qualifications but who are registered on the list of non-practitioners, cannot provide services to clients, including representation in courts.

Portugal

Q004 (2016): In the present questionnaire we used another "concept" of gross anual salary that we believe is closer to the objectives of this question.
We opted for the category of "payments and salaries" instead of "remunerations" of the national budget because "remunerations" also includes social contributions by the employer which constitue wage costs and not salary.
Q046 (General Comment): The total includes judges from courts of 1st, 2nd and 3rd instances, except the Constitutional Court.
Q046 (2020): 3. We are dealing with small numbers, therefore the dicrepancy ratio is big. In addition, with time female judges, that are the majority of judges, are getting to the top of their professional career.
Q046 (2019): In absolute terms the increase is only 5 persons. The numbers are small, therefore in relative terms it appears to be relevant.
Q046 (2018): The number of Supreme Court Judges has been decreasing since 2015. In absolute terms the decrease from 2016 to 2018 is from 82 to 71 judges, which is not significative in absolute terms, but acquires a more relevant expression in relative terms.
Q046 (2017): As concerns the increase in the number of female Supreme Court judges: the numbers are small, therefore the variation seems important.
Q046 (2014): The increase in the number of Supreme Court female professional judges is due to the general tendency of increase of female judges in the last decade at first instance courts.
Q046-2 (2021): As there are judges who have civil and criminal competences at the same time, it is not possible to distinguish judges by civil and comercial matters. Therefore, the judges of the judicial courts were all included in the column “other”.

Q046-2 (2020): As there are judges who have civil and criminal competences at the same time, it is not possible to distinguish judges by civil and comercial matters. Therefore, the judges of the judicial courts were all included in the column “other”.

Q052 (General Comment): The variations in the number of non-judge staff over the different evaluation cycles seem high due to the small numbers.
Q052 (2020): 52-3-In absolute terms, the increase between 2018 and 2020 in the category "Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts" for women is from 94 to 104. Since we are dealing with small absolute values, the identified variation, despite not representing a significant difference in absolute terms, acquires a more relevant expression in terms of relative variation.
52-4- We confirm the increase in the number of "technical staff" in the courts between 2018 and 2020. No specific explanation.

Q052 (2019): In 2019, as in previous years there was no other non-judge staff.

Q052 (2018): In 2018, as in 2017 there were no other non-judge staff.

Q052 (2017): "other non judge staff" - this category includes all staff with a non-specified category or non-specific functions. As this is a residual category, the numbers tend to be small.
Q052 (2014): The decrease in the number of staff in charge of administrative tasks is due to retirements that have not been replaced and to the continuous IT modernization.
Q052 (2013): The number of judicial staff is decreasing on account of retirements that have been occurring since 2010. In addition, due to the reform of the Public Administration that is taking place since 2009 and the financial constraints of the past few years, the number of public servants has decreased.

Q052-1 (2020): We confirm the increase in 2020 in the category of non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level in the Supreme Court of Justice and the Supreme Administrative Court, with a special focus on the administrative and tax courts.

Q052-1 (2018): Since 2016 there has been an increase of non-judge staff to meet the needs of additional staff. There were no legislative or other changes that could directly justify the increase.
Q055 (General Comment): The communicated data encompasses the number of magistrates of the Public Prosecution Service in courts of first instance, second instance and high superior courts, except the Constitutional Court.

Q055 (2020): No specific explanation for the numbers above.

Q055 (2018): In absolute terms the decrease from 2016 to 2018 is from 7 to 5 female prossecutors, which is not significative in absolute terms, but acquires a more relevant expression in relative terms.
Q055 (2012): The increase in the number of female prosecutors is due to the general tendency of increase of female prosecutors in the last decade at first instance courts. It is natural that gradually the proportion of female prosecutors in the higher courts tends to grow as a result of their career progress. The number of prosecutors in the High Judicial Court and in the High Administrative Court, increased. In particular, in the High Administrative Court there was a strong reinforcement of these professionals in 2011 in order to respond to a pressing need of prosecutors in this court.

Q132 (General Comment): The net annual salary depends on various factors: personal tax situation; other personal revenues. It would not be accurate to provide a number under this category.
Q132 (2020): Source of data: Directorate-General for the Administration of Justice and the High Council for the Judiciary
The increase of salaries resulted from the revision of the statute of judges and prossecutors.

Q132 (2019): The increase of the Public Prosecutors' salary in the Supreme Court was due to the revision of the Statute of Judicial Magistrates
Q144 (General Comment): Judges: the annual report of the High Judicial Council doesn't discriminate the categories of disciplinary proceedings.
Q145 (2021): Regarding judges, on n.1 (2 sanctions were registered and 6 non registered), on n.9 (2 are sanctions of compulsory retirement and 1 of pension loss)

Q145 (2020): According to article 227 (2) of the Public Prosecution Statute, reprimands may not be registered. One of the reprimands applied in the year 2020 was not registered in the individual file of the sanctioned prosecutor.
Some of the sanctions applied in 2020 concern disciplinary proceedings started in 2019. Some of the disciplinary proceedings started in 2020 (Q144) have been filed (2).
With regard to judges, one of the reprimands was registered in the individual file of the sanctioned prossecutor, one was not and the third one is unknowed. Sanction 7 (transfer to another geographical (court) location) was applied as na accessory penalty of the suspension sanction).

Q145 (2018): 9. other: compulsory retirement

Q145 (2016): For public prosecutors other include temporary inactivity (2) and compulsory retirement (1).
For judges other include compulsory retirement (5)and dismissal (1).
Q145 (2014): For 2012 and 2014, the category “other” encompasses mandatory retirements. Sanctions indicated in items 2 and 4 imply salary reduction.
Q145 (2012): For 2012 and 2014, the category “other” encompasses mandatory retirements. Sanctions indicated in items 2 and 4 imply salary reduction.
Q148 (2021): We do not have this figure in Portugal.

Q148 (2020): We do not have this figure in Portugal.

Romania

Q004 (General Comment): At national level, the average gross annual salary is not calculated and included in the official statistical reports made annually by the National Institute of Statistics. Thus, the SMBA was calculated on the basis of the monthly average gross salary at an average monthly value of the euro calculated by the National Bank of Romania for the reference year concluding in the average gross annual salary (as the sum of monthly average salary).

Q004 (2020): The difference can be explained based on salary increases, and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.

Q004 (2018): At national level, the average gross annual salary is not calculated and included in the official statistical reports made annually by the National Institute of Statistics. Thus, the SMBA was calculated by request by the National Institute of Statistics on the basis of the monthly average gross salary at an average annual value of the euro calculated by the National Bank of Romania for the reference year 2018
According to the provisions of the national legislation in force (GEO no. 79/2017 with subsequent amendments and completions), the social insurance contributions, respectively those of social health insurance that fell to the employer, were transferred to the employee's responsibility and, starting with 2018, are fully supported by the employee, being reflected in the gross amount of the earning.
Consequently, the indicator "monthly gross average wage" produced and disseminated from 2018 is no longer comparable with the previous data series.
These legal provisions do not influence the data comparability for the series of "average monthly net earnings."

Q046 (General Comment): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). Only judges of the first instance court „judecatorii" are counted as first instance judges. In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above judges from tribunals and courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional judges", even if according to the procedural provisions in terms of competences tribunals may judge both as first and instance court and for certain procedural circumstances (material and personal) even the courts of appeal may judge in first instance. Moreover even the High Court can judge in first instance for example in criminal cases according to the personal competence rules of procedure.

Q046 (2020): Only judges of the „judecatorii" are counted as first instance judges.

Q046 (2019): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above judges from tribunals and courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional judges", even if according to the procedural provisions in terms of competences tribunals may judge both as first and instance court and for certain procedural circumstances (material and personal) even the courts of appeal may judge in first instance. Moreover even the High Court can judge in first instance for example in criminal cases according to the personal competence rules of procedure.

Q046 (2018): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above judges from tribunals and courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional judges", even if according to the procedural provisions in terms of competences tribunals may judge both as first and instance court and for certain procedural circumstances (material and personal) even the courts of appeal may judge in first instance. Moreover even the High Court can judge in first instance for example in criminal cases according to the personal competence rules of procedure.

Q046 (2017): The number of professional judges sitting in second instance courts (point 2) includes both the number of judges within the courts of appeal and the number of judges within the tribunals.
Q046 (2016): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In the table above the judges from tribunals are included in the category "second instance professional judges".
Q046 (2014): For 2014, judges mentioned at 46.1 are judges within first instance courts, while judges mentioned at 46.2 are judges within tribunals and courts of appeal.
Q046 (2013): Judges mentioned at 46.1 are judges within first instance courts and tribunals, while judges mentioned at 46.2 are judges within courts of appeal. In 2012 and 2013, the Superior Council of Magistracy brought important changes to the Regulation for the promotion of judges to the High Court of Cassation and Justice and 19 judges were promoted.

Q046 (2012): At 46.1 are mentioned judges within courts of first instance, while at 46.2 are mentioned judges within tribunals and courts of appeal.
Q046-2 (General Comment): The statistical system does not collect information regarding a breakdown in the number of judges based on the different legal matters.
Q046-2 (2020): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above judges from tribunals and courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional judges", even if according to the procedural provisions in terms of competences tribunals may judge both as first and instance court and for certain procedural circumstances (material and personal) even the courts of appeal may judge in first instance. Moreover even the High Court can judge in first instance for example in criminal cases according to the personal competence rules of procedure.

Q052 (General Comment): The number indicated for the category “non-judge staff assisting judges” encompasses clerks with judicial tasks; the number indicated for “staff in charge of administrative tasks” concerns registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants; the number indicated for “technical staff” includes IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel (drivers, ushers, procedural agents etc.). The category “other” subsumes assistance magistrates, judicial assistants and probation counselors. o Assistance magistrates work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice. They participate in the trial sessions, have a consultative vote in deliberations and write the minutes of the sessions, as well as the decisions. o Judicial assistants work only within tribunals and are part, together with the judges, of the panels which judge, in first instance, cases regarding labor and social insurances litigations (the panel is composed of 1 judge and 2 judicial assistants; the latter participate in the deliberations with a consultative vote and sign the decisions). o The probation counselors have, in principle, the following attributions: support the activity of judges by elaborating certain evaluation documents in criminal cases with juvenile offenders; support the activity of the judge delegated with enforcing decisions in criminal matters; cooperate with public institutions in order to execute the measure to force a minor to carry out an unpaid activity in an institution of public interest; initiate and carry on special programs of social reinsertion for persons convicted to prison and for minors who committed offences provided by the criminal law; carry out, at request, activities of individual counseling of offenders, with regard to the social, group and individual behavior; initiate and carry out special programmes of protection, social and judicial assistance of minors and youngsters who committed offences.

Q052 (2021): 6.665 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 170 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1.701 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 38 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1.723 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (–100 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).
Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (1055): a higher percentage of occupation of vacant positions.
Assistance magistrates: 130 Judicial assistants: 176 Probation counselors: 749

Q052 (2019): 6437 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 169 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1646 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 16 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1750 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents..... (– 6 IT staff works only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).
Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (867):
Assistance magistrates: 116 Judicial assistants: 177 Probation counselors: 574

Q052 (2018): 6402 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 163 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1645 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 17 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1772 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (–101 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).
Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (843):
Assistance magistrates: 110 Judicial assistants: 176 Probation counselors: 557

Q052 (2017): Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (852): Assistance magistrates: 112 Judicial assistants: 176 Probation counselors: 564
The increase observed in the category "other" between 2016 and 2017 is explained by the employment of the respective number of probation counselors.

Q052 (2016): 6191 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 165 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1621 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 9 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1822 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (– 109 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).
Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (663):
Assistance magistrates: 113 Judicial assistants: 173 Probation counselors: 377

Q052 (2015): 6149 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 149 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1615 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 9 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1844 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (– 109 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).

Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts: Assistance magistrates: 115 ; Judicial assistants: 176 ; Probation counselors: 352

Q052 (2014): In 2014, there were 6072 clerks with judicial tasks (153 within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1585 registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (9 within the HCCJ); 1854 IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (96 within the HCCJ). The category "other" subsumes 101 Assistance magistrates, 175 Judicial assistants and 360 Probation counselors.

Q052 (2013): In 2013, there were 5743 clerks with judicial tasks; 1563 registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants; 1784 IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel (drivers, ushers, procedural agents). The category "other" subsumes 92 Assistance magistrates, 176 Judicial assistants and 281 Probation counselors.

Q052 (2012): In 2012, there were 5489 clerks with judicial tasks; 1486 registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants; 1762 IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel (drivers, ushers, procedural agents). The category "other" subsumes 90 Assistance magistrates; 175 Judicial assistants; 281 Probation counselors.

Q052-1 (2021): A higher percentage of occupation of vacant positions for total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level.

Q052-1 (2020): 3. Total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level-
The difference between 2018 (comunicated data) and 2020 is pointedly given by the difference in the methodology for reporting data within the human resources sector. Thus, for 2018, in the total number of auxiliary staff (non-judge staff working at Supreme Court level) was not included the number of staff represented by ushers, procedural agents, drivers. Also, rechecking the communicated data for 2018 on this point (point. 3), it is confirmed that the total number of auxiliary staff (occupied positions) at the High Court of Cassation and Justice is 230 (2018 data, including the staff represented by the professional categories mentioned above).

Q055 (General Comment): In Romania there are four level of courts/prosecution offices attached to these courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above prosecutors from prosecution offices of the tribunals and of the courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional prosecutors".

Q055 (2018): In Romania there are four level of courts/prosecution offices attached to these courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above prosecutors from prosecution offices of the tribunals and of the courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional prosecutors".

Q055 (2014): The prosecutor's offices are established in the following hierarchy: the prosecutor's offices attached to the courts of law (point 1 of the table), the prosecutor's offices attached to tribunals and prosecutor's offices attached to the courts of appeal (point 2), and the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (point 3).

Q055 (2012): The prosecutor's offices are established in the following hierarchy: the prosecutor's offices attached to the courts of law (point 1 of the table), the prosecutor's offices attached to tribunals and prosecutor's offices attached to the courts of appeal (point 2), the Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (point 3).

Q060 (2020): Out of the total of 2408 filled in positions in the prosecution offices country wide, 1997 are occupied by clerks and the rest of 411 are procedural agents (who accomplish activities such as delivering summons, other courier activities etc.) and other staff such as drivers.

Q060 (2018): Out of the total of 2468 filled in positions in the prosecution offices country wide, 2044 are occupied by clerks and the rest of 424 are procedural agents (who accomplish activities such as delivering summons, other courier activities etc.) and other staff such as drivers.

Q060 (2016): The numbers include the clerks, forensics, auxiliary staff, public servants and contract staff

Q132 (2016): The increase between 2014 and 2016 is resulting from legislative changes, including the way in which specific legislation is applied in the light of the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court. The calculation method did not change, but the base of the monthly salaries has grown during the last two years, according to the legislation concerning the public remuneration, as it was interpreted by the Constitutional Court and the ordinary courts of law. Currently, the differences between salaries in the judicial system are eliminated. Since 2000 to the present, the magistrates' salaries have risen steadily, including the latest law on salaries in the public domain (Law no. 153/2017) has set a has set a salary level for magistrates well above the average of the budgetary staff. This law will have its full effect until 2022.

Q132 (2012): The 2012 data was based on the Law regarding the unitary remuneration of personnel paid from public funds, no.284/2010, with subsequent amendments and additions.

Q133 (2021): Other financial benefits are essentially related to medical expenses and travel expenses (limited).

Q133 (2020): Other financial benefits are essentially related to medical expenses and travel expenses (limited).

Q133 (2019): Other financial benefits are essentially related to medical expenses and travel expenses (limited).

Q133 (2018): Other financial benefits are essentially related to medical expenses and travel expenses (limited).

Q144 (General Comment): Disciplinary breeches may have only a disciplinary liability. Nevertheless, judges and prosecutors are responsible for criminal acts as any other citizen, according to an ordinary proceeding.

Q144 (2021): As previously, in the table above we have indicated the number of disciplinary actions registered in the reference year (2021) before the Sections for judges and prosecutors of the Superior Council of Magistracy in disciplinary matters.
The discrepancies between the number of disciplinary actions and the number of breaches of professional ethics + breaches of the professional inadequacy are due to the fact that one disciplinary action can refer to not only one but more disciplinary offences, as well as to not only one but more magistrates.
The disciplinary offences are expressly regulated under the provisions of art. 99 of the Law no.303/2004 amended and republished in 2018.

Q144 (2020): As previously, in the table above we have indicated the number of disciplinary actions registered in the reference year (2020) before the Sections for judges and prosecutors of the Superior Council of Magistracy in disciplinary matters (9 disciplinary cases/disciplinary actions were registered before the Section for Judges of the SCM in disciplinary matters and 9 disciplinary cases were registered before the Section for Prosecutors of the SCM in disciplinary matters).
The discrepancies between the number of disciplinary actions and the number of breaches of professional ethics + breaches of the professional inadequacy are due to the fact that one disciplinary action can refer to not only one but more disciplinary offences, as well as to not only one but more magistrates.
The disciplinary offences are expressly regulated under the provisions of art. 99 of the Law no.303/2004 amended and republished in 2018.

Q144 (2018): In the table above we have indicated the number of disciplinary actions registered in the reference year (2018) before the Sections for judges and prosecutors of the Superior Council of Magistracy in disciplinary liability matters.
The inadvertence between the number of disciplinary actions and the number of breaches of professional ethics + breaches of the professional inadequacy is due to the fact that one disciplinary action can refer to not only one but more disciplinary offences, as well as to not only one but more magistrates.
The disciplinary offences are expressly regulated under the provisions of art. 99 of the Law no.303/2004 amended and republished in 2018.

Q145 (General Comment): In the case of breach of the Deontological Code, there is no disciplinary sanction applicable. According to our legislation (art. 100 of the Law no. 303/2004 modified and republished) the sanctions that may be applied to judges and prosecutors, according to the seriousness of their violations, are the following: warning; decreasing the gross monthly indemnity by up to 25% for a period from one to 3 months; disciplinary transfer for a period from one to 3 years to another court or prosecutor's office, even lover in rank; suspension from office for a period of up to 6 months; position downgrade; exclusion from the magistracy.

Q145 (2021): There should be taken into account that the above mentioned data reflect the number of the disciplinary sanctions rendered in the reference year (2021) irrespectively of the year the disciplinary action was registered in, therefore this number is not necessary equal to the number of disciplinary actions registered in 2021, as these sanctions can be rendered for disciplinary actions registered before 2021 while there are also disciplinary actions registered in 2021 but not yet solved before the end of 2021; moreover, most of the decisions are final but there are also several ones are not final yet (the recourse procedure).
“Position downgrade” - this type of disciplinary sanction did not exist and it has been introduced by the Law no. 242/2018.

Q145 (2020): There should be taken into account that the above mentioned data reflect the number of the disciplinary sanctions rendered in the reference year (2020) irrespectively of the year the disciplinary action was registered in, therefore this number is not necessary equal to the number of disciplinary actions registered in 2020, as these sanctions can be rendered for disciplinary actions registered before 2020 while there are also disciplinary actions registered in 2020 but not yet solved before the end of 2020; moreover, most of the decisions are final but there are also several ones are not final yet (the recourse procedure).
“Position downgrade” - this type of disciplinary sanction did not exist and it has been introduced by the Law no. 242/2018.

Q145 (2018): There should be taken into account that the above mentioned data reflect the number of the disciplinary sanctions rendered in the reference year (2018) irrespectively of the year the disciplinary action was registered in, therefore this number is not necessary equal to the number of disciplinary actions registered in 2018, as these sanctions can be rendered for disciplinary actions registered before 2018 while there are also disciplinary actions registered in 2018 but not yet solved before the end of 2018.

Q146 (2020): There is no official explanation due to legal norms, in principle such fluctuations can be registered within the profession, as long as the total number has not registered significant fluctuations.

Slovak Republic

Q004 (2021): http://datacube.statistics.sk/#!/view/en/VBD_INTERN/pr0204qs/v_pr0204qs_00_00_00_en

Q004 (2020): Ministry of Finance did not offer closer explanation. Source: https://www.statista.com/statistics/419502/average-annual-wages-slovak-republic-slovakia-y-on-y-in-euros/
Q046 (2021): Number of Supreme Administrative Court professional judges are included in the Q. 46 line 3. (8 males, 13 females; total 21).

Q046 (2019): The Number of Supreme Court professional judges is 77 for the full time judges. There are 7 temporarily assigned judges as well (2 women and 5 men).
Q046 (2018): The provided total corresponds to the number of judges actually performing their functions. Put differently, judges
who are temporary assigned to other institutions (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, other judicial institutions including international courts), judges granted maternity leave etc. are not considered in the provided figures. Total number including judges temporary not performing their functions is 1427 (521 men, 906 women).
Q046 (2017): The increase in the total number of judges is caused by filling the previously designed vacant posts of judges.

Q046 (2015): The decrease in the number of judges in comparison with the previous cycle has been caused by the retirement of the judges whose posts have not been filled yet. The selection procedures for the vacant posts are under way.

Q046 (2014): In 2014, the total number of judges in the records of the Ministry of justice was 1366 (503 males, 863 females), including judges temporary assigned to other institutions, judges granted maternity leave etc.
Q046 (2013): In 2013, the total number of judges in the records of the Ministry of justice was 1385 (511 males, 874 females), including judges temporary assigned to other institutions, judges granted maternity leave etc.
Q046 (2012): In 2012, the total number of judges in the records of the Ministry of justice was 1344 (497 males, 847 females), including judges temporary assigned to other institutions, judges granted maternity leave etc.
Q046-2 (2021): The Supreme Administrative Court had 21 administrative judges in 2021, included in Second instance.

Q052 (2021): The number of technical staff is included in category 3 (staff in charge of administrative tasks).
The position in line 2. is not atractive for males.
Q052 (2020): The number of technical staff and other non-judge staff are included in category 3 (staff in charge of administrative tasks)
Q052 (2018): See general comment.
There are no special explanation related to discrepancies in gender composition of court staff
Q052 (2017): The slight increase in the number of male non-judge staff originates at the Supreme court of the Slovak republic. The position of the "Judicial assistant" has been established and filled. The assistant helps the judge with legal research, drafting of decisions etc. Out of 86 assistants there are 29 male.
Q052 (2014): In 2014, the category “Rechtspfleger” subsumes 967 higher judicial officers and 63 mediation and probation officers. The category “staff assisting judges” includes assistants of judges and court secretaries. The category “staff in charge of different administrative tasks” encompasses court staff responsible for court administration, contact with the public (information centre, filing office), archives and technical staff. It was not possible to extract the accurate number of “technical staff” and “other non-judge staff” from the overall data on “staff in charge of different administrative tasks”.

Q052 (2013): In 2013, the category “Rechtspfleger” includes 975 judicial officers, 45 legal assistants at the Supreme Court and 63 mediation and probation officers. The category “non-judge staff assisting judges” includes 1348 assistants and 752 judicial secretaries. The rest of the non-judge staff is subsumed in the category “other”. In 2011 and 2012, the Ministry of Justice decided to increase the total number of the judicial officers with the intention to improve the disposition of certain court agendas.

Q052 (2012): In 2012, the category “Rechtspfleger” includes 982 judicial officers and 64 mediation and probation officers. It was not possible to extract the accurate number of “technical staff” and “other non-judge staff” from the overall data on “staff in charge of different administrative tasks”.

Q052-1 (2021): Total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Administrative Court level - 59 total; 18 males and 41 females, included in line 3.. Some of the staff moved to the Supreme Administrative Court and some left the judicial system.

Q052-1 (2018): All data were provided by the central institution for the court management, The Department of Human Resources Development of the Ministry of Justice

Q055 (General Comment): The number of prosecutors at the Supreme Court level also includes prosecutors of the Special Prosecution Bureau. The latter deals with crimes of corruption and the most severe offences including organized crime. It intervenes in first instance, but acts as an organizational part of the General Prosecutor’s Office.

Q060 (2020): Staff increased for natural recruitment procedure

Q060 (2012): In 2012, the increase of the number of non-prosecutor staff resulted from the organisational changes in the prosecution services in the year 2011. In that year, the military prosecution services (which were administrated by the Ministry of Defence) were abolished and all the staff was assigned to the prosecution services.

Q132 (General Comment): The stated sums represent the basic gross salary of judges/prosecutors without bonuses and supplements. According to the Act on Judges (No. 385/2000 Coll.) the average monthly salary of the judge equals the monthly salary of the Member of Parliament. The monthly salary of the judge at the beginning of the career is 90% of this salary. The monthly salary of the judge of the Supreme Court is 130 % of the monthly salary of the Member of Parliament. The judge is entitled to have 2 additional monthly salaries (in May and in November) unless he/she do not meet the conditions stipulated in law. The sum of annual average salary stated in this questionnaire counts 14 months salaries.
All bonuses and supplements are stipulated by law. Specific supplement belongs to the judges of the Specialized Criminal court and to the judges of the Supreme court deciding on the remedies against the decisions of that court. The value of the net salary depends on several individual criteria, e. g. the number of children, the voluntary pension security scheme etc. Similar rules govern the salaries of prosecutors (Act on Prosecutors and Trainee Prosecutors No.154/2001 Coll.). The average salary of the prosecutor equals the average salary of the judge. The salary of the beginning prosecutor is 85% of this salary, the salary of the prosecutor at the General Prosecutors office is equal to the salary of the Supreme Court judge. Prosecutors are also entitled to 2 additional monthly salaries. Supplements for the heads of the prosecutor offices are similar to supplements of the court presidents at the same level.The prosecutors of the Special Prosecutor´s Office are entitled to same supplement as the judges of the Specialized Criminal Court.

Q132 (2019): The stated sums represent the basic gross salary of judges/prosecutors stipulated by law without supplements (methodology comparable to previous years data in the questionnaire). See general comment for details.

Q132 (2018): The stated sums represent the basic gross salary of judges/prosecutors stipulated by law without supplements. See general comment for details.

Q132 (2014): The salaries of judges and prosecutors in 2014 were at the same level as in 2012. The adjustments of salaries for all State officials (Members of Parliament, Government, judges) were stopped in the years 2013 and 2014 due to State expenditures restrictions.

Q133 (2020): The regulation about housing was included in the Decree of the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic no. 293/2019
Coll., which lays down the conditions and scope of reimbursement of increased expenses for traveling of the hosting judge, or the hosting court can offer accommodation for the judge.

Q133 (2019): The regulation about housing is newly included in the Decree of the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic no. 293/2019 Coll., which lays down the conditions and scope of reimbursement of increased expenses for traveling of the hosting judge, or the hosting court can offer accommodation for the judge.

Q144 (General Comment): Criminal offences of judges and prosecutors are not tried at discipilinary proceedings.

Q144 (2021): We would like to draw your attention to the judicial reform adopted in the Slovak Republic last (reference) year, which had also an impact on the disciplinary proceedings against judges and public prosecutors. The Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic (SAC) was established on 1 January 2021 and became fully operational on 1 August 2021; the competence to decide on the disciplinary liability of judges and prosecutors was transferred to it. The authority responsible for decision-making on the disciplinary liability of judges until the establishment of the SAC was the disciplinary chambers elected by the Judicial Council of the Slovak Republic. Disciplinary Proceedings Code of the Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic came into force on 1 December 2021. In the absence of this concrete legal regulation of disciplinary proceedings, the disciplinary chambers of SAC were not able to commence their decision-making. The number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges refers to the disciplinary proceedings brought before the SAC since 1 August 2021 and those which were brought before the disciplinary chambers of the Judicial Council from 1 January 2021 till 31 July 2021, were pending as of 1 August 2021 and transferred to the SAC.
The number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors refers to the proceeding which was brought before the SAC from 1 August 2021. From 1 January until 31 July 2021, there might have been some other disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors, which were brought before the disciplinary committees appointed by the Prosecutor General - the authority responsible for decision-making on the disciplinary liability of public prosecutors before the establishment of the SAC. None of the cases were transferred to the SAC and the SAC therefore does not have the data or statistics of the decision-making of those disciplinary committees.
Besides the disciplinary proceedings heard and decided by the SAC, there is a possibility to impose a sanction of minor importance to a judge. According to Article 117 paragraph 7 of the Act on Judges, deficiencies in the work/ethics of minor importance can be dealt with by giving a written warning to a judge if this is sufficient. The SAC does not have the competence to collect the information regarding the written warnings unless the judge proposes to invalidate the written warning since the review of those written warnings is carried out by the SAC. In 2021, there were 6 proposals for determining the written warning as invalid brought before the SAC and the disciplinary chambers of the Judicial Council.

Q144 (2020): In the line 4. "Other" are counted motions for a declaration that the written warning is invalid.

Q144 (2018): In 2018 there were 21 disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges for these reasons:
Professional inadequacy: 19 disciplinary proceedings, e.g. violation of the duties of a judge; a deliberate breach of the judge's duty to decide impartially and impartially; presence in the workplace under the influence of alcohol, narcotic or psychotropic substances; culpable conduct of a judge resulting in delays in court proceedings, Other: 2 disciplinary proceedings for failure to submit the written declaration along with asset declaration

Q144 (2016): With respect to the judges the majority of "other" disciplinary proceedings was initiated due to causing the procedural delays (23 cases), filing an application for declaration of invalidity of a written reprimand filed by a judge itself (3 cases) and failure to meet the obligation of standby duty performance duly and timely and failure to meet the obligation of overtime function performance (1 case).
Q144 (2014): In 2014, the category “other” included 1 deliberate violation of the obligation to impartial and unbiased deciding, 9 deliberate conducts of judges leading to undue delays, 1 arbitrary decision, 2 repeated committing of a serious breaching of discipline.
Q144 (2012): In 2012, there were 19 disciplinary proceedings against judges for professional inadequacy - undue delays in proceedings (10), failure to elaborate the judgments within the statutory time period (3); failure to decide within the statutory time period (3); other breaches of the professional duties (3). As to the category “other”, it encompassed one misdemeanor against the public order.
Q145 (General Comment): The disciplinary judiciary at the Judicial Council of the Slovak Republic consisted of the Disciplinary Boards (senates) and the Disciplinary Boards (senates) of Appeal. The senates were created by the Judicial Council of the Slovak Republic, which supervised them to the extent specified by law. The first instance disciplinary board/senat consists of 3 members - the president of the board has to be a judge, 1 member is a judge and 1 member is experienced legal professional. The appeal disciplinary board consists of 5 members - the president of the tribunal and 2 members have to be judges, 2 members are experienced legal professionals. In the case of the president and the vice-president of the Supreme Court, the role of disciplinary court is performed by the Constitutional court of the Slovak republic. The disciplinary judiciary exercised its powers in the above mentioned proces from 1st of July 2017 untill 31st of July 2021. From 1st of August 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic is the disciplinary court for judges of the Slovak Republic.

Q145 (2021): In the light of the above-mentioned information concerning the judicial reform, there were no sanctions against judges and public prosecutors imposed by the SAC in 2021. The disciplinary chambers of the SAC started the decision-making process in February/March 2022. Due to the de facto inoperability of the disciplinary chambers of the Judicial Council, there were no sanctions against judges imposed by Judicial Council either. Regarding the sanctions against public prosecutors imposed before 1 August 2021, the SAC does not have the data or statistics of the decision-making of the disciplinary committees.

Q145 (2020): Prosecutors: In 2020, no disciplinary measure was imposed by the prosecutor, only one disciplinary was legally terminated, namely with the acquittal of the prosecutor. Judges: In the line 4. "Other" are counted suspension of disciplinary proceedings (16) and liberation (2).

Q145 (2018): The difference between the number of disciplinary proceedings initiated and the number of sanctions imposed is caused by the fact that not every initiated disciplinary proceedings results in sanction or finding the defendant guilty. The other reason is that some proceedings were not terminated within the same year.

Q145 (2016): In relation to the judges the majority of “other” disciplinary proceedings was ended by the judge being acquitted (9 cases), the disciplinary proceedings being terminated (11 cases), the disciplinary sentence being withheld (1 case) or the sanction being pronounced to be invalid (2 cases). There were situations within one disciplinary proceeding of partly deciding one way and partly deciding the other (for example partly imposing a sanction and partly terminating the disciplinary proceedings), therefore the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings differs from the number of sanctions. In relation to the prosecutors the “other” sanctions include suspension of the disciplinary proceedings due to the initiation of public prosecution in criminal proceedings against the prosecutor (1 case), termination of the disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because of lapse of the period of two years since commitment of the disciplinary misconduct (5 cases), termination of the disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because of failure to file an application on time (1 case), termination of disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because of termination of function of the prosecutor accused (2 cases), termination of the disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because of the application being filed by an unauthorised person (1 case), termination of the disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because the act was not considered to be a disciplinary misconduct (2 cases) and the prosecutor being acquitted (2 cases).
There were situations within one disciplinary proceeding of partly deciding one way and partly deciding the other (for example partly imposing a sanction and partly terminating the disciplinary proceedings), therefore the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings differs from the number of sanctions.

Q145 (2014): In 2014, only 6 disciplinary proceedings were resolved with final and conclusive decision. The remaining proceedings were pending. As concerns the category “other”, it subsumed a removal from the office of the vice-president of a court.
It is noteworthy that in 2014, several essential changes of legislation were made regarding disciplinary sanctioning of prosecutors. As a result, ongoing disciplinary procedures took more time and a low number of disciplinary sanctions were imposed.

Q145 (2012): In 2012, only 9 cases were decided by the Disciplinary court, the rest of the proceedings being pending. Besides, as regards the category “other”, in 3 cases the motion was withdrawn, while in 1 case the motion was dismissed.

Q146 (2016): The number represents all lawyers registered in the list of the Slovak Bar Association.
Out of this number 848 lawyers have their practise suspended.

Q146 (2012): The number of practising lawyers is increasing constantly.

Q148 (2018): Slovak legal order does not regulate this type of legal advisors.

Q148 (2017): The Slovak legal system does not recognize this kind of legal advisors.

Slovenia

Q004 (2020): Annual average gross salary is increasing (increase by 4% from 2018 to 2019 and by 6% from 2019 to 2020).

Q004 (2016): Average monthly gross earnings for 2016.

Q046 (General Comment): The provided total number of judges corresponds to the number of de facto occupied judicial posts performing their functions. Some judges are assigned to other duties (eg. to the Judicial council, Ministry of Justice, Supreme court) and are not included in the reported numbers. The information on actual presence (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave) is also available. Higher judges at first instance courts (local, district, labour and social and the Administrative Court) are reported by their court - as second instance judges.

Q046 (2021): At the end of 2021, 880 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 860 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (20 judges - difference to the total of 880 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts. The data on actual presence of judges in courts is also collected; the number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2021 was 802,84 according to actual presence calculations.
Until 2021, approx. 30 judges at the Administrative Court (first instance court, see Q44) and approx. 50 higher judges at local and district courts (first instance courts) were reported as second-instance judges (accoriding to their rank: higher judge); from 2022 they are reported according to their court (first-instance judges).

Q046 (2020): At the end of 2020, 890 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 875 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (15 judges - difference to the total of 890 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts. The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave).
The number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2020 was 805,5 according to actual presence calculations.

Q046 (2019): At the end of 2019, 890 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave).
Nevertheless, we report that 873 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (17 judges - difference to the total of 890 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts.
The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave). The number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2019 was 797 according to actual presence calculations.

Q046 (2018): At the end of 2018, 890 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 867 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (23 judges - difference to the total of 890 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts. The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave).
The number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2018 was 796 according to actual presence calculations.

Q046 (2017): At the end of 2017, 889 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 869 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (20 judges - difference to the total of 889 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts.
The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave)
The number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2016 was 795,54 according to actual presence calculations.

Q046 (2016): At the end of 2016, 897 judicial posts were formally occupied (full-time equivalent method), although some post were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave). The number of judges in Slovenian judicial system in 2016 was 811,52 according to actual presence calculations.
Nevertheless, we report that 880 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (17 judges - difference to the total of 897 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts.

Q046 (2015): At the end of 2015, 912 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some post were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave).
Nevertheless, 897 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since
some judges were assigned to other duties (at the Supreme Court; different projects ;appointed to the Judicial Council and appointed to the Ministry of Justice.

We reported the Administrative court as the first instance court (Q42 and Q91). However, the law requires for the Administrative court judge to be a higher judge (2nd instance judge), therefore the Administrative court judges are included as the 2nd instance professional judges

Q046 (2012): Starting with 2012, judges of administrative courts are included in the number of first instance judges.

Q046-2 (General Comment): In 2021, the data on judges classified by legal fields was collected for the first time (by approximating the time an individual judge is working on a certain type of case). Since the methodology of reporting is yet to be revised and elaborated, we can only report approximate numbers. The distinction to Civil and/or Commercial/Criminal/Administrative/Other judges is roughly the same as for the number of cases (see comments to Q91, 93 and 94). The category "Other" includes judges involved in the court management. Judges involved in court management are partially or entirely relieved from adjudicating cases.
The data is reported as actual presence (not FTE).

Q046-2 (2021): The data is only approximate - please see general comment. The data is reported as actual presence (not FTE) and therefore not compatible with Q46.

Q046-2 (2020): There is no data for 2020. In 2021, the data on judges by legal fields was collected for the first time (by approximating the time and workload an individual judge is working on a certain type of cases). Since the metodology of reporting is yet to be revised and elaborated, we can only report approximate numbers. For distinction on Civil and/or Commercial/Criminal/Administrative/Other please see comments to Q91, 93 and 94.
First instance judges: Civil and/or commercial: 62% (approx. 396 judges); Criminal: 33% (approx. 214 judges); Administrative: 4% (approx. 28 judges), Other: 1% (approx. 5 judges)
Please note: the judges at the Administrative Court that resolve administative cases at first instance have the rank of a higher judge.
Second instance judges: Civil and/or commercial: 66% (approx. 77 judges); Criminal: 34% (approx. 39 judges); Administrative: /, Other: /
Supreme court judges: Civil and/or commercial: 57% (approx. 16 judges); Criminal: 18% (approx. 5 judges); Administrative: 25% (approx. 9 judges), Other: /

Q052 (General Comment): The definitions of categories are as follows:
1. “Rechtspfleger” category includes only the staff (judicial assistants and judicial advisers) with autonomous competence to adopt final decisions (decisions on the merits of the case), set explicitly in procedural laws - currently the Claim Enforcement and Security Act, the Financial Operations, Insolvency Proceedings and Compulsory Windingup Act, the Court Register of Legal Entities Act and the Land Register Act.
2. “Non-judge staff” category includes staff, whose tasks are generally set by the Courts Act. These are judicial assistants (filing applications and statements by parties for the record and, by order of a judge, perform less demanding tasks related to preparation for trial proceedings or other procedural acts, making calculations of costs, preparing drafts of decisions and performing other tasks in judicial proceedings under the orders of a judge), judicial advisers (performing work connected with the examination of parties, witnesses and experts (outside the main hearings), performing more complex preparatory work for hearings, reporting at panel meetings, drafting decisions, conducting hearings under the guidance of a judge and performing other work by order of a judge) and judicial trainees (typically do not perform significant amount of work as their role is to learn; however they can participate in hearings and drafting of court decisions in some cases).
3. All the other staff, not mentioned above and not corresponding to 4. “Technical staff” is included in 3. “Administrative staff”. The latter includes, along with the court management staff, the office support staff, whose tasks are not specifically set by the law and include case registering, administrative case preparation, court fees, typing and/or recording of court sessions etc.

Q052 (2021): Approx. 3% of all court staff (115 persons) are judicial trainees (reported under “2. Non-judge (judicial staff”).

Q052 (2020): Approx. 3% of all court staff (109 persons) are judicial trainees (counted under “2. Non-judge (judicial staff”). No particular explanation can be given regarding the increase in the number of “3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts” / Males.

Q052 (2017): Differences with previous evaluation cycles within categories (including male/female ratio):
The number of court staff is reported according to the actual work tasks of the staff. Between years, court staff can be assigned to different departments and tasks and therefore the variation of Rechtspfleger/Non-judge/Administrative staff categories and male/female ratio within categories can change, even though no major hiring or letting go for different categories of court staff had occurred. The relative differences in the Technical staff category are due to the small (absolute) number of staff.

Q052 (2016): Differences with previous evaluation cycles within categories (including male/female ratio):
The number of court staff is reported according to the actual work tasks of the staff. Between years, court staff can be assigned to different departments and tasks and therefore the variation of Rechtspfleger/Non-judge/Administrative staff categories and male/female ratio within categories can change, even though no major hiring or letting go for different categories of court staff had occurred. The relative differences in the Technical staff category are due to the small (absolute) number of staff.

Q052 (2015): The difference between 2014 and 2015 data is due to the methodology of gathering the data. In this cycle, all the courts were asked to provide the additional data to assure the accuracy of the answer. The reporting method was further improved and some adjustments were made according to the definition of “Rechtspfleger”, “Non-judge staff” and „Administrative staff“ categories.

Q052 (2014): In courts, there were 14,55 % of males and 85,45 % of females (judges included) on 31. 12. 2014. In this cycle the reporting method was further improved. The Supreme Court's strategic orientation according to this matter is to decrease the number of judges, while increasing the number of non-judge staff. The Supreme Court can, in order to ensure timeliness of proceedings, distribute additional finances for temporary employment of additional staff to individual courts.

Q052 (2013): The category 1 - "Rechtspfleger" includes court clerks, independent and higher judicial advisors in the field of commercial (court) register, land register and civil enforcement procedure, as they have the competence to decide on certain cases, judicial advisers in the field of civil enforcement, who have even slightly broader competences than judicial assistants. The category 2 includes judicial advisers and the remaining judicial assistants. The category 3 includes administrative support to the judge and court management – court director, human resources office, financing-accounting office. The category 4 refers to cleaning, security, system administration, drivers, etc.

Q052 (2012): In 2012, the category 1 - "Rechtspfleger" includes court clerks; the category 2 includes judicial advisers. The other court staff was not further categorised.
Q052-1 (General Comment): Besides profiles typically working in courts, the non-judge staff at the Supreme court includes also staff at the Centre for Informatics (see Q62-1) – approx. 20 employees, mostly system administrators/engineers (counted at Q52 under “4. Technical staff”) and project managers (counted at Q52 as “3. Administrative staff”).

Q052-1 (2020): No particular explanation can be given regarding the increase in the number of “3. Total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level” / Males.
Q055 (General Comment): The number is reported in FTE.
In the Slovenian criminal justice system state prosecutors are exclusively authorized to conduct public prosecution in criminal matters on behalf of society and in the public interest. The Constitution and law guarantee autonomy in status and functioning of state prosecutors. Decisions made by the state prosecutor shall not be interfered with, except by way of general instructions and assigning of a case in the manner determined by the law.
Slovenian state prosecutors perform their function in 13 organizational units – prosecution offices. There are 11 District State Prosecutor’s Offices and one Specialized State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia, where local, district and senior state prosecutors are positioned. At the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia supreme state prosecutors and the State Prosecutor General perform their functions. Some state prosecutors of lower ranks are assigned to the office perform demanding professional tasks.
There are no higher state prosecutor’s offices as the proceedings at the courts of appeal are governed by the district prosecutor’s offices. According to the State Prosecution Service Act prosecutors with the rank of at least local state prosecutor may represent a case at local courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least district state prosecutor may represent a case at district courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least senior state prosecutor may represent a case before higher courts and only supreme state prosecutors may represent a case at the Supreme Court. Local state prosecutors may also appear at district courts, if authorized by the head of state prosecutor’s office for certain categories of matters, for a particular matter, for certain categories of procedural acts or for a particular procedural act. Local and district prosecutors may in their cases appear along with a senior prosecutor at courts of appeal, if authorized by the head of an appellate division of the state prosecutor’s office for a particular case. Senior and supreme state prosecutors are competent to represent a case at before first instance courts. Local and district prosecutors are reported as prosecutors at first instance level, senior prosecutors as prosecutors at second instance level and supreme prosecutors as prosecutors at Supreme Court level, without regard to the court instance where they perform their function, or that they are assigned to another institution for a limited period of time (e.g for the administration of State Prosecutorial Council).
The number of posts of state prosecutors is set by the Government's Regulation. However the actual number of state prosecutors is lower than the number se by regulation due to different factors.

Q055 (2021): Before 2021, data was reported in gross numbers. For 2021 data, the FTE format is observed.
The above data does not include six State prosecutors who perform other duties (assigned to The Council of State Prosecutors, appointed to Eurojust, the European Public Prosecutor and the European Delegate Prosecutor).
Q055 (2020): The information is in form of gross data. According to the methodology used for reporting judges and court staff (FTE) – by which part-time employees are converted to full-time time by the calculation of working hours, the number amounts to 193, as a number of prosecutors are not working full time.

Q055 (2016): Slovenian state prosecutors perform their function in 13 organizational units. There are 11 district prosecutor's offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office of The Republic of Slovenia, where local, district and higher state prosecutors are positioned. At The Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia supreme state prosecutors and State Prosecutor General perform their functions. Here are also some state prosecutors of lower ranks assigned to perform demanding professional tasks.
There are no higher state prosecutor's offices as the proceedings before the courts of appeal are governed by the district prosecutor's offices. According to the State Prosecutor Act prosecutors with the rank of at least local state prosecutor may represent a case before local courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least district state prosecutor may represent a case before district courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least higher state prosecutor may represent a case before higher courts and only supreme state prosecutors may represent a case before the supreme court. Local state prosecutors may also appear before district courts if authorized by the head of a state prosecutor's office for certain categories of matters, for a particular matter, for certain categories of procedural acts or for a particular procedural act. According to amendment of legislation in 2015 local and district prosecutors may in their cases appear along with a higher prosecutor before the courts of appeal if authorized by the head of an appellate division of the state prosecutor's office for a particular case. Higher and supreme state prosecutors are competent to represent a case also before first instance courts.
In the context of question 55 we counted local and district prosecutors as prosecutors at first instance level (164), higher prosecutors as prosecutors at second instance level (42) and supreme prosecutors as prosecutors at Supreme Court level (11) without regard of the rang of court before they perform their function in fact or if they are assigned to other institution for a limited period of time (e.g for the administration of State Prosecutorial Council). The information is in form of full-time equivalent.

Q055 (2014): In November 2011, the new State Prosecutor Act came into force. It dissolved the special department of the Office of the State Prosecutor General, responsible for the 2d instance level. Proceedings before courts of appeal are now governed by the 4 State circuit prosecutor offices in towns where the higher courts are located. Prosecutors are organised in 12 offices (11 circuit offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office, where circuit and higher prosecutors work) and the Supreme State Prosecutor Office (where supreme State prosecutors and the general State prosecutor work). The function "assistant State prosecutor" changed in "local State prosecutor". The Specialised State Prosecutor's Office for dealing with the most severe criminal offences was established.

Q055 (2012): In November 2011, the new State Prosecutor Act came into force. It dissolved the special department of the Office of the State Prosecutor General, responsible for the 2d instance level. Proceedings before courts of appeal are now governed by the 4 State circuit prosecutor offices in towns where the higher courts are located. Prosecutors are organised in 12 offices (11 circuit offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office, where circuit and higher prosecutors work) and the Supreme State Prosecutor Office (where supreme State prosecutors and the general State prosecutor work). The function "assistant State prosecutor" changed in "local State prosecutor". The Specialised State Prosecutor's Office for dealing with the most severe criminal offences was established.

Q060 (General Comment): The number is reported in FTE. Staff attached to the public prosecution service are civil servants at state prosecutor's offices (state prosecutorial personnel). Staff includes the director general, directors, judicial advisors, trainees, administrators, registrars and other civil servants from state prosecutor's offices. Trainees typically do not perform a significant amount of work as their role is to learn; nevertheless, they participate in hearings and in drafting decisions in some cases.

Q060 (2021): Before 2021, data was reported in gross numbers. For 2021 data, the FTE format is observed.

Q060 (2020): The information is in form of gross data. According to the methodology used for reporting judges and court staff (FTE) – by which part-time employees are converted to full-time time by the calculation of working hours, the number amounts to 298, as a number of staff are not working full time.

Q060 (2016): The information is in form of full-time equivalent.

Q060 (2014): The substantial increase of employments in state prosecutor's offices in 2014 is a result of Government's decision to strengthen the fight against corruption and other fields of criminality defined in the Prosecution Policy. In the year 2014, 40 Senior Judicial Advisers took up their post, as well as 7 other types of civil servants. In the year 2015 the employment procedures were concluded for admitting 15 trainees.

Q132 (General Comment): The basic salary for judges and prosecutors is regulated by law, as well as promotion. The salary of the prosecutor is determined on the same basis, with the same supplements and in the same way as the salary of the judge. All employees in the country (including judges and public prosecutors) are also entitled to the supplement for the period of employment. As the calculation of the average pay would be too complicated, we report figures calculated from above criteria. Please note all figures reported include the supplement for the period of employment.
Judge/prosecutor at the beginning of the career: starting salary for local court judge and for local state prosecutor (without promotion), including the supplement for the period of employment (5 years) - approx. 1-2% of the reported amount.
Judge/Prosecutor at the highest instance: starting salary of a supreme court judge and supreme state prosecutor – counselor (not president of the Supreme Court or State Prosecutor General) including the supplement for the period of employment (44 years) - approx 15% of the reported amount.

Q133 (General Comment): There is a possibility for judges, public prosecutors and state attorneys (as well as other public servants in judiciary) to apply for a non-profit tenancy in an apartment, owned by the Ministry of Justice. However, the number of available apartments is very low (less than 0,5% of all functionaries and public servants in judiciary).

Q133 (2018): There is a possibility for judges, public prosecutors and state attorneys (as well as other public servants in judiciary) to apply for a non-profit tenancy in an apartment, owned by the Ministry of Justice. However, the number of available apartments is very low (less than 0,5% of all functionaries and public servants in judiciary).

Q144 (General Comment): The Judicial Service Act provides for 27 different types of conduct of judges that represent a disciplinary breach and the state State Prosecution Service Act provides for 31 different types of conduct of public prosecutors that represent a disciplinary breach.
Q144 (2016): Judges: Seven disciplinary proceedings were initiated in 2015.
Prosecutors: One disciplinary proceeding was initiated in 2015 for the reason of professional inadequacy.
Q144 (2014): o breach of professional ethics: one disciplinary proceeding was initiated in 2014 because of an action or behaviour on the part of the judge that conflicts with the judge's impartiality or that damages the reputation of the judicial profession and inappropriate, indecent or insulting behaviour or expression towards individuals, organs of the State and legal entities in connection within the judicial service or outside of it;
o professional inadequacy: two disciplinary proceedings were initiated in 2014 because of careless, untimely inappropriate or negligent performance of judicial service;
o criminal offence: one disciplinary proceeding was initiated in 2014 because of commission of an act that has the statutory definition of a criminal offence while holding judicial office.
o "other": 11 different breaches, such as illegal or irrational use of means of work, abuse of right to absence from work, infringement of the rules on safety at work, infringement of the Court Rules on the use of service uniform etc.; however there were no discipline proceedings corresponding to such breaches in 2014.

Q144 (2013): With regard to public prosecutors, to provide a more comprehensive picture it was mentioned that there were 3 disciplinary proceedings initiated in year 2013.
Q144 (2012): In 2012 one disciplinary proceeding was initiated against a judge because of an action or behaviour on the part of the judge that conflicts with the judge's impartiality or that damages the reputation of the judicial profession. The proposal of the disciplinary prosecutor for the pronouncement of disciplinary sanction was refused.
According to the Judicial Service Act, there are 27 types of breach of discipline in respect of judges. For the purpose of these questions, they were divided to 4 corresponding groups:

Q145 (General Comment): According to the Judicial Service Act, the following disciplinary sanctions are possible: written warning (CEPEJ: reprimand), suspension of promotion (but not position downgrade, therefore CEPEJ: other), wage reduction (CEPEJ: temporary reduction of salary), transfer to another court (CEPEJ: transfer to another geographical (court) location) and termination of judicial office (CEPEJ: resignation). There are no other disciplinary sanctions corresponding to the rest of the CEPEJ categories.
Q145 (2021): In 2021, 4 procedures against judges has ended (2 finding alleged offender not responsible and 2 has been stopped due to procedural reasons).
Q145 (2020): In 2020, one procedure agains judges has ended (finding alleged offender not responsible).

Q145 (2018): Suspension (judges and public prosecutors): In previous campaigns, the answer was “NAP”, as suspension de facto includes withdrawal from cases, but is not a disciplinary sanction strictly speaking. In terms of the Judial Council Act suspension is a temporary dismissal from the judicial service that is related to the conduct of disciplinary proceedings and may last until the adoption of the final decision of the disciplinary court. In the reference year, one judge was suspended.
Other (judges): Cessation/suspension of promotion.
The difference between the number of disciplinary proceedings and the number of sanctions for judges is due to the fact that not all initiated disciplinary proceedings have been finished during the reference year. In the reference year 2018 two disciplinary proceedings were finished: one initiated already in 2017 and one initiated in 2018. Two disciplinary proceedings initiated in 2018 have not been finished in 2018, but only in 2019.

Q145 (2016): Judges, other: Cessation/suspension of promotion.

Q145 (2012): In 2012 the following sanctions have been pronounced: 1 reprimand because of an unconscious, late, inappropriate or negligent performance of judicial service. There has been no termination of judicial office for a judge on the grounds that he/she is not suitable for performing judicial service.

Q146 (2017): (Male: 939, 798: female).

Q147 (General Comment): Persons entered in the directory of the Bar Association of Slovenia are only lawyers (and not other legal experts, in-house counsellors etc.)

Spain

Q052 (General Comment): The Spanish judicial system distinguishes between three categories of non-judicial staff: Gestión Procesal, Tramitación Procesal and Auxilio Judicial. These bodies have their competences regulated at article 475 and other of the Organic Law of the Judiciary, it is very difficult to distribute them in the previous points of the question because the three groups have functions to assist Judges, make administrative tasks and have technical tasks. The sum of these bodies, destinated to Courts, is the response to Q.52.5 'Other non judge staff'.

Q052 (2021): The sum of the bodies [Gestor Procesal, Tramitador Procesal and Auxilio Judicial] destinated to Courts:44651
In adition to that, there are 1147 Forensic Doctors.

Q052 (2020): The sum of the bodies [Gestor Procesal, Tramitador Procesal and Auxilio Judicial] destinated to Courts:44289
In adition to that, there are 1144 Forensic Doctors.
Regarding the distribution males / females: This distribution can only be given from the Autonomous Regions of the direct competence of the Ministry of Justice (5 out of 17). In these Autonomoues Regions the proportion of females within the civil servants in Courts is 71'76% (therefore, 28'23% of males). This proportion is possibly applicable to the whole national system.

Q052 (2019): The data indicated in the chart as 'other non judge staff' (43556) includes the three kinds of civil servants that work in Courts (Gestión procesal, Tramitación procesal, Auxilio judicial). In addition to that, there are other 1122 Forensic Doctors.

Q052 (2018): 1121 Forensic Doctors

Q052 (2017): The figure for other non judge staff includes judicial civil servants who are in charge of the processing of files, communication acts, and other tasks, and are distributed in three categories (called Auxilio Judicial,Tramitación Procesal, Gestión Procesal). Forensic Doctors are a special body (not included in the figure provided in this question). Their total number (Forensic Doctors) at 4 April 2018 is 1003.
For 2017, in contrast with previous cycles, data on number of “other non-judge staff” excludes the civil servants that work in Prosecution Offices.

Q052 (2016): The figure for other non judge staff includes judicial civil servants who are in charge of the processing of files, communication acts, and other tasks, and are distributed in three categories (called Auxilio Judicial, Tramitación Procesal, Gestión Procesal). Forensic Doctors are a special body (not included in the figure provided in this question). Their total number (Forensic Doctors) at 4 April 2018 is 1003.

Q052 (2014): In 2014, there are 44 896 other non-judge staff (judicial clerks) and 3 667 judicial counsellors (this is the new name for the secretario judiciales since October 1st).

Q052-1 (2018): These figures include the number of "letrados de Administración de Justicia", which are the CEPEJ equivalent of "Rechtspfleger".

Q055 (General Comment): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'. However, it distinguishes three categories.
Article 34 of Law 50/1981, (Organic Statute of the Public Prosecutor's Office) distinguishes three categories:
1st Chamber Prosecutors of the Supreme Court, equal to Magistrates of the High Court. The Deputy Prosecutor of the Supreme Court will be considered the President of the Chamber.
2nd Prosecutors, equated to Magistrates.
3. Lawyers-Prosecutors, equated to Judges.

Q055 (2021): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category (''Fiscales de Sala'') Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 32, Males 21, Females 11 (this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second. ''Fiscal'': Total 1825, Males 701, Females 1124
Third: ''Abogado-Fiscal'': Total 774, Males 178, Females 596

Q055 (2020): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category (''Fiscales de Sala del Tribunal Supremo'') Supreme Court Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 50, Males 36, Females 14
Second. ''Fiscal'': Total 1830, Males 700, Females 1130
Third: ''Abogado-Fiscal'': Total 681, Males 158, Females 523

Q055 (2018): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, Total 33, Males 26, Females 7
Second) Total 1779, Males 696, Females 1083
Third) Total 653, Males 161, Females 492

Q055 (2016): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First) Total 25, Males 19, Females 6
Second) Total 1826, Males 738, Females 1088
Third) Total 622, Males 155, Females 467

Q132 (General Comment): In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: Remuneration for objectives and professional substitutions.
Remuneration according to objectives can be considerable in both cases (judges and prosecutors). Substitution refers to cases in which, according to the law, one judge substitutes another, thereby accruing an increase in remuneration, depending on the circumstances and duration of that substitution

Q132 (2021): In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Prosecution 3.391.688,99 euros, Judges 6.719.737,10 euros.
- Professional substitutions. Prosecution 596.210,59 euros, Judges 7.666.770,44 euros.

Q132 (2020): In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Prosecution 3.364.701,68 euros, Judges 6.760.485,89 euros.
- Professional substitutions. Prosecution 624.438,54 euros, Judges 8.852.605,61 euros.

Q132 (2019): Other two concepts have to be taken into account:
- Remuneration for objectives. (For 2019, Judges 6.560.790,81, Prosecutors 3.298.733,53)
- Professional substitutions. (For 2019, Judges 6.028.864,05; Prosecutors 726.720,41)
Remuneration according to objectives can be considerable in both cases.Substitution refers to cases in which, according to the law, one judge substitutes another, thereby accruing an increase in remuneration, depending on the circumstances and duration of that substitution.

Q132 (2018): Other two concepts have to be taken into account:
- Remuneration for objectives. (For 2018, Judges 6.474.050,91, Prosecutors 3.220.851,03)
- Professional substitutions. (For 2018, Judges 3.220.851,03; Prosecutors 646.740,23)

Q144 (2020): Other Judges: affiliation to a political party or union; unjustified absence; incompatible activity.
Other Prosecutions: lack of consideration; delay.

Q144 (2018): The number total in case of Prosecutors expresses the number of information proceedings opened.

Q144 (2016): 2 - Delay 1 - To break the regime of incompatible activities (data for Prosecutors)

Q145 (2012): For 2012, the category “other” encompasses disciplinary proceedings resolved without a sanction for the judge.

Q146 (2021): The data are obtained through the General Bar Association Annual Report 2021. On practicing and resident lawyers.

Q146 (2020): The data are obtained through the General Bar Association Annual Report 2020. On practicing and resident lawyers.

Q146 (2017): Resident Lawyers (Memory of the General Bar Association 2017)

Q146 (2016): Resident Lawyers (31 December 2016)

Q146 (2015): In civil cases, mainly the legal representation is for Procuradores. In criminal cases, lawyers can assume legal representation until a Procurador is appointed for the case. In administrative cases legal representation is mostly assumed by lawyers. Graduados sociales' (consultants on labour and social security matters) may represent the parties in labour law proceedings. The responses above are given is on the basis that lawyers have a monopoly on practising the defence at Court which, in Spain, is not equivalent to “legal representation”.

Indicator 7: Professionals of justice

comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

Question 004. Average gross annual salary (in €) for the reference year

Question 046. Number of professional judges sitting in courts (if possible on 31 December of the reference year). (please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled for all types of courts - general jurisdiction and specialised courts)

Question 046-2. Number of judges (FTE) by case type:

Question 052. Number of non-judge staff who are working in courts (if possible on 31 December of the reference year) (this data should not include the staff working for public prosecutors; see question 60) (please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled)

Question 052-1. Number of non-judge staff by instance (if possible, on 31 December of the reference year) (this data should not include the staff working for public prosecutors; see question 60) (please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled).

Question 055. Number of public prosecutors (on 31 December of the reference year). (Please give the information in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled, for all types of courts – general jurisdiction and specialised courts).

Question 060. Number of staff (non-public prosecutors) attached to the public prosecution services, if possible, on 31 December of the reference year and without the number of non-judge staff, see question 52 (in full-time equivalent and for posts actually filled).

Question 132. Salaries of judges and public prosecutors on 31 December of the reference year:

Question 133. Do judges and public prosecutors have additional benefits?

Question 144. Number of disciplinary proceedings initiated during the reference year against judges and public prosecutors. (If a disciplinary proceeding is undertaken because of several reasons, please count the proceedings only once and for the main reason.)

Question 145. Number of sanctions pronounced during the reference year against judges and public prosecutors:

Question 146. Total number of lawyers practising in your country:

Question 147. Does this figure include "legal advisors" who cannot represent their clients in court (for example, some solicitors or in-house counsellors)?

Question 148. Number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court:

Question 004

Austria

(General Comment): Since the 2010 evaluation, the provided figure corresponds to the average gross income including taxes and social expenses borne by the employee, but not employer's contribution for social insurance. This is in line with the figures given in question 132 (gross annual salary of judges and prosecutors).

(2021): Not available yet.

(2019): 2018 data has been communicated, pending 2019 data.

Belgium

(2021): The average gross annual salary is 44022,8 euros, source National Bank of Belgium.

(2020):
Answer provided based on the latest data published by the National Accounts (April 2021).

(2019): Average gross annual salary for employees (both full-time and part-time).

(2016): Average gross salary for a full-time employee (without exceptional bonuses and vacation pay)

Bulgaria

(2021): Preliminary data.
The minimum wage in the country has been risen with 6.6%. In section “Human health and social work activities” the average annual wage increased with 25.7% due to additional wage payments related with the health crisis. In section “Education” there was an increase of the teachers' wages and salaries and the increase in the section was 17.0%. High growth rate of wages and salaries in 2021 compared to 2020 (17.7%) was recorded in “Accommodation and food service activities” as the section started to recover after 2020 lockdowns.

(2018): NSI data

(2016): No explanation.

Croatia

(2021): Average monthly gross salary for 2021 for person in paid employment in legal entities in the Republic of Croatia is available at web page of the Croatian Bureau of Statistics (https://podaci.dzs.hr/2021/en/10583).
This monthly gross salary (9599 Croatian Kuna) has been multiplied by 12 and then divided by Croatian Kuna / Euro average annual medium exchange rate published by the Croatian National Bank (7,52418 Croatian Kuna for 1 Euro; this information is available at https://www.hnb.hr/temeljne-funkcije/monetarna-politika/tecajna-lista/tecajna-lista.)

Czech Republic

(2021): The gross salary is constantly growing.

(2020): The gross salary is constantly growing.

(2019): Positive trends in Czech economy and the exchange rate have had an influence on the rise of average gross annual salary (in €).

(2016): The Czech economy is doing well + the exchange rate.

Estonia

(2020): Inflation

(2018): There is no specific reason.

Finland

(General Comment): Source: Structure of Earnings, Statistics Finland
https://pxweb2.stat.fi/PxWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/StatFin__pra/

(2021): Preliminary information: salary in 2020 multiplied by the annual percentage change in the earnings level index 2021q4

(2020): In 2020, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3 595 per month.

(2019): In 2019, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3528 per month.

(2018): In 2018, the average gross annual salary was EUR 3465 per month. Correspondingly, the median was EUR 3079 per month. The most common monthly earnings of all full-time wage and salary earners was EUR 2600 per month.

France

(2021): The exact data are 37 742,7

(2020): The exact figure is 34,494.5_x000D_
Source INSEE

Germany

(2021): The figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time including special payments (without special payments: 49 202 EUR)
Special payments are any payments outside of the regular remuneration. Typical examples of such payments are Christmas bonuses/end-of-the year bonuses, holiday bonuses, payments for jubilees, bonuses for the fulfilment of target agreements.

(2020): figure represents the average gross annual salary of employees working in full time

(2019): With regard to this question, no data are available for 2019. The data from 2018 have therefore been included.

(2018): With regard to this question, no data are available for 2018. The data from 2017 have therefore been included.

(2016): The circumstances have changed since the last campaign

Greece

(2021): Our service has the data of the structure and distribution of Remuneration Survey in enterprises on the structure of remuneration of employees(having a dependent employment relationship) in enterprises by Sector (B-S branches), excluding X (Public Administration and Defense, compulsory Social Security) based on the NACE Rev. 2. The survey is conducted on a four-year basis. Therefore, the latest available figures are of the year 2018. The results of the of the survey will be published in late 2024 to early 2025.

(2020): The data come from the Survey of the Structure and Distribution of Remuneration in Greece for the year 2018, from which the sector X is excluded (Public Administration and Defense, Compulsory Social Security) based on the classification of activities NACE Rev. 2 and relate to the average annual gross earnings in euros. Data is available by gender.The only one available at the moment.
Men 19 234 Average Women 15 947 Average

(2019): The competent authority for this data (see Hellenic Statistical Authority) provides the relevant numbers. The competent authority did not provide any numbers for this section.

(2016): The data provided correspond to those of 2014, since the statistics on this point are carried out every four years. Therefore, they are not absolutely accurate.

Hungary

(2021): In comparison to the previous year, the average gross annual salary increased due to the general development of Hungarian economy, to the increase in our GDP, as well as to the raising of the minimum wage.
See the most important annual data on the labour market on the website of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office:
https://www.ksh.hu/stadat_files/mun/en/mun0001.html

Ireland

(2021): Year 2021 is the latest data available. The figure of €44,912.24 was taken from Q4 but it should be noted that the annual gross salary fluctuated during the course of 2021.
https://www.cso.ie/en/releaseandduplications/en/elcq/earningsandlabourcostsq42021final/2022premliminaryestimates.
According to preliminary estimates of the Earnings and Labour Costs Quarterly release, the average weekly earnings were €880.3 in Q1 2022, an increase of 2.3% from €860.19 one year earlier and an increase of 10.0% from the same period in 2020. This represents average earnings of those in employment in the Irish economy in Q1 2022, including those supported by the Employment Wage Subsidy (EWSS).
https://www.cso.ie/en/releaseandduplications/en/elcq/earningsandlabourcostsq42021final/2022premliminaryestimates.

(2020): Year 2019 is latest data available

(2019): Comments Taken from Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2019 release of 26 June 2020
https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2019/

(2018): Taken from Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2018 release of 11 June 2019
https://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2018/

(2016): Average annual earnings increased by 1.1% to €36,919 in 2016, from €36,519 in 2015.
Taken from CSO release of 29 June 2017 - Earnings and Labour Costs Annual 2016. See link
http://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/elca/earningsandlabourcostsannualdata2016/

Latvia

(General Comment): After 2012, the minimum monthly salary increased, which could have had an effect on the average gross annual salary.

(2021): The data provided by the Central Statistical Bureau.

(2020): The data provided by the Central Statistical Bureau.

(2016): on 2016

Lithuania

(2021): From the 1st January, 2021 the minimum monthly salary was increased, the base salary of state politicians, judges, state officials, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions was increased, the procedure for calculating the amount of tax-free income was changed and other reasons.
https://osp.stat.gov.lt/informaciniai-pranesimai?articleId=9732032

(2020): Annual salary growth has been affected by the increase in the minimum monthly salary since the beginning of the reference year, the base salary of state politicians, judges, state politicians, judges, civil servants, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions, changes in the procedure for calculating tax-free income and other reasons.

(2019): The increase in wages in 2019 was caused by changes in the tax system: an increase in the basic salary of politicians, judges, civil servants, civil servants and employees of budgetary institutions, an increase in the minimum monthly salary, a revision of the new salary system for civil servants, a change in the procedure for calculating exemptions and other reasons.

(2018): The state budget and salary increased due to the growth of the economy.

(2016): The state budget and salary increased due to the growth of the economy (after recovering from crisis before).

Luxembourg

(2020): The 2019 data has been tentatively provided, pending the official release of the 2020 data.

(2019): This figure represents the average gross salary for the "Industry and Service" sector, according to the NACE Rev 2 code.
(https://statistiques.public.lu/stat/ReportFolders/ReportFolder.aspx?IF_Language=fra&MainTheme=3&FldrName=1&RFPath=30).

(2016): The variation between the different cycles (44% between 2014 and 2016) comes from a difference between gross salary (which was given for this cycle) and net salary (which was given for the previous cycles).

Malta

(2021): The figure quoted above relates specifically to the Average Annual BASIC salary as provided by the National Statistics Office of Malta. The NSO do not collect the Average Annual Gross salary.

(2018): This data has been provided by NSO based on as yet provisional estimates.

Netherlands

(General Comment): These are provisional numbers; definitive numbers (available next year) may differ slightly from those provided here. The data specifies ‘reward per working year’ as salary. This reward consists of salary (gross salary, including taxes and social contributions/premiums), rewards like holiday stipends, payment in kind, expense allowances tied in with work (e.g. travel allowances), and social premiums for the employer (payments for lawful and contractual social security, like pension contributions).

(2020): These are provisional numbers and the definitive numbers (available in 2022) may differ slightly from these provided here. The data specifies ‘reward per working year’ as salary. The reward consists of salary (gross salary, as it includes taxes and social contributions/premiums), rewards like holiday stipends, payment in kind, expense allowances that tie in with work (like travel allowances that cover costs to and from work), and social premiums that are for the employer (payments for lawful and contractual social security, like pension contributions).

(2019): The Statistics Bureau only had numbers for 2018. 2019 data was not available at the moment of data collection.

(2018): This is average salary of all employees; the number includes money that employers pay for pension plans, social security (money that is paid directly to employees). The statistic does not include the income of people who are not employees (people without work, employers).

(2016): Compared to previous questionaires (before 2014) these figures have been adjusted according to new rules of the european system of national accounts (illegal activities are now included)

Poland

(2021): data source - Central Statistical Office
The wage increases linked to economic changes.

(2016): NA

Portugal

(2016): In the present questionnaire we used another "concept" of gross anual salary that we believe is closer to the objectives of this question.
We opted for the category of "payments and salaries" instead of "remunerations" of the national budget because "remunerations" also includes social contributions by the employer which constitue wage costs and not salary.

Romania

(General Comment): At national level, the average gross annual salary is not calculated and included in the official statistical reports made annually by the National Institute of Statistics. Thus, the SMBA was calculated on the basis of the monthly average gross salary at an average monthly value of the euro calculated by the National Bank of Romania for the reference year concluding in the average gross annual salary (as the sum of monthly average salary).

(2020): The difference can be explained based on salary increases, and an upward trend can be observed continuing from 2018.

(2018): At national level, the average gross annual salary is not calculated and included in the official statistical reports made annually by the National Institute of Statistics. Thus, the SMBA was calculated by request by the National Institute of Statistics on the basis of the monthly average gross salary at an average annual value of the euro calculated by the National Bank of Romania for the reference year 2018
According to the provisions of the national legislation in force (GEO no. 79/2017 with subsequent amendments and completions), the social insurance contributions, respectively those of social health insurance that fell to the employer, were transferred to the employee's responsibility and, starting with 2018, are fully supported by the employee, being reflected in the gross amount of the earning.
Consequently, the indicator "monthly gross average wage" produced and disseminated from 2018 is no longer comparable with the previous data series.
These legal provisions do not influence the data comparability for the series of "average monthly net earnings."

Slovak Republic

(2021): http://datacube.statistics.sk/#!/view/en/VBD_INTERN/pr0204qs/v_pr0204qs_00_00_00_en

(2020): Ministry of Finance did not offer closer explanation. Source: https://www.statista.com/statistics/419502/average-annual-wages-slovak-republic-slovakia-y-on-y-in-euros/

Slovenia

(2020): Annual average gross salary is increasing (increase by 4% from 2018 to 2019 and by 6% from 2019 to 2020).

(2016): Average monthly gross earnings for 2016.

Question 046

Austria

(General Comment): For the all exercises, data have been provided in full time equivalent. The first instance judges sit in District and partly regional courts. The second instance judges sit in partly regional courts and Courts of appeal. The last instance includes judges sitting in the Supreme Court and the Supreme Administrative Court.

(2019): Data in full time equivalent
1.: district courts and partly regional courts + administrative courts 2.: courts of appeal and partly regional courts

(2018): Data in full time equivalent
1.: district and regional Courts + administrative court
2.: courts of appeal

(2017): The data also include those of administrative courts.

(2016): This cycle admnistrative courts were taken into account for the first time.
The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. After their establishment the data of the administrative courts is introduced this cycle for the first time.

(2015): The right (not rounded) numbers are:

TotalMalesFemales
Total number of professional judges (1 + 2 + 3)1620,65 - 790,52 - 830,13
1. Number of first instance professional judges1222,95 - 559,08 - 663,87
2. Number of second instance (court of appeal) professional judges 330,35 - 187,75 - 142,60
3. Number of supreme court professional judges 67,35 - 43,69 - 23,66

Data in full time equivalent
1.: district and partly regional courts
2.: partly regional courts and courts of appeal

(2014): For 2014, the numerical values in the table have been rounded. The most exact replies would be: Total: 1 620,04 (789,68 Male, 830,36 Female); first instance professional judges: 1 224,36 (556,01 Male, 668,35 Female); second instance professional judges: 329,63 (190,78 Male, 138,85 Female); Supreme court professional judges: 66,05 (42,89 Male, 23,16 Female). In 2014, some judges entitled to adjudicate in different law fields have been counted twice.

(2013): In 2013, the different tasks had been assigned to the full time equivalent judges, distinguishing between dealing with first and second instance court proceedings on the one hand and administrative tasks on the other hand.

(2012): In 2012, in contrast with previous evaluations, the different tasks had been more exactly assigned to the full time equivalent judges, distinguishing between dealing with first and second instance court proceedings on the one hand and administrative tasks on the other hand.

Belgium

(General Comment): There is no particular reason for the increase in the number of female second instance judges; it is related to the natural evolution (more women at the first instance implies, after some time, a larger base for recruitment at the appeal level).
The table contains data for civil and criminal courts, as well as for the Council of State (44 members) and the Aliens Litigation Council (55 judges).

(2021): Source: FPS Justice, Directorate-General for the Judiciary, HR Department Judiciary, Notaries and Enforcement agents.
Point 3 concerns judges of the Court of Cassation.
As for the previous cycles, the table contains data for the civil and criminal courts. For this cycle, the (administrative) judges of the Council of State and of the Aliens Litigation Council (41 and 55 judges respectively) have been added to the table. With regard to the administrative judges of the Council of State (as for the Aliens Litigation Council), it is decided to count them as first instance judges. It should be noted, however, that judges of the Council of State intervene both at first and last instance. The number of judges at the Council of State is 44 members and for the Aliens Litigation Council it is 55. For the Aliens Litigation Council, the total of 55 is broken down as follows: 32 female judges - 23 male judges, of whom the first president and the president are men. For the Council of State, the situation is as follows: in principle, the Council is composed of 44 members (1 first president, 1 president, 14 chamber presidents and 28 councillors of State); in practice, 41 members are currently in office (two recent retirements and one death); 20 Dutch-speaking and 21 French-speaking; 12 women and 29 men. It is worth mentioning that an extension of the framework of the Council of State is provided for by a law of 6 September 2022 (which amended article 69 of the laws on the Council of State, coordinated on 12 January 1973). The Council will now consist of 58 members. These new members have not yet been recruited.

(2020): "No particular reason for the increase in the number of female second instance judges; related to natural evolution (more women in the first degree means, after a while, a larger base for recruitment to the appellate degree).
As in previous cycles, the table contains data for the judicial courts. The number of judges in the Council of State is 44 members and for the Council of Foreigners' Disputes it is 54 judges. "

(2019): Number of judges in courts within the ambit of the Federal Public Service of Justice (ordre judiciaire)

(2018): As a result of the reform of the cantons of justice of the peace, the number of places for justices of the peace has decreased by 25.

(2014): For 2014, the number of professional judges includes presidents of courts.

(2013): The 2013 data on the number of professional judges reflects the situation as at 18 January 2014.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The number of the first instance professional judges encompasses the judges of the first instance courts as follows - 113 district, 28 administrative, 3 military-district and the Specialized Criminal Court;
The number of the second instance (court of appeal) professional judges encompasses the judges of second instance courts as follows - 28 regional/provincial, 5 appellate, The Military Court of Appeal and the Specialized Criminal Court of Appeal.
The number of Supreme Court professional judges encompasses the judges of the Supreme Court of Cassation and the Supreme administrative court.

(2021): First instance courts – district, administrative, military district and Specialized Criminal Court.
Second instance courts (courts of appeal) – regional, appellate, Appellate Specialized Criminal Court and Military Appellate Court.
Supreme Courts – Supreme Court of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Court

(2020): Number of professional judges from district courts - 959, incl. men - 354 and women - 605. Annex: Summary information on the data as of 31.12.2020, received by all regional courts and all administrative courts, regarding the number of judges working in the first instance panels and the number of judges, who administer justice in the appellate / cassation panels, as well as data on how many of them are men and how many of them are women. It should be borne in mind that, according to the information received, in almost all courts, a large number of judges sit both at first instance and as second instance judges. Therefore, the sum of the number of first instance judges and the number of second instance judges should not give the total number of magistrates in the respective region/ administrative court. Number of professional judges from the Court of Appeal - 124, incl. men - 43 and women - 81.

(2019): 046/2. The indicated number of 134 judges refers only to the magistrates appointed and working in the 7 courts of appeal in Bulgaria. The calculation is made on the basis of the question itself, which draws attention only to the number of appellate judges (judges working in a court of appeal), as is evident from it - "professional judges of second instance / appellate court /". In almost all regional courts, most judges sit in both the first and second instance departments of the courts and this makes it difficult to differentiate them. This year all judges in regional courts are listed in 046/1 - Number of first instance professional judges.

(2017): P. 1 – The number of first instance professional judges consists of judges in 27 Regional courts within regional centres; 86 out of regional centres; 28 Administrative courts; 1 Specialized Criminal Court; 3 Military courts; and the number of the first instance judges in District courts has been added to them;
P.2 – The number of the second instance judges consists of judges in 27 District courts; Sofia City Court; 5 Courts of Appeal; 1 Military court of appeal and 1 Appealate Specialized Criminal Court. This number does not include the second instance judges who have adjudicated in first instance pannels.
P.3- The number of working judges in the Supreme Court of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Court at 31.12.2017

(2016): P. 1 – The number of first instance professional judges consists of judges in 27 Regional courts within regional centres; 86 out of regional centres; 28 Administrative courts; 1 Specialized Criminal Court; 3 Military courts; and the number of first instance judges in District courts has been added to them;
P.2 – The number of second instance judges consists of judges in 27 District courts; Sofia City Court; 5 Courts of Appeal; 1 Military court of appeal and 1 Appealate Specialized Criminal Court. This number does not include the second instance judges who have served in first instance courts. P.3- The number of working judges in the Supreme Court of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Court at 31.12.2016

(2015): 1.The figure 1760 includes the number of judges, employed at the 1st instance courts ((113 regional courts (27 Regional courts in the district centers and 86 regional courts outside the district centers); 28 Administrative courts; 1 Specialized criminal court; 3 Military courts) including the number of the first instance judges` (524) working in the first instance court formations in the District courts as from 31.12.2015. The number of Military courts has been reduced after decision under protocol ? 44/13.12.2013 of the Supreme Judicial Council from 5 to 3.

2.The number of judges, employed at the 2nd instance courts as from 31.12.2015 and the Courts of Appeal is 277. This figure is a result from the addition of the judges in the 28 District courts; 6 Courts of appeal and 1 Specialized criminal court of appeal – 801 judges in total, where the number of the first instance judges in the District courts (524) have been deducted.

3.The number of judges, employed in the Supreme Court of Cassation and the Supreme Administrative courts as from 31.12.2015 is 188.

(2014): In 2014, the number 1753 shows the number of judges employed in the first instance courts (113 regional, 28 administrative and 3 military courts) and 550 first instance judges, working in the district courts. The number of military courts was reduced from 5 to 3. The number of second instance judges is 277 and does not encompass first instance judges, working in the first instance chambers of the district courts.

Croatia

(General Comment): In the total number of judges, only data on actually working judges is presented (the total does not include judges on unpaid leave; judges on maternity leave; judges suspended after the disciplinary procedure; judges transferred to other State bodies- for example to Ministry of Justice or Judicial Academy). Moreover, two judges working half-time (for the reason of care for a child with special needs) are counted as 1 judge. Data refer to all judges: presidents of courts, judges authorised to perform judicial administration and judges.

(2018): Source: Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Croatia
The number of court presidents is included in the number of judges provided, but the data does not include the number of judges who are on unpaid leave, judges who are in non-active status, judges who work part-time in accordance with the Maternity and Parental Benefits Act, judges who are on maternity leave or on parental leave, judges suspended after disciplinary proceedings, judges working part time in order to time care for a child with special needs, judges transferred in another state body (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council) and international institutions and missions.

(2017): The number of court presidents is included in the number of judges provided, but the data does not include the number of judges who are on unpaid leave, judges who are in non-active status, judges who work part-time in accordance with the Maternity and Parental Benefits Act, judges who are on maternity leave or on parental leave, judges suspended after disciplinary proceedings, judges working part time in order to time care for a child with special needs, judges transferred in another state body (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council) and international institutions and missions.

(2016): Source: Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Croatia
The number of court presidents is included in the number of judges provided, but the data does not include the number of judges who are on unpaid leave, judges who are in non-active status, judges who work part-time in accordance with the Maternity and Parental Benefits Act, judges who are on maternity leave or on parental leave, judges suspended after disciplinary proceedings, judges working part time in order to time care for a child with special needs, judges transferred in another state body (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, State Judicial Council) and international institutions and missions.

(2015): The Republic of Croatia submits now correct numbers of professional judges sitting in courts for previous cycles (2013 and 2014), because in the previous cycles this number did not include court presidents, while there were excluded in the separate questions. Therefore, the correct numbers for these cycles is now provided.

(2014): In 2014, the number of professional judges in first instance courts includes judges of municipal, commercial, administrative and misdemeanour courts. The number of judges in second instance courts includes judges of county courts, the High Commercial Court, the High Misdemeanour Court and the High Administrative Court. The number of 3rd instance judges refers to the Supreme Court. Four first instance administrative courts became operational in 2012, while the Administrative Court of the Republic of Croatia became the High Administrative Court.

Cyprus

(General Comment): Cyprus has a two tier system. The Supreme Court is the second and final instance court. All judges of the Supreme Court hear appeals.

(2020): Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in the second instance cases - questions 97 and 98.

(2015): From 2014, following the retirement of male judges at last instance, female judges were appointed.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): The Czech Republic has a four-tier system. The number of judges of the two High Courts is included in the number of second instance judges. This methodology of presentation of data is applied since 2013, while for the previous evaluations, magistrates of the High Courts were considered as third instance judges.

(2016): The Czech Republic has a four-tier system. The number of judges of the two High Courts is included in the number of second instance judges.

Denmark

(2017): The figures above show the numbers of appointed judges in the Danish judicial system. Thus, the figures also include the Court of Greenland, the High Court of Greenland and the court of the Faroe Islands.

Estonia

(2014): In 2014, one male judge left and a female judge was appointed.

(2012): In 2010, there were 3 female professional judges at the Supreme Court. At the beginning of 2012, one female judge became the judge representing Estonia in the European Human Rights Court.

France

(2021): Data taken from an extraction of the LOLFI SIRH - Number of professional judges on 31/12/2021. The values are expressed in FTEs. Source DSJ
Administrative justice data: 1. total number of professional judges at first instance: 899(463 men, 436 women); 2) Number of professional judges in the courts of appeal (2nd instance): 304 (163 men, 141 women); 3. number of professional judges in the Supreme courts: 128 (81 men, 47 women). 1+2+3. Total number of professional judges: total 1331 (707 men, 624 women). The figures are expressed in physical numbers as at 31/12/2021. The members of the National Court of Asylum (CNDA) and the Paid Parking Litigation Commission (Commission du contentieux du stationnement payant) are counted under the first instance.
Source: Council of State
The gender distribution is based on the number available in FTE for all professional judges except for administrative judges for whom the distribution is available in FTE only for the total.

(2020): "Here are the details:
With respect to the judiciary. The data are expressed in full-time equivalent. These figures concern only judges (and not paralegals) who sit in court (magistrates seconded to the central administration are not counted). In the table above, the figures have been rounded up when the decimal is greater than or equal to 0.5:
Total number of professional judges: total 6177.9; men 1725.5; women 4452.4
1. Number of first instance professional judges: total 4378.6; men 1133.7; women 3244.9
2. Number of second instance professional judges : total 1577.8; men 503.8; women 1074
3. Number of Supreme Court professional judges : total 221.5; men 88; women 133.5
Source: LSB
For the administrative order, the data include the National Court of Asylum (CNDA) and the Commission du contentieux du stationnement payant (CCSP). In FTE, only the total is available. The detail in physical staff is as follows:
Total number of professional judges: total 1357; men 727; women 630
1. Number of first instance professional judges : total 920; men 487; women 433
2. Number of second instance professional judges : total 306; men 156; women 150
3. Number of Suprem Court professional judges : total 131; men 84; women 47
Source: EC
"

(2019): Data are presented in full time equivalent, part-time employees being counted, which explains the possible horizontal and vertical inconsistencies in the table. For information: number of judges from civil society (first instance):
Total: 19,002 (489 temporary judges (MTT) + 13,277 labor judges (conseillers prud'hommes ((CPH) + 1,832 Assessors of the Social Centres (APS) + 3,404 Consular Judges of the Commercial Courts (JC) Men: 11,249 (243 MTT + 6,902 CPH + 1,294 APS + 2,810 JC); Women: 7,753 (246 MTT + 6375 CPH + 538 APS + 594 JC). Source: LOLFI. Number of judges on duty in the courts.
The data do not encompass "public prosecutors and their staff". All judges in courts are counted, including presidents of courts, as the latter perform judges' duties.

(2018): With regard to administrative justice, in 2018, it should be noted that the number of judges sitting in specialised courts increased due to the very sharp increase in the number of appeals to the National Court of Asylum (CNDA) and the creation of the Commission du contentieux du stationnement payant (CCSP).
In the area of judicial justice, the increase is due to the filling of vacancies in the courts and the decrease in the number of departures of judges.

(2014): The 2014 data on number of judges of courts of law subsumes also the presidents appointed by 31 December 2014.

(2013): In 2013, in first instance, there are 161 presidents of ordinary courts of law and 42 presidents of administrative courts. In second instance, there are 37 first presidents of courts of law and 8 presidents of administrative courts. They are encompassed in the indicated figures. However, presidents of administrative courts of appeal are not included (being members of the State Council, they are included within the number of Supreme court judges).

(2012): The 2012 data is expressed in FTE, for positions actually filled on 31 December 2012 within courts of law and administrative courts. For the latter, data in FTE concerning the distribution between men and women is not available. Out of the 1377 first instance and appeal judges, there are 816 men and 561 women. Data on men-women distribution for the State Council is not available in FTE: there were 105 men and 47 women. For courts of law, there were in FTE: total: 5771 FTE (2066 men/3705 women); first instance professional judges (1326 men/2804 women); appeal court professional judges (622 men/795 women); Supreme court professional judges (118 men/106 women).The State Council used different calculation methods for 2010 and 2012.

Germany

(General Comment): 1. There is a "court-staff statistic" ("Personalbestand") of the Länder that reports the number of judges in full-time equivalent as of 31 December of the reference year. This statistic also shows the number of female judges but it is not possible to allocate the judges to the different instances/stages of appeal. This statistic does not include the judges at the Federal Courts ("Supreme Courts").
2. The "staff-assignment statistics" ("Personalverwendung") of the Länder basically reports the average number of personnel actually deployed during the reference year (full-time equivalent). For example, employees who were not present for more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training are excluded. The staff- assignment statistic offers the possibility to allocate the judges to the different instances but it does not show the number of female judges. It does not include the Federal judges either.
3. The "judiciary-staff statistic" ("Richterstatistik") combines the number of the judges of the Länder from statistic No 1 (court staff statistic) with the number of judges at the Federal Courts (full-time equivalent as of 31 December 2020). This statistic is not published every year but every two years. It differentiates between the judges of the Länder and the judges of the Federal Courts (highest instance) and includes the number of female judges.
Regarding Q46 the figures under "1. Number of first instance professional judges" and "2. Number of second instance (court of appeal) professional judges" were taken from statistic No 2 (staff-assignment) because statistic No 1 does not offer the possibility to allocate personnel to the different instances. The figures under "3. Number of Supreme Court professional judges" were taken from statistic No 3 because the Federal judges only appear in that statistic. "Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
These numbers will not be reflected directly in the answers to Q 46, because the figures represent the average value of the actual personnel deployed during the reference year (in full-time equivalents).
It should also be noted that one of goals of the ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’ is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

(2021): 1. and 2.: Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder. It is derived from a complex calculation key as an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training). The staff-assignment statistics do not distinguish between male and female jugdes. The "regular" court-staff statistics of the Länder distinguish between "total" and "female" but do not allow for a diffentiation between the instances. According to the regular court-staff statistics as of 31 December 2021 there were 22 006 judges in total, 10 626 female and 11 380 male (full-time equivalents).
3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in full time equivalents as of 31 December 2020. The number of judges at the Federal Courts is published every second year (see General Comment).

(2020): 46.1 and 46.2: Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder. It is derived from a complex calculation key as an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training). The staff-assignment statistics do not distinguish between male and female jugdes. The "regular" court-staff statistics of the Länder distinguish between "total" and "female" but do not allow for a diffentiation between the instances. According to the regular court-staff statistics as of 31 December 2020 there were 21.944 judges in total, 10.418 female and 11.526 male (full-time equivalents)
46.3: Figures represent the number of judges at the Federal Courts in full time equivalents as of 31 December 2020.
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
These numbers will not be reflected directly in the data given above, because the figures represent the average value of the actual personnel deployed during the reference year (in full-time equivalents).
It should also be noted that one of goals of the ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’ is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

(2019): The number of supreme court professional judges is based on judicial statistics. These data are collected and collated every two years (last updated 31/12/2018).

(2018): The number of supreme court professional judges is based on judicial statistics. These data are collected and collated every two years (last updated 31/12/2018).

(2017): Comment - Please provide any useful comment for interpreting the data above: The information provided counts the number of full-time equivalent staff. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons making up this staff. A judge working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). A judge working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for a judge working half the usual number of hours). Re 1 and 2: Information based on staffing overviews. These data are ascertained according to a complex calculation mechanism as an annual average of the actual personnel deployed (for example: minus the number of staff absent for more than 20 working days in a single quarter for reasons other
than vacation and/or further-training). Re 3: The number of supreme court professional judges is based on judicial statistics. These data
are collected and collated every two years (last updated 31/12/2016).

(2016): The information provided counts the number of full-time equivalent staff. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons making up this staff. A judge working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). A judge working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for a judge working half the usual number of hours). Re 1 and 2: Information based on staffing overviews. These data are ascertained according to a complex calculation mechanism as an annual average of the actual personnel deployed (for example: minus the number of staff absent for more than 20 working days in a single quarter for reasons other than vacation and/or further-training). Re 3: The number of supreme court professional judges is based on judicial statistics. These data are collected and collated every two years (last updated 31/12/2016).

(2015): The data refer to the year 2014. At present, no more recent data are available.

Sources: Federal Office of Justice (Bundesamt für Justiz), Schöffenstatistik (statistical information on lay judges) as per 31 December 2014 as well as information provided by the Federal Länder

Greece

(2021): The answer came after the cooperation of the Directorate for the organization and operation of Justice with Juststat. The increase in the number of Supreme Court professional judges is explained by the fact that, the judges of the Court of auditors, who are all supreme, had not been previously counted, but now they are included.

(2020): Gender statistics are not kept. -Number of first instance professional judges :593 first-instance administrative judges,1167 first instance judges,916 judges of local courts and District Criminal Courts.
- Number of second instance (court of appeal) professional judges:336 second-instance administrative judges,598 second instance judges
- Number of Supreme Court professional judges:170 administrative judges of Council of State,5 of the General Committee of the Ordinary and Administrative Courts,76 judges of Areios Pagos(Supreme Court),
The methodology of replying changed. Differences in numbers with previous years cannot be explained as we don’t have enough information about previous data.

(2018): There is not a specific reason for the discrepancy of point 3. The number 243 is a result of the subtraction of points 1 and 2 from the total number of professional judges (1+2+3), just as last year.

(2016): Previous data concerning the number of second instance judges did not, inadvertently, include all the ranks for penal, political and administrative justice. Accordingly, this year the number is higher and explains also the variation in the total.
It should be mentioned that the number of judges at the courts of Peace, which on 31/12/2016 was 880, is not taken into consideration since they have a separate procedure entering the judiciary and they are a separate category within it.

(2014): The decrease in the number of second instance judges between 2013 and 2014 is due to the fact that administrative judges are not counted in this category for 2014.

(2013): In 2013, justices of peace are included, while Court of Auditors’ judges are not considered in the total.

(2012): For 2012, the total number subsumes judicial officials of the civil-penal and administrative courts. It should be noticed that 688 magistrates were not included, as well as Court of Auditors’ judges.

Hungary

(General Comment): Since 2012 and the establishment of the National Office for the Judiciary, the data collection methodology is the same. Accordingly, the number of first instance professional judges includes judges of the District Courts. As second instance judges are counted judges of the Regional Courts and the Regional Courts of Appeal. As concerning the Regional Courts, the distribution of first and second instance cases is based on the internal regulations which are renewed every year by the president of each court after consultation with the judicial council and the professional departments of the court. The number of Supreme Court judges is indicated in item 46.3.

(2019): There are additional 54 judges assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary (for work in accordance with judicial administration) and to the Ministry of Justice (to help the legislative work of the ministry). These judges do not hear cases while they are assigned.

(2018): There are additional 48 judges assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary (for work in accordance with judicial administration) and to the Ministry of Justice (to help the legislative work of the ministry). These judges do not hear cases while they are assigned.

(2017): There are additional 34 judges assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary (for work in accordance with judicial administration), and 4 judges assigned to the Ministry of Justice (to help the legislative work of the ministry). These judges do not hear cases during their assignment.

(2016): There are additional 35 judges assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary (for work in accordance with judicial administration), and 9 judges assigned to the Ministry of Justice (to help the legislative work of the ministry). These judges do not hear cases while they are assigned.

(2014): In 2014, 26 judges were assigned to the National Office for the Judiciary and 7 judges were assigned to the Ministry of Justice. These judges do not hear cases when carrying out their specific missions within the NOJ and the Ministry of Justice.

(2013): The number of Supreme Court female judges decreased between 2010 and 2012, while the number of Supreme Court male judges increased between 2012 and 2013. There is no specific reason in this respect, as the vacant positions are filled through an open application process, where the gender of the applicants is not taken into consideration in any way.

(2012): The number of Supreme Court female judges decreased between 2010 and 2012, while the number of Supreme Court male judges increased between 2012 and 2013. There is no specific reason in this respect, as the vacant positions are filled through an open application process, where the gender of the applicants is not taken into consideration in any way.

Ireland

(2021): Figures as of 31/12/2021.
At that time there were 6 vacancies in total.
First Instance Courts – District Court, Circuit Court, High Court = total 3
Second Instance Court – Court of Appeal = total 1
Highest Instance Court – Supreme Court = total 1

(2020): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the circuit court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents.
An amendment was made in 2019 to the number of judges in the court of appeal due to workload of the court.

(2019): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the Circuit Court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents.
An amendment was made to the number of judges in the court of appeal due to workload of the court.

(2018): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the Circuit Court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents.

(2017): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the Circuit Court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents. As at 31 December 2017 there were three serving female Supreme Court judges.

(2016): Number of first instance professional judges refers to ordinary judges of the District Court, ordinary and specialist judges of the Circuit Court and ordinary judges of the High Court - including Court Presidents. As regards the number of Supreme Court judges, the figures reflect a reduction in the actual number of judges compared to the number reported in the previous reporting cycle.

(2015): The discrepancy between the total figures and the figures for gender is explained by vacancies in the judiciary's establishment, as follows: Supreme Court: 1; High Court: 1; Circuit Court: 2.

First instance judges are judges of the High Court, Circuit Court and District Court. The High Court and Circuit Court also exercise appellate jurisdiction.

Numbers above include Court Presidents.

(2014): In 2014, data on 2nd instance judges is available, since the new Court of Appeal was established only in 2014.

Italy

(General Comment): Apart from Administrative Justice, other specialized first instance courts that are not administered and financed by the Ministry of Justice (i.e. regional audit commissions, local tax commissions and military courts) are not taken into consideration at question 46.

(2018): Since 2018, the figures have also included judges belonging to Administrative Justice. The above figures include 6634 ordinary judges and 381 administrative judges.

(2017): An upward trend in respect of the number of female judges in the Supreme Court: in Italy, the High Council of the Judiciary is competent for the transfers of judges from one office to another. This transfer procedure generally takes place once or twice a year. The number of open positions for each court is proportional to the percentage of vacancies in that particular court. During the last few years, there were occasions where the positions made available at the court of cassation were a bit higher than number one would have expected according to the percentage of vacancies. Hence, more judges applied for the vacancies at the court of cassation compared to other courts. To date the vacancies at the court of cassation are about 4% of the total number of positions. As a matter of fact the penetration of female judges shows a positive trend. In first and second instance courts the penetration is already over 50%. At court of cassation level there is much room for improvement.

(2015): The overall reduction of judges between 2014 and 2015 is partly due to the effect of the recent labor reform that lowered the mandatory retirement age for judges from 75 to 70.

(2013): In the last few competitive exams held in Italy, the percentage of female candidates was higher than this of male candidates. Accordingly, a positive variation can be observed in respect of the number of female judges between 2010 and 2013.

Latvia

(2017): The changes in the number of judges at the Supreme Court are the outcome of the court reform developing pure three instance level court system. Until 2014 there were both appellate and cassation courts within the Supreme Court. Until end of 2014 and 2016 respectively there were additional appellate chambers dealing with criminal and civil cases. Since beginning of 2017 the number of judges at Supreme Court (cassation instance) is stable – 36.

(2014): The number of male judges in the Supreme Court decreased per 5 judges between 2012 and 2014 due to various reasons: three male judges retired; two male judges returned to regional courts (because they worked in the Supreme Court temporarily); one male judge passed away in 2014; one new male judge came to work in the Department of Civil Cases of the Supreme Court.

Lithuania

(General Comment): The methodology of presentation of data reflects the peculiarities of the Lithuanian court system. Namely, as the regional courts function not only as courts of appeal, but also as courts of first instance (Article 19 of the Law on Courts of the Republic of Lithuania), the number of judges of these courts is included in the 1st section. Accordingly, the latter indicates the number of judges of district courts, regional courts and regional administrative courts. Likewise, given that the Supreme Administrative Court is the court of appeal (although the rulings of the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania are final and not subject to appeal) the number of judges of this court is encompassed in the 2nd section. The latter indicates the number of judges of the Court of Appeal of Lithuania and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania. The 3rd section indicates the number of judges of the Supreme Court of Lithuania.

(2017): Please see general comments.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): Section 1: The number of first instance professional judges includes judges of the district courts, judges of the justices of the peace and judges of the administrative tribunal.
section 2: The number of second instance professional judges includes judges of the Court of appeal of the Superior court of justice and judges of the Administrative court.
Section 3: The number of professional judges at the Supreme court level includes only judges of the Court of cassation.

(2018): The staff of the judicial and administrative courts has grown steadily in the recent years, as established by the amended law of 7 March 1980 on judicial organization. This explains the significant variations observed between 2016 and 2018 in the judiciary and non-judge staff. According to the judicial organisation of Luxembourg, there is a Superior Court of Justice, composed of the Court of Cassation and the Court of Appeal. The judges of the Superior Court of Justice belong to both the Court of Cassation and the Court of Appeal. If, legally speaking, these are separate positions, in practice the five judges of the Superior Court of Justice occupy two positions and they are therefore counted among the judges of the Court of Appeal as well as at the level of the Superior Court of Justice .
The figures differ from those indicated in the last data collection campaigns on two points. 1) concerning the number of judges at the highest level: starting with 2016, we have distinguished between the judges sitting at the court of appeal and those of the Cour de cassation, which is the highest court in Luxembourg. Until 2016, and as the two courts taken together form the Cour supérieure de Justice (which as such has some very specific competences), we indicated only the total of the judges affected to the Cour supérieure. It might be useful for statistical purposes to distinguish between the two levels. 2) concerning the number of judges at the first level: the figures indicated until 2016 were superior to the real figures, as, erroneously, the prosecutors (which by law are also magistrates affected to these courts) had been included. We corrected this error in 2016.
There has been a major modification in june 2017, by the law of 27th of June 2017 adopting a multiannual program of recruitment into the judiciary and amending the amended law of 7th of March 1980 on judicial organisation, programming the future changes in the staff at the different entities. This law provides for a multiannual program of recruitment of judges and prosecutors during the years 2017-2020. It entered into force in july 2017.

(2017): The Act of 27 June 2017 introducing a multiannual programme for recruitment to the judiciary and amending the amended Act of 7 March 1980 on the organisation of the judiciary, defines the number of posts in the various instances.
The indicated data correspond to the number of permanent positions actually held in 2017.

(2016): The figures differ from those indicated in the last data collection campaigns on two points.
1) concerning the number of judges at the highest level: starting with 2016, we have distinguished between the judges sitting at the court of appeal and those of the Cour de cassation, which is the highest court in Luxembourg. Until 2016, and as the two courts taken together form the Cour supérieure de Justice (which as such has some very specific competences), we indicated only the total of the judges affected to the Cour supérieure. It might be useful for statistical purposes to distinguish between the two levels.
2) concerning the number of judges at the first level: the figures indicated until 2016 were superior to the real figures, as, erroneously, the prosecutors (which by law are also magistrates affected to these courts) had been included. This error has now been corrected.

(2015): In 2014, the judges of the Administrative Court were included in the number of judges in the Supreme Court but in 2015 these judges were accounted as second instance judges.

(2014): In 2014, the judges of the Administrative Court were included in the number of judges in the Supreme Court but in 2015 these judges were accounted as second instance judges.

(2013): To the total number of judges, should be added 4 trainees ("attachés de justice"). The increase in the number of female judges at all instances between 2010 and 2013 is explained by the special attraction for a profession that allows to combine work and family life. Judges of second instance and those of the Court of Cassation are all part of the Superior Court of Justice.

(2012): The total number of professional judges does not correspond to the sum of the number of judges before each instance because some judges have jurisdiction in two courts (e.g. the Constitutional Court is composed of judges of the Court of Cassation and the Administrative Court).

Malta

(General Comment): In Malta there is no Supreme Court, the Court of Appeal being the Court of second instance. The Constitutional Court, then, is presided over by the 3 judges who compose the Court of second instance also known as the Court of Appeal in its Superior Jurisdiction. It is interesting to notice that 2 judges presiding over the Second Instance Courts also preside over the Civil Court, First Hall and the Family Court (which are specialised 1st instance courts).
The number of 1st Instance 'judges' also includes magistrates that preside over 1st Instance Courts.

(2021): During 2021, 4 new magistrates and 2 new judges were appointed to the bench, thereby increasing the judicial complement by the same number. 2 judges were also appointed to the bench, but given that they were previously magistrates, their appointment did not increase the judicial complement.

(2019): For Number of first instance professional judges, the difference in nominal figures is of 4 male magistrates compared to previous cycle. This is mainly due to retirement and the appointment of 2 male magistrates to judges. 3 new magistrates have been appointed in 2019, only 1 of which is male.
For the Number of second instance professional judges, Madame Justice Lorraine Schembri Orland has been appointed Judge elect in respect of Malta on the European Court of Human Rights. Given that she did not serve in Malta at the end of 2019, she does not feature in the above data.

(2017): Despite the categorical manner in which the Maltese judiciary have been classified for the purpose of this exercise, it is important to note that the roles of some of the judges are very fluid. Hence, some of the 1st Instance judges preside, when the need arises, over 2nd Instance courts, whilst 2nd Instance judges hear cases at 1st Instance such as at the Civil Court, First Hall or the Civil Court, Family Section.
Throughout 2017, 1 male 1st Instance Judge passed away at the beginning of the year, whilst another 2nd Instance Judge retired towards the end of the year. 1 female Magistrate has been appointed. Care is being taken in order to ensure an equal gender representation in the appointments of the judiciary.

(2016): Despite the categorical manner in which the Maltese judiciary have been classified for the purpose of this exercise, it is important to note that the roles of some of the judges are very fluid. Hence, some of the 1st Instance judges sit, when the need arises, in 2nd Instance courts, whilst 2nd Instance judges hear cases at 1st Instance such as at the Civil Court, First Hall or the Civil Court, Family Section.
There has been an increase of 3 female judges at 1st instance since 2014. There was an increase from 15 to 17 female judges at 1st instance in 2015 and a further increase of 1 female judge at 1st instance in 2016. Care is being taken in order to ensure an equal gender representation in the appointments of the judiciary.

(2015): Regarding the number of judges, the high percentage variations that might be observed results from the small absolute number of judges that Malta has. Malta has been trying, and there are still on-going efforts, at increasing the number of judges. If between 2010 and 2015 the number of male judges decreased (by 1), this was complemented by an increase in the number of female judges (also by 1).

Netherlands

(General Comment): Since 2020, new methodology of presentation of data is used, allowing distinguishing between first and second instance for the specific group of judges who were previously all counted as first instance judges ('overig RA'). For all cycles, court presidents are taken into consideration in the figures

(2021): Numbers are on posts filled, not fte. Total fte is 2416.
Total fte for first and second instance was given in 2021, but information on fte was NA for the rest of the categories and the detail required cannot be provided.
For the Supreme court, fte and posts filled are the same.

(2020): These numbers are on posts filled, not fte. The total fte for first and second instance together is 2372, but information on fte is NA for the rest of the categories and detail required for this question. These numbers include court presidents.
In the previous cycles, due to an inability to differentiate between first or second instance for a certain group of judges, they were counted as first instance judges. This inflated the first instance numbers and underreported the second instance numbers. This problem was present in the data up until the 2019 survey. For the 2020 data, this problem has been solved, and the data is now correct.

(2018): We did not receive information on the number of judges (in fte) working at the High Court. There are 33 judges at the High Court (people, not fte), 20 male / 13 female. Since this concerns only 1% of all judges, we'd suggest to work with these numbers (and accept the small deviation in the calulated total number)

(2017): these are number of people (posts); the total number of fte is 2315, this can not be separated for 1st and 2nd instances
NB: data on the number of Supreme Court judges is provided in fte. More precisely, according to the annual report of the Council of State https://jaarverslag.raadvanstate.nl/2017/ the number was 37.9 fte in 2017.

(2016): All data in number of persons. FTE data are only available for the total: 2148.
Supreme Court NA

(2015): Number of deputy judges courts in 2015 = 1.100
The numbers provided in the table are posts. The FTE is avaialble only for the total and it is 2.169. Other categories are NA.

(2014): In 2014, the number of first instance judges does not include judges of the Trade and Industry Tribunal, the Supreme Court and the Council of State. The number of second instance judges includes magistrates of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal and the Administrative High Court, excluding these of the Supreme Court and the Council of State.

(2013): In 2013, the total in fte is 2 181. This was excluding the Supreme Court. The number of first instance judges excludes judges of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, the Supreme Court and the Council of State. The number of second instance judges includes magistrates of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal and the Administrative High Court, excluding these of the Supreme Court and the Council of State.

(2012): In 2012, the total in fte is 2 194, excluding the Supreme Court. The number of first instance judges excludes judges of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal, the Supreme Court and the Council of State. The number of second instance judges includes magistrates of the Trade and Industry Appeals Tribunal and the Administrative High Court, excluding these of the Supreme Court and the Council of State.

Poland

(General Comment): The Polish court structure is characterized by four levels of courts but only three instances. Basically, there are district courts which are first instance courts, regional courts which are first and second instance courts, and appellate courts which are second instance courts. The highest instance courts are the Supreme Court, the Supreme Administrative Court and the Constitutional Tribunal. Owing to this peculiarity, some judges sit as first and second instance magistrates. According to the methodology of presentation of data that has been chosen, judges of regional courts are counted as first instance judges together with judges of district courts and judges of first instance administrative courts. Only judges of appellate courts are considered as second instance magistrates. The Supreme Court operates under the Constitution of the Republic of Poland and the Supreme Court Act. It is established to:
- exercise supervision over the activities of common and military courts in the area of adjudication - this is the so-called judicial supervision (Article 183(1) of the Constitution). The means used to exercise such supervision include:
- recognition of extraordinary complaints, cassations and other appeals (instance supervision),
passing resolutions resolving legal issues (extra-institutional supervision) Resolutions of the entire chamber or a larger body of judges have the force of law and are binding on all Supreme Court formations. A panel of 7 judges may decide to give the resolution the force of legal principle.
Competence of the Constitutional Tribunal
The Constitution of 2 April 1997 includes four areas within the jurisdiction of the Constitutional Tribunal:
1) control of norms (abstract and concrete; a posteriori and a priori - Art. 188 items 1-3, Art. 122 items 3 and 4, Art. 133 item 2 of the Constitution); a special procedure for the control of norms is the consideration of constitutional complaints (Art. 79 and Art. 188 item 5 of the Constitution)
2) adjudication of competence disputes between central constitutional organs of the state (Article 189 of the Constitution);
3) adjudicating on the compatibility with the Constitution of the objectives or activities of political parties (Article 188, item 4 of the Constitution)
4) recognising the temporary inability of the President of the Republic to discharge his office (Article 131, paragraph 1 of the Constitution).
Of the four areas of the jurisdiction of the Tribunal indicated above, the control of norms is undoubtedly a fundamental task.

(2021): Common courts:
The number of judges of district courts: 6046 (3938 women, 2108 men)
The number of judges of regional courts : 2684 (1550 women, 1134 men)
The number of judges of the appeal courts: 459 (239 women, 220 men)
The numbers are higher because the president appointed a lot of court assessors as judges in 2021. In addition, there were more appointments to the regional and appeal courts than retirements of judges from these courts.
The Supreme Court : 93 (73 men, 20 women)
The Administrative Supreme Court: 102 (62 men, 40 women);
Administrative courts first instance: 431 (192 men, 239 women);

(2020): The number of judges of district courts: 6036 (3922 women, 2114 men)
The number of judges of regional courts : 2544 (1462 women, 1082 men)
The number of judges of the appeal courts: 417 (220 women, 197 men)
The number of judges of the first instance administrative courts : 454 (260 women, 194 men)
Supreme courts:
The number of judges of the Supreme Administrative court: 102 (62 women, 40 men)
The number of judges of the supreme court: 97 (75 women, 22 men)
Military courts:
The number of judges of district military courts: 18 (1 woman, 17 men)
The number of garrison judges: 27 (5 women, 22 men).
*Starting from 2020 the number of Supreme court judges include also judges of the Supreme Administrative Court

(2019): Compared to the previous edition, the number of judges of the supreme court was also given.
The number of Supreme court is 99: 25 (civil chamber), 27 (criminal chamber) 14 (labour law and social security chamber), 20 (extraordinary control and public affairs chamber), 13 (disciplinary chamber).
Females: 21 (total)
11(civil chamber)
3 (criminal chamber)
3 (labour law and social security chamber)
3 (extraordinary control and public affairs chamber)
1 (disciplinary chamber)
Males: 78 (total)
14 (civil chamber)
24 (criminal chamber)
11 (labour law and social security chamber)
17 (extraordinary control and public affairs chamber)
12 (disciplinary chamber)

Portugal

(General Comment): The total includes judges from courts of 1st, 2nd and 3rd instances, except the Constitutional Court.

(2020): 3. We are dealing with small numbers, therefore the dicrepancy ratio is big. In addition, with time female judges, that are the majority of judges, are getting to the top of their professional career.

(2019): In absolute terms the increase is only 5 persons. The numbers are small, therefore in relative terms it appears to be relevant.

(2018): The number of Supreme Court Judges has been decreasing since 2015. In absolute terms the decrease from 2016 to 2018 is from 82 to 71 judges, which is not significative in absolute terms, but acquires a more relevant expression in relative terms.

(2017): As concerns the increase in the number of female Supreme Court judges: the numbers are small, therefore the variation seems important.

(2014): The increase in the number of Supreme Court female professional judges is due to the general tendency of increase of female judges in the last decade at first instance courts.

Romania

(General Comment): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). Only judges of the first instance court „judecatorii" are counted as first instance judges. In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above judges from tribunals and courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional judges", even if according to the procedural provisions in terms of competences tribunals may judge both as first and instance court and for certain procedural circumstances (material and personal) even the courts of appeal may judge in first instance. Moreover even the High Court can judge in first instance for example in criminal cases according to the personal competence rules of procedure.

(2020): Only judges of the „judecatorii" are counted as first instance judges.

(2019): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above judges from tribunals and courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional judges", even if according to the procedural provisions in terms of competences tribunals may judge both as first and instance court and for certain procedural circumstances (material and personal) even the courts of appeal may judge in first instance. Moreover even the High Court can judge in first instance for example in criminal cases according to the personal competence rules of procedure.

(2018): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above judges from tribunals and courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional judges", even if according to the procedural provisions in terms of competences tribunals may judge both as first and instance court and for certain procedural circumstances (material and personal) even the courts of appeal may judge in first instance. Moreover even the High Court can judge in first instance for example in criminal cases according to the personal competence rules of procedure.

(2017): The number of professional judges sitting in second instance courts (point 2) includes both the number of judges within the courts of appeal and the number of judges within the tribunals.

(2016): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In the table above the judges from tribunals are included in the category "second instance professional judges".

(2014): For 2014, judges mentioned at 46.1 are judges within first instance courts, while judges mentioned at 46.2 are judges within tribunals and courts of appeal.

(2013): Judges mentioned at 46.1 are judges within first instance courts and tribunals, while judges mentioned at 46.2 are judges within courts of appeal. In 2012 and 2013, the Superior Council of Magistracy brought important changes to the Regulation for the promotion of judges to the High Court of Cassation and Justice and 19 judges were promoted.

(2012): At 46.1 are mentioned judges within courts of first instance, while at 46.2 are mentioned judges within tribunals and courts of appeal.

Slovak Republic

(2021): Number of Supreme Administrative Court professional judges are included in the Q. 46 line 3. (8 males, 13 females; total 21).

(2019): The Number of Supreme Court professional judges is 77 for the full time judges. There are 7 temporarily assigned judges as well (2 women and 5 men).

(2018): The provided total corresponds to the number of judges actually performing their functions. Put differently, judges who are temporary assigned to other institutions (Ministry of Justice, Judicial Academy, other judicial institutions including international courts), judges granted maternity leave etc. are not considered in the provided figures. Total number including judges temporary not performing their functions is 1427 (521 men, 906 women).

(2017): The increase in the total number of judges is caused by filling the previously designed vacant posts of judges.

(2015): The decrease in the number of judges in comparison with the previous cycle has been caused by the retirement of the judges whose posts have not been filled yet. The selection procedures for the vacant posts are under way.

(2014): In 2014, the total number of judges in the records of the Ministry of justice was 1366 (503 males, 863 females), including judges temporary assigned to other institutions, judges granted maternity leave etc.

(2013): In 2013, the total number of judges in the records of the Ministry of justice was 1385 (511 males, 874 females), including judges temporary assigned to other institutions, judges granted maternity leave etc.

(2012): In 2012, the total number of judges in the records of the Ministry of justice was 1344 (497 males, 847 females), including judges temporary assigned to other institutions, judges granted maternity leave etc.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The provided total number of judges corresponds to the number of de facto occupied judicial posts performing their functions. Some judges are assigned to other duties (eg. to the Judicial council, Ministry of Justice, Supreme court) and are not included in the reported numbers. The information on actual presence (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave) is also available. Higher judges at first instance courts (local, district, labour and social and the Administrative Court) are reported by their court - as second instance judges.

(2021): At the end of 2021, 880 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 860 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (20 judges - difference to the total of 880 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts. The data on actual presence of judges in courts is also collected; the number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2021 was 802,84 according to actual presence calculations.
Until 2021, approx. 30 judges at the Administrative Court (first instance court, see Q44) and approx. 50 higher judges at local and district courts (first instance courts) were reported as second-instance judges (accoriding to their rank: higher judge); from 2022 they are reported according to their court (first-instance judges).

(2020): At the end of 2020, 890 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 875 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (15 judges - difference to the total of 890 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts. The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave).
The number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2020 was 805,5 according to actual presence calculations.

(2019): At the end of 2019, 890 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave).
Nevertheless, we report that 873 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (17 judges - difference to the total of 890 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts.
The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave). The number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2019 was 797 according to actual presence calculations.

(2018): At the end of 2018, 890 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 867 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (23 judges - difference to the total of 890 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts. The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave).
The number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2018 was 796 according to actual presence calculations.

(2017): At the end of 2017, 889 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some posts were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). Nevertheless, we report that 869 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (20 judges - difference to the total of 889 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts.
The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave)
The number of judges in the Slovenian judicial system in 2016 was 795,54 according to actual presence calculations.

(2016): At the end of 2016, 897 judicial posts were formally occupied (full-time equivalent method), although some post were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave). The actual presence is also calculated, based on number of hours judges are actually present in court (excluding the maternity or sick leave, but including the annual leave). The number of judges in Slovenian judicial system in 2016 was 811,52 according to actual presence calculations.
Nevertheless, we report that 880 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since the rest of the judges (17 judges - difference to the total of 897 judges) were assigned to other duties (e.g. the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Judicial Council) and do not sit in courts.

(2015): At the end of 2015, 912 judicial posts were formally occupied (FTE), although some post were de facto vacant (e.g. judge absent due to maternity leave).
Nevertheless, 897 professional judges sit in courts (perform judicial function), since
some judges were assigned to other duties (at the Supreme Court; different projects ;appointed to the Judicial Council and appointed to the Ministry of Justice.

We reported the Administrative court as the first instance court (Q42 and Q91). However, the law requires for the Administrative court judge to be a higher judge (2nd instance judge), therefore the Administrative court judges are included as the 2nd instance professional judges

(2012): Starting with 2012, judges of administrative courts are included in the number of first instance judges.

Question 046-2

Belgium

(2020): The system does not allow part-time work for judges. Data by type of case are not known. Judges are appointed at the court level, and the head of the court assigns them to the different chambers of the court and allocates cases.

Bulgaria

(2021): The total number of first-instance judges is 1258. It includes 991 district (first instance) judges, for whom there is no available information regarding the specialization, 236 administrative, 10 other (military) and 21 - judges at first instance Specialized Criminal Court.
The total number of second-instance judges includes also 59 junior judges, adjudicating at regional courts (second instance), for whom information on specialization is not available. 5 other are military judges.
The total number of supreme judges includes the president of the Supreme Court of Cassation, for whom there is no available information regarding the specialization.

(2020): The column "others" in question 46-2 refers to the military judges - 12 regional/provincial and 5 appellate - a total of 17.
The total number of judges in the district courts is 959, and the same, with the exception of the Sofia District Court, are not divided by subject matter. Therefore, data related to the number of first instance judges dealing with civil / commercial and criminal cases are not available. Appendix: Summary information on the data as of 31.12.2020, received by all regional/provincial courts (first and second instance) regarding the number of judges in them, who work in the civil, commercial and criminal divisions. It should be borne in mind that, according to the information received, in almost all courts, a large number of judges sit in more than one division, therefore the summation of the number of judges from the three divisions should not give the total number of judges in the respective court. Total number of judges in the Court of Appeal (second instance) - 124, of which in the civil division - 36, in the commercial division - 38 and in the criminal division - 50.

Croatia

(General Comment): The difficulty to provide the data lays in mixed specialization of judges in courts, so exact data cannot be extracted.

Cyprus

(General Comment): Cyprus has a two-tier system; therefore, the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court is included in the second instance cases (questions 97 and 98).

(2021): All 13 Supreme court judges hear all cases. District court judges are dealing with criminal and civil cases, and they were previously included in the 'Other' cases. We have now limited this to judges of special jurisdiction courts.

(2020): This includes the supreme court judges who deal with all types of cases, first instance family court judges, labour court judges, rent control court judges and military court.
Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in the second instance cases - questions 97 and 98.

Czech Republic

(2021): Insolvency proceedings and Guardianship proceedings

(2020): Insolvency Proceedings

Denmark

(General Comment): We cannot answer this question by case type as all judges make decisions in all types of cases in Denmark.

Estonia

(2020): In the first instance we don't have judges formally seperated as criminal or civil judges.

Finland

(General Comment): We do not have statistic of the amount of the civil and/ or commercial and criminal judges in the general courts as in many courts judges work in both types of cases. In Market Court, there are 21 judges who are civil/commercial judges.

France

(2021): Non-specialised judges, who account for approximately 45% of the staff of the civil and criminal courts, are required to work in both criminal and civil matters. As a result, the distribution between the different types of litigation is not quantifiable, as these assignments fall within the organisational powers of the head of court.
Similarly, certain specialised judges (juvenile judges and liberty and custody judges) are also likely to intervene in both civil and criminal cases due to their areas of competence.
Source DSJ. Data have been rounded up from 0.5, down below. Source: Council of State for the administrative part (data have been rounded).

(2020): "The distinction by type of case is not possible in the justice of the judicial order.
Note: the distribution of the processing of civil and criminal cases within the tribunals and courts, which depends on the organization of the jurisdictions, does not allow us to fill in this table. For the administrative courts, the FTEs have been rounded up. The precise non-rounded data can be made available if necessary. "

Germany

(2021): "Other" includes: familiy cases (at the Local and Higher Regional Courts), cases at the Labour Courts, Social courts, Finance courts
"First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder. It is derived from a complex calculation key as an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training).
"Surpreme Court": the figures are taken from the court-staff statistics and represent the number (FTE) of judges at the Federal Courts (Federal Court of Justice, Federal Patent Court, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Finance Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court, Federal Consitutional Court, Military Disciplinary Courts) as of 31. December 2020. The statistic is published every second year. It shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (152) but includes no information on their assignment to civil or criminal cases. According to the website of the Federal Court of Justice, there are currently 113 judges (headcount) assigned to the civil panels and 46 to the criminal panels.

(2020): "Other" includes: familiy cases (at the Local and Higher Regional Courts), cases at the Labour Courts, Social courts, Finance courts
"First instance" and "Second instance": Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder. It is derived from a complex calculation key as an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training).
"Surpreme Court": the figures are taken from the court-staff statistics and represent the number (FTE) of judges at the Federal Courts (Federal Court of Justice, Federal Patent Court, Federal Administrative Court, Federal Finance Court, Federal Labour Court, Federal Social Court, Federal Consitutional Court, Military Disciplinary Courts) as of 31. December 2020. The statistic shows the number of judges (FTE) at the Federal Court of Justice (152) but includes no information on their assignment to civil or criminal cases. According to the website of the Federal Court of Justice, there are currently 114 judges (headcount) assigned to the civil panels and 47 to the criminal panels.
Slight horizontal and vertical inconsistencies are caused by rounding.

Greece

(2020): There are two categories of judges, those dealing with criminal and civil justice and administrative judges. There is no data on the separation of cases

Ireland

(2021): Judges can be assigned to both criminal and civil cases. Although in some jurisdictions, mainly the High Court and Circuit Court, Judges might specialise for a period (sometimes for a period of years) in criminal and civil matters. All Judges can administer all types of cases within their jurisdiction. Administrative cases are not a separate category in Ireland.

(2020): Judges deal with both criminal and civil and commercial proceedings. Number of Judges would be the same across all headings (except administrative as already explained) - Court Service

Latvia

(General Comment): The courts of first instance of general jurisdiction do not explicitly distinguish between the specialisation of judges on the basis of the main types of cases, therefore there is not possible to distinguish the data between civil and or commercial cases and criminal cases.

(2021): For Supreme Court - within the number of judges is not indicated number of President of the Supreme Court.

(2020): The courts of first instance of general jurisdiction do not explicitly distinguish between the specialisation of judges on the basis of the main types of cases, therefore there is not possible to distinguish the data between civil and or commercial cases and criminal cases.

Lithuania

(2020): the first instance indicates the number of judges of district courts, regional courts and regional administrative courts. Likewise, given that the Supreme Administrative Court is the court of appeal (although the rulings of the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania are final and not subject to appeal) the number of judges of this court is encompassed in the 2nd instance. The latter indicates the number of judges of the Court of Appeal of Lithuania and the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania.

Malta

(2021): Some judges in the Maltese judicial system preside over both civil and criminal courts. In this instance, such judges have been distributed evenly between the 2 courts.
Administrative cases at first instance are heard by the Administrative Review Tribunal, presided over by 3 magistrates. If appealed, such cases are heard by the Court of Appeal Inferior Jurisdiction presided over by a judge who hears and decides cases appealed from a number of first instance courts (not only the Administrative Review Tribunal). Given that these cases constitute only a fraction of the caseload of this judge, it would be misleading to indicate him as a 2nd Instance judge over appeals from administrative cases.

(2020): Some judges in the Maltese judicial system preside over both civil and criminal courts. In this instance, such judges have been distributed evenly between the 2 courts.
Administrative cases at first instance are heard by the Administrative Review Tribunal, presided over by 3 magistrates. If appealed, such cases are heard by the Court of Appeal Inferior Jurisdiction presided over by a judge who hears and decides cases appealed form a number of first instance courts (not only the Administrative Review Tribunal).

Netherlands

(General Comment): Judges often work more than one case type. There is a large overlap, but in the administrative system, only one sector can be registered. Therefore, making a distinction would not be a fair reflection of the true situation and the information is not easily available. This comment does not generally apply to the High Court.

(2021): Numbers are on posts filled, not fte. FTE for first and second instance is 2416.
For SC fte and posts filled are the same. Note that the 11 judges under the category ‘Administrative’ (Supreme Court) refer to the judges in the tax chamber of the Dutch Supreme Court. With regard to administrative law, the Dutch Supreme Court only handles tax cases and some social security cases. There is no third instance court for other administrative cases in The Netherlands.

(2020): Judges often work with more than one case type. There is a large overlap, but in the administrative system, only one sector can be registered. Therefore, while this information is not easily available, making this distinction would also not be a fair reflection of the true situation.
These are positions filled, not fte (like Q46).

Poland

(General Comment): It is noteworthy recalling that the Supreme Administrative Court is also the court of second instance.

(2020): 1. Supreme Court - the 13 judges of the Supreme Court Chamber of Labour Law and Social Insurance appear in the column “other” together with the 18 judges of the Extraordinary Review and Public Affairs Chamber and the 13 judges of the Disciplinary Chamber.

Portugal

(2021): As there are judges who have civil and criminal competences at the same time, it is not possible to distinguish judges by civil and comercial matters. Therefore, the judges of the judicial courts were all included in the column “other”.

(2020): As there are judges who have civil and criminal competences at the same time, it is not possible to distinguish judges by civil and comercial matters. Therefore, the judges of the judicial courts were all included in the column “other”.

Romania

(General Comment): The statistical system does not collect information regarding a breakdown in the number of judges based on the different legal matters.

(2020): In Romania there are four level of courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above judges from tribunals and courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional judges", even if according to the procedural provisions in terms of competences tribunals may judge both as first and instance court and for certain procedural circumstances (material and personal) even the courts of appeal may judge in first instance. Moreover even the High Court can judge in first instance for example in criminal cases according to the personal competence rules of procedure.

Slovak Republic

(2021): The Supreme Administrative Court had 21 administrative judges in 2021, included in Second instance.

Slovenia

(General Comment): In 2021, the data on judges classified by legal fields was collected for the first time (by approximating the time an individual judge is working on a certain type of case). Since the methodology of reporting is yet to be revised and elaborated, we can only report approximate numbers. The distinction to Civil and/or Commercial/Criminal/Administrative/Other judges is roughly the same as for the number of cases (see comments to Q91, 93 and 94). The category "Other" includes judges involved in the court management. Judges involved in court management are partially or entirely relieved from adjudicating cases.
The data is reported as actual presence (not FTE).

(2021): The data is only approximate - please see general comment. The data is reported as actual presence (not FTE) and therefore not compatible with Q46.

(2020): There is no data for 2020. In 2021, the data on judges by legal fields was collected for the first time (by approximating the time and workload an individual judge is working on a certain type of cases). Since the metodology of reporting is yet to be revised and elaborated, we can only report approximate numbers. For distinction on Civil and/or Commercial/Criminal/Administrative/Other please see comments to Q91, 93 and 94.
First instance judges: Civil and/or commercial: 62% (approx. 396 judges); Criminal: 33% (approx. 214 judges); Administrative: 4% (approx. 28 judges), Other: 1% (approx. 5 judges)
Please note: the judges at the Administrative Court that resolve administative cases at first instance have the rank of a higher judge.
Second instance judges: Civil and/or commercial: 66% (approx. 77 judges); Criminal: 34% (approx. 39 judges); Administrative: /, Other: /
Supreme court judges: Civil and/or commercial: 57% (approx. 16 judges); Criminal: 18% (approx. 5 judges); Administrative: 25% (approx. 9 judges), Other: /

Question 052

Austria

(General Comment): Starting from 2021, the “Kanzlei” who are responsible for handling of case files are counted as “staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts”. “Other staff” only includes trainees (including trainees for Rechtspfleger) and staff representation. Moreover, starting from 2021, “technical staff” also includes staff working at the courts‘ IT departments.

(2021): Starting from 2021, the “Kanzlei” who are responsible for handling of case files are no more counted as “other staff”, but as “staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts”. “Other staff” only includes trainees (including trainees for Rechtspfleger) and staff representation. Moreover, starting from 2021, “technical staff” also includes staff working at the courts‘ IT departments, therefore the number is higher than in previous years.

(2020): "Other": Handling of case files (“Kanzlei”)
2. Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges: the increased number concerns administrative courts.

(2019): Non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges: more staff at the administrative courts
Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts: more staff
Other: Handling of case files (“Kanzlei”)

(2018): Handling of case files (“Kanzlei”)

(2017): The data also include those of administrative courts.

(2016): This cycle admnistrative courts were taken into account for the first time.
The administrative courts were established January 1st 2014. After their establishment the data of the administrative courts is introduced this cycle for the first time.

(2015): The right (not rounded) numbers are:
Total non-judge staff working in courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5) 4734,55 - 1407,08 - 3327,47
1. Rechtspfleger (or similar bodies) with judicial or quasi-judicial tasks having autonomous competence and whose decisions could be subject to appeal798,11 - 331,63 - 466,48
2. Non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars (case file preparation, assistance during the hearing, court recording, helping to draft the decisions) 19,05 - 1 - 18,05
3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (human resources management, material and equipment management, including computer systems, financial and budgetary management, training management)439,56 - 155,86 - 283,70
4. Technical staff21,70 - 9,85 - 11,85
5. Other non-judge staff3456,13 - 908,74 - 2547,39

(2014): The numerical values in the table have been rounded. The most exact replies for this period would be: total non-judge staff: 4 704,51 (1 388 Male, 3 316,51 Female); Rechtspfleger: 784,78 (320,21 Male, 464,57 Female); non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges: 19,18 (1 Male, 18,18 Female); staff in charge of different administrative tasks: 438,97 (159,85 Males, 279,12 Females); technical staff: 23,05 (9,95 Males, 13,10 Females); other non-judge staff: 3 438,53 (896,99 Males, 2 541,54 Females).

Belgium

(2019): "Technical personnel": the slight increase observed between 2018 and 2019 results from investments in personnel.

(2013): The number of women per category is as follows: Total: 3839,45; category 2: 1212,62; category 3: 2031,93; category 4: 594,90.

(2012): The 2d category "non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars" covers clerks and referendaries; the 3d category "staff in charge of different administrative tasks" includes HRM staff, seconded staff to specific authorities of the judicial organisation and administrative staff of the court registry. This distribution can be presented with the following figures: Total: 5457,95 (3930,35 women); 2: 1707,72 (1166,52 women); 3: 2766,23 (2075,73 women); 5: 984 (688,10 women).

Bulgaria

(General Comment): Since 2012, the category “other” encompasses the number of non-judge staff employees working in the recreational field, while in 2010 it subsumes the number of court assistants. The Judicial Administration Commission does not keep statistics of those who are trained, as well as of trainee judges. There are junior judges in the courts in the country, for whom Judicial Administration Commission has no relation, no data. Accordingly, the total number of judicial employees in the courts does not include trainee judges.

(2019): Since 2012, the category “other” encompasses the number of non-judge staff employees working in the recreational field, while in 2010 it subsumes the number of court assistants.

(2017): These are the staff employed in the recreational establishments of the Supreme Administrative Court and the Supreme Court of Cassation such as: manager of the training center, chefs, worker in the kitchen, bartender, waiter, tendant.

(2015): Unlike the previous evaluation cycles, now we indicate the figure 502 – technical staff (it includes drives, cleaning staff, guards, etc.), which reduce the number of the employees engaged with administrative tasks and court management under number 3.
Other non-judge staff includes 55 court servants working in recreation department.

(2013): The number of non-judge staff assisting judges includes the number of all court staff from the so called specialized administration supporting judges, including court secretaries and court assistance, while for 2010 it subsumes only court secretaries. The category “staff in charge of different administrative tasks” subsumes the number of non – judge staff of general administration.

(2012): The number of non-judge staff assisting judges includes the number of all court staff from the so called specialized administration supporting judges, including court secretaries and court assistance, while for 2010 it subsumes only court secretaries.

Croatia

(General Comment): The total number of non-judicial staff is a result of a deduction and subsumes only actually working staff. Thus, the total does not include staff on unpaid leave; staff on maternity leave; staff suspended after disciplinary procedures; staff transferred to other State bodies (for example the Ministry of Justice or Judicial Academy). Besides, two non-judicial officials working half-time (for the reason of care for a child with special needs) are counted as 1 non-judicial official. The reason for fluctuation and differences in the number of Rechtpflegers in Republic of Croatia is that they work for 2 years, then prolonged 5 years and then they get a permanent post or not.

(2015): The Republic of Croatia submits correct numbers of non-judge staff who are working in courts for previous cycles (2012, 2013 and 2014), because in the previous cycles this number included the staff working for public prosecutors. Therefore, the correct numbers for these cycles are now provided.

(2014): In 2013, the number of “Rechtspfleger” included judicial advisors because they work autonomously on cases, on the one hand, and staff who are not judges, but who can enact decisions (land registry officials and court registry officials), on the other hand. In 2014, the interpretation changed and judicial advisors were moved to the category “non-judicial staff whose task is to assist the judges”, since they work autonomously but their decision must be signed by a judge.

(2013): The variations between 2012 and 2013 in respect of certain sub-categories are due only to a different methodology of classification. The total is slightly different for the two years.

Cyprus

(General Comment): The total number of non-judge staff includes clerical staff and also court bailiffs.

(2021): court baillifs

(2020): Other non-judge staff includes court bailiffs. Differences in number of staff compared to previous year come from new appointments and retirements.

(2018): Court bailiffs are included in category Other.

(2017): court bailiffs

(2016): court bailiff
in 2014 the correct number for male no judge staff assisting the judge should be 9
Question 52: if we change the number of male non judge staff assisting the judge for 2014 from 23 to 9, we must also change the number of non-judge staff assisting judges from 143 to 129 and also the total from 462 to 448. Do you agree on up-dating in this way 2014 data in order to ensure the consistency of the table? the numbers for 2014 must also be changed

(2015): Between 2014 and 2015, there was a change in the distribution of non-judge staff. In 2014, in the category "staff in charge of administrative tasks", only the number of high-level administrative staff was included. The other administrative staff were included in the category "other non judge staff". Whereas in 2015, all administrative staff were included in the category "staff in charge of administrative tasks". This change of distribution leads to significant variations.

(2014): Variations concerning data on different categories of non-judge staff are due to different methodology of presentation of data used for 2014 and the previous evaluations.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): The category “other” encompasses for 2010 judicial trainees or staff in charge of court documentation. For 2012, 2013 and 2014, besides the already mentioned components, it subsumes also press centre and telephone exchange.
The judicial trainee is entitled to perform the acts of the court under the conditions and to the extent specified in factual and time plan of the preparatory service which is compiled by the chairman of the regional court after consultation with the advisory board for the education of trainees. The plan must be focused in such a way that the training for the performance of the function of a judge serves in particular to:
a) deepening the trainee's professional knowledge of substantive and procedural law,
b) developing the trainee's ability to apply legislation in a specific matter,
c) gaining knowledge of individual agendas maintained by courts and their implementation,
d) acquisition of procedural procedures and habits necessary for the performance of the function of a judge,
e) acquaintance with ethical principles related to the performance of the function of a judge.
In accordance with the preparatory service plan, the trainee performs preparatory service at a district or regional court. The trainee is usually assigned to one judge. Familiarization with individual court agendas is ensured by the fact that the president of the court where the judicial trainee is currently located gradually assigns the trainee to individual court departments.
The preparatory service includes adaptation courses, seminars and lectures organized by the Judicial Academy and educational activities organized by court for at least 2 days per month.
Nowadays, there are few judicial trainees and in 2022 the title will be replaced by a „judicial candidate“.

(2017): Other - judicial trainees, staff in charge of court documentation, press centre and telephone exchange.

(2016): Other - judicial trainees, staff in charge of court documentation, press centre and telephone exchange.

(2015): In 2015, compared to 2014, the number of non-judge staff increased due to a project financed from the European social fund and state budget: “Project on improvement of the efficiency of courts by strengthening of the administrative capacities”. The project is running until 30th December 2015.

(2014): In 2014, the number of non-judge staff increased due to a project financed from the European social fund and State budget: “Project on improvement of the efficiency of courts by strengthening of the administrative capacities”. The project is running until 30th December 2015.

Denmark

(2020): -

(2019): information NA

(2017): "other non judge staff" - in 2017 there was no staff to fit into this category.

(2016): The 2016 data on the number of rechtspflegers is correct. The discrepancy that occurs compared to 2014 data is due to a mistake in the 2014 numbers.

Estonia

(2020): Trainees are not included in the numbers provided for Q52 and Q52-1.

(2019): Court interpreters are in the category "other non-judge staff".

(2018): Court interpreters are in the category "other non-judge staff".

(2017): The increase in the number of male staff in charge of administrative tasks is due to the general movement of personnel.
"Other non-judge staff": Court interpreters.

(2016): The observed variations in the numbers with regard to the different sub-categories are due to a general movement of staff.

In 2015, a reform of the Land Registry and Registration Department was carried out, during which the four districts were brought together registry and land registry departments to the Tartu County Court, thus establishing one land registry department and one registry office. The reform involved significant optimization of work processes and dossiers which resulted in the reduction of staff working in the registers. The objectives and results of the reform were largely achieved because registries are kept electronically, and individuals can largely interact with the registers, transmit and receive documents receive electronically.

(2015): The number of technical staff has been decreasing due to redundancies in the Registration and Land Registry Departments. The project of court lawyers was carried out having in mind that the Registration and Land Registry departments are fully digital. Therefore there is a possibility to decrease the number of technical staff.

(2014): A pilot project has been introduced in 2013 in one county court consisting in providing each judge with a personal legal assistant. After the first year of the pilot project, the average proceeding times in civil cases in that particular court dropped from 201 days to 160 days; after the second year the average proceeding times dropped further to 132 days. In 2015, the project has been extended to all first and second instance courts.

(2013): Since 2013, the second category includes a new position among court staff – judicial clerks. They assist judges in the administration of justice, participating in the preparation of court cases or in court proceedings. They replace step by step former consultants. There is one judicial clerk for every judge. In 2013, the reform was implemented in the largest court of general jurisdiction as a pilot (Harju County Court). In 2015,it was extended to all first and second instance courts.

(2012): The overall number of court staff has not changed much during the last years: 976 (2010), 957 (2012) and 990 (2013). Differences in figures in the sub-categories are due to the different categorization of court staff.

Finland

(General Comment): The Finnish court staff organisation does not correspond to the CEPEJ subcategories. Therefore, only the total of non-judge staff can be provided for the question 52. Office staff has tasks mentioned in the categories 2-5. Summoners' tasks are for example to serve summons, subpoenas and other documents. Trainee judges have the same responsibility as judges but they do not have competence to deal with difficult cases. They are always appointed for a fixed term period (one year). In the courts of appeal, the
administrative courts, the Supreme Court, the Supreme Administrative Court, the Labour Court and the Market Court a referendary prepares and presents a case to the judges but the final judgment is decided by the judges. The tasks of trainee judges and referendaries correspond to the categories 1 and 2.

(2021): The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1530, summoners 269, trainee district judges 131 and referendaries 278. 1. “Rechtspfleger (or similar bodies)”: The senior judge of a district court may appoint in writing a member of the office personnel at the district court who has given an affirmation corresponding to the judge’s affirmation, who has received sufficient training and who has sufficient skills to attend to the duties: (1) in cases referred to in Chapter 5, section 3 of the Code of Judicial Procedure: (a) to give judgments by default; (b) to give, on the basis of Chapter 21, section 8(c) of the Code of Judicial Procedure, decisions and judgments on court costs, if the respondent has conceded the claim; (c) to decide on the staying of an action if the plaintiff
has withdrawn the action and the respondent does not call for a decision in the case; (2) to decide on applications for divorce on the basis of section 25, subsection 1 of the Marriage Act (234/1929) if both spouses are domiciled in Finland. If the case to be decided by office personnel, as referred to in subsection 1, proves to be extensive, subject to interpretation or otherwise difficult to decide, the case shall be transferred for a decision of a notary or a legally trained judge at the district court. The chief judge of a district court may appoint in writing a member of the office personnel at the district court who has sufficient skills, to issue summons and certificates, to effect service of documents and to attend to other duties connected to the preparation, consideration or enforcement of administration of justice matters. Before taking such tasks the staff member must give an oath. (Courts Act, Chapter 19, Section 6).

(2020): The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1477, summoners/process serves 273, trainee district judges 137 and referendaries 275. 1. “Rechtspfleger (or similar bodies)”: The senior judge of a district court may appoint in writing a member of the office personnel at the district court who has given an affirmation corresponding to the judge’s affirmation, who has received sufficient training and who has sufficient skills to attend to the duties: (1) in cases referred to in Chapter 5, section 3 of the Code of Judicial Procedure: (a) to give judgments by default; (b) to give, on the basis of Chapter 21, section 8(c) of the Code of Judicial Procedure, decisions and judgments on court costs, if the respondent has conceded the claim; (c) to decide on the staying of an action if the plaintiff has withdrawn the action and the respondent does not call for a decision in the case; (2) to decide on applications for divorce on the basis of section 25, subsection 1 of the Marriage Act (234/1929) if both spouses are domiciled in Finland. If the case to be decided by office personnel, as referred to in subsection 1, proves to be extensive, subject to interpretation or otherwise difficult to decide, the case shall be transferred for a decision of a notary or a legally trained judge at the district court. The chief judge of a district court may appoint in writing a member of the office personnel at the district court who has sufficient skills, to issue summons and certificates, to effect service of documents and to attend to other duties connected to the preparation, consideration or enforcement of administration of justice matters. Before taking such tasks the staff member must give an oath. (Courts Act, Chapter 19, Section 6).

(2019): The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1455, summoners 267, trainee district judges 135 and referendaries 271

(2018): The total non-judge staff includes office staff 1435, summoners 263, trainee district judges 136 and referendaries 297.

(2017): Office staff 1440, summoners 263, trainee judges 122, referendaries 312

(2016): office staff 1473, summoners 248, trainee district judges 136, junior district judges 1, referendaries 312

(2015): office staff 1428, summoners 265, trainee district judges 138, junior district judges 5, referendaries 309

(2014): For the 2014 exercise the total of 2 161 subsumes 1 434 office staff, 266 summoners, 136 trainee district judges, 7 junior district judges and 318 referendaries.

(2013): For 2013, the total of 2 196 subsumes 1445 office staff, 265 summoners, 133 trainee district judges, 7 junior district judges, 346 referendaries.

(2012): For 2012, the total of 2 214 subsumes 1447 office staff, 264 summoners, 129 trainee district judges, 9 junior district judges, 365 referendaries.

France

(General Comment): "Other non-judge staff" refers to legal assistants and specialised assistants who do not work for the public prosecution service. For the other subcategories (2, 3 and 4) it is not possible to distinguish between staff working for the courts and those working for the public prosecution services.

(2021): Concerning the total of 22 115, it should be noted that this figure includes 597 legal assistants and specialised assistants working for the courts and 939 contractual staff recruited in the framework of local justice. The "other non-judge staff" correspond to legal assistants and specialised assistants who do not work for the prosecution services. The category "non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars" includes the category B contractual staff recruited under the support plan for justice implemented since the second half of 2020 on the sole basis of Article 7 bis of Law No. 84-16 of 11 January 1984 on the statutory provisions relating to the State civil service, created by the law on the transformation of the civil service of 6 August 2019, which institutes the project contract. These contractual employees are recruited for three years. The significant increase in the number of these contractual staff (240 more than in 2020), combined with the increase in the number of court clerks (+221 compared to last year) and the increase in the number of other non-judge staff (+210 compared to last year), contributes to the increase in the overall figures communicated for the year 2021. As on 31 December 2021, 1 666 category A and B staff (including 1 383 women) were undergoing initial training at the “École nationale des greffes”, most of them on practical training in the courts. These staff will join the courts in 2022 or 2023, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and the regional administrative services.
Source DSJ

(2020): "Non-judge staff" correspond to legal assistants and specialized assistants who do not work for the prosecution service. Unlike in previous years, this distinction could be made for the numbers in 2020, which explains the decrease in the figures provided compared to the previous year. The category "Non-judicial staff responsible for assisting judges, like registrars" includes the category B contractual employees recruited under the plan to support justice, implemented since the second half of 2020 on the sole basis of article 7bis of the law n°84-16 of January 11, 1984, concerning statutory provisions relating to the State civil service, created by the law on the transformation of the civil service of August 6, 2019, instituting the project contract. These contract employees are hired for 3 years.
As of 12/31/2020, 1,699 category A and B agents (including 1,388 women) were undergoing initial training at the National School of Clerks, most of whom were on practical training in the courts. These personnel will join the courts during 2021 or 2022, which will significantly increase the number of agents working in the courts and regional administrative services.
The data compiles data from the judicial and administrative justice systems. Interns are not included. "

(2019): As of 31/12/2019, 1,693 category A and B staff (including 1,408 women) were undergoing initial training at the “Ecole nationale des greffes”, most of them on practical training courses in the courts. These staff will join the courts in 2020 or 2021, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative departments.
Other non-judge staff includes specialised assistants (106, 48 men and 58 women) and legal assistants (422, 93 men and 329 women) working in the civil and criminal courts. The increase in the number of legal assistants between 2018 and 2019 is due to the creation of new budgetary posts obtained.

(2018): With the exception of heading 5 "Other non-judge staff", the distinction between staff attached to judges and staff attached to prosecutors is not possible
At the date of 31/12/2018, 1,173 category A and B staff (including 1,003 women) were in initial training at the National School of Registries, most of whom were on practical training in the courts. These staff will join the courts in 2019 or 2020, which will significantly increase the number of staff working in the courts and regional administrative services.
"Other non-judge staff" includes specialised assistants and assistant lawyers who assist non-judge prosecutors in their duties.
The detail by function and gender is as follows:
Categories Total Male Female
Specialized assistants 23 13 10 10
Assistant lawyers 245 53 192
Total 268 66 202

(2017): The distinction between staff attached to judges and staff attached to prosecutors is not possible. Namely, the sub-category 2 encompasses specialised assistants (31) and assistant lawyers (242), who assist civil and penal judges or prosecutors in the preparation of case files.

(2016): No distinction is possible between staff attached to courts and staff attached to public prosecution services. The category “Other non-judge staff” refers to specialized assistants (18) and legal assistants (111) who work in civil and penal courts.

(2015): It should be noted that as of 31 December 2015, 1013 categories A and B staff (including 886 women) were in initial training at the Ecole nationale des greffes (French National School for Registrars), most of them in practical training in courts. This high volume of staff has joined the courts in 2016 or will do so in 2017, which will increase the number of staff actually working in the courts and regional administrative offices.

The distinction between staff in charge of assisting judges and staff in charge of assisting prosecutors is not possible. The latter are therefore part of the figures provided.

(2013): The 2013 data encompasses non-judge staff appointed to judges and public prosecutors. On 31 December 2013, 1064 agents were in initial training. They joined courts of law in 2014 or will do in 2015. Among the 21946 non-judge staff, 1911 were appointed to administrative courts. The 274 agents of the State Council counted in 2012 were appointed to a support function and are therefore excluded from the 2013 figures. The size of the litigation section of the State Council represents 87 FET. The staff of the National Court for asylum right has also been taken into account in categories 2, 3 and 4 for a total of 325 FET (not counted until 2013). In 2013, the State Council distributed non-judge staff which was before included in the category "other" in the proposed categories.

(2012): On 31 December 2012, 1039 staff were in initial training at the National School for Registrars, most of them in practical training in courts. They joined the tribunals in 2013 or will do so by 2014, which will increase the number of agents actually in office in courts and regional administrative services. Data pertaining to administrative courts is classified within the category "other" because of the versatility of their staff (1,505.5 FTE). As for the State Council, the number in FTE of the non-judge staff is 274.

Germany

(General Comment): Data is taken from the "staff-assignment statistics" of the Länder and represents an annual average value of the actual personnel deployed (for example, excluding employees who were not present more than 20 working days during a quarter for reasons other than holiday and/or training). The staff-assignment statistics do not distinguish between male and female staff.

(2021): These figures denote the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel

(2020): These figures denote the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel

(2019): These figures denote the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel

(2017): This figures denotes the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel

(2016): This figures denotes the number of staff (full-time equivalent) who are:
•granted unpaid leave for training/further-training purposes,
•released to work in staff representation bodies, as representatives for staff with disabilities, and as gender equality commissioners,
•employed in a special facility,
•employed as reception/security staff,
•employed by the court switchboard,
•motorpool staff,
•cleaners and other non-salaried personnel
Comments:
These are personnel-deployment figures denoting the number of full-time equivalent employees not exercising judicial office. Personnel-deployment figures are not collected according to reference date. Instead, an annual average is calculated over four quarters. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons making up this staff. An employee working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). An employee working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for an employee working half the usual number of hours). Figures for the federal courts are not included.

(2014): The 2013 and 2014 data are the same due to the impossibility to obtain data for 2014. The trend observed since 2010 reveals stable figures.

Greece

(2020): The above figures include civil servants, permanent and those with a private law relationship of indefinite duration

(2016): Previous data did not, inadvertently, exclude staff working for the public prosecution services.

Hungary

(General Comment): • Court secretaries („bírósági titkár") are employees of the court that are similar to Rechtspfleger. They are lawyers, who after acquiring a degree at a law faculty have made the bar exam (which requires at least 3 years professional practice). They are enabled to perform duties of judges in cases specifically defined by law.
According to the Constitution when a court secretary is dealing with a case he/she has the same independence as a judge. In criminal cases they can make out of trial decisions (e.g. order an expert to be included in the case), or they can hear witnesses on request of another court. This practically means they assist the judges in pre-trial phase of the case. In misdemeanour cases they adjudicate the case - this is an area of law in which mostly court secretaries deal with cases of first instance. In civil and labour cases they can make any decision that can be made without hearing the case. This practically means they assist the judges in pre-trial phase of the case. In administrative non-litigious cases they can make any decision that can be made without hearing the case. In company registry cases they can make every decision, as well in insolvency cases (with some exceptions).
• From 2012, the category "non-judge staff assisting judges" includes only staff directly assisting judges. • Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).

(2021): Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).

(2020): Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).

(2018): Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).

(2017): Other non-judge staff includes staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).

(2016): Other non-judge staff includes Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).

(2015): For the gender ratio we are only able to provide the total figures.

Other non-judge staff (5) includes Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts (3) and technical staff (4).

(2014): In 2014, the category "other" includes "staff in charge of different administrative tasks", "technical staff" and some of those judicial employees who in 2012 were counted as "non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges".

(2013): The methodology of presentation of data used in 2013 is different. Some of those judicial employees who in 2012 were included in the category "non-judge staff whose task is to assist judges" were taken into account in the category "other". The latter includes in 2013 the total number of "staff in charge of different administrative tasks" and "technical staff" because these numbers could not be separated within the national database.

(2012): Court secretaries are enabled to perform duties of judges in cases specifically defined by law. The increase of the number of Rechtspfleger was mainly due to the expanding scope of their authority according to the amended procedural codes. More administrative tasks and cases of lesser difficultiesare dealt with by Rechtspfleger.The category "non-judge staff assisting judges" includes in 2012 only staff directly assisting judges while in 2010, it encompassed other staff as well. In 2012, staff whose task does not consist in directly assisting judges was included in the item “other”.

Ireland

(General Comment): Staff numbers in the Irish Courts Service are computed on the basis of "Full-time equivalent" resources, requiring that staff numbers include decimal points, reflecting part-time, work-sharing and other reduced time working arrangements. As decimal points are not imputtable to this question in the data base, it has been necessary to round up or round down figures.

(2021): The discrepancies with previous data are explained by staffing fluctuations.

(2017): As concerns the increase observed in the number of female staff in charge of different administrative tasks, additional staff have been employed since the last reporting cycle.

(2016): With regard to the category "staff in charge of different administrative tasks", additional staff have been employed since the last reporting cycle.

(2015): Figures have rounded up or down to adjust for the fact that actual personnel resource numbers are calculated to decimal points to reflect employment of part of a full-time personnel resource (e.g. where work-sharing arrangements are in place).

(2013): The reduction in the number of Rechtspfleger since 2012 reflects in part the appointment of number of County Registrars falling within the Rechtspfleger category as Specialist Judges of the Circuit Court. There were also a number of vacant posts at the end of 2013.

Italy

(General Comment): The category “other non-judge staff” encompasses assistants, receptionists, porters and other judicial staff. As a general remark, it should be stressed that the high percentage of “other non-judge staff” in Italy is due to a very strict interpretation of the definition of the main categories. The specialized first instance courts that are not administered and financed by the Ministry of Justice (regional audit commissions, local tax commissions and military courts) are not taken into consideration at question 52.

(2021): The number of staff has increased due to the hiring of new personnel through public competition.

(2018): Since 2018, the figures have also included court staff belonging to Administrative Justice.

(2016): According to the data provided for 2014, 2015 and 2016, we can notice a downward trend as concerns the number of technical staff (a decrease of 28% between 2014 and 2015 and a decrease of 26% between 2015 and 2016), especially the number of female staff (a decrease of 33% between 2014 and 2015 and of 32% between 2015 and 2016). An explanation of these variations is not available at this stage.

(2015): 'Other non-judge staff' includes: assistants, receptionists, porters and other judicial staff.
The high percentage of “other non judge staff” in Italy is due to a very strict interpretation of the definition of the main categories.

Latvia

(2021): Other non-judge staff: Supreme Court - Division of case-law an research, Division of provision of regime of secrecy, Staff of secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary.
In general at the end of 2021, there were many vacancies for court staff for the first and second instance courts, therefore also there are differencies in the number of court staff. In the previous cycles, the numbers for court staff for the first and second instance courts were calculated a little bit different, there were included also vacancies.

(2020): The observed variations in the different categories are due to changes in court staff.
Other for Supreme Court - Division of case-law and research, Division of provision of regime of secrecy, Staff of the Secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary. Trainees are not included in the number provided of the non-judicial staff.

(2019): Other non - judge staff: Staff of the Division of case-law and research, Division of provision of regime of secrecy and Secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary, as well consultants (desk officers) of the Supreme Court of Latvia.
The overall discrepancies starts from 2018 due to court reform (Land Registry offices integrated in general jurisdiction courts and historically high turnover rate). The data between 2018 and 2019 are very similar.

(2018): Discrepancy due to court reform (Land Registry offices integrated in general jurisdiction courts and historically high turnover rate).

(2017): Other non-judge staff- this satff is for Supreme Court - Staff of Division of case-law and research staff, Division of provision of regime of secrecy staff, the Supreme Court of Latvia consultants and Secretariat of the Council for the Judiciary

Starting from 2015 till March, 2018 there were introduced court reform where the judicial map was revised. In the course of the court reform, several courts were merged, legally creating one larger court. On the other hand, in this new territory, the existing courts continue operating as the new body of the joint court, providing the opportunity for citizens to submit the documents at any place of the court. The court reform affected also the changes in the number of court staff, some positions were combined, some positions changed.

(2014): The category “other” includes employees from the Division of Provision of Secrecy Regime and the Supreme Court Division of Case-Law. The latter is a unit of the Supreme Court responsible for the compilation, analysis and publication of court opinions, as well as for summarizing, selecting, processing and publishing in the case-law database court rulings. For 2014, it also subsumes consultants of the Supreme Court.

(2013): The category “other” includes employees from the Division of Provision of Secrecy Regime and the Supreme Court Division of Case-Law. The latter is a unit of the Supreme Court responsible for the compilation, analysis and publication of court opinions, as well as for summarizing, selecting, processing and publishing in the case-law database court rulings.

(2012): The category “other” includes employees from the Division of Provision of Secrecy Regime and the Supreme Court Division of Case-Law. The latter is a unit of the Supreme Court responsible for the compilation, analysis and publication of court opinions, as well as for summarizing, selecting, processing and publishing in the case-law database court rulings.

Lithuania

(General Comment): The category “other” includes translators, court psychologists, it encompasses also other helping staff (civil servants and working under the labour agreement).

(2021): Psychologists and translators.

(2020): Other staff – translators and psychologists.
There is no such a position as trainee judges in the Lithuanian court system.

(2019): Other staff - translators and psychologists.

(2018): Other non-judge staff – translators and psichologists.

(2017): Other staff – translators and psychologists.

(2016): In 2015 the number of technical staff has decreased while at the same time the number of staff assisting judges has increased.

(2014): The National Courts Administration has never collected data on statistics of court personnel according to the gender. The data, which was provided in earlier evaluation cycles, was preliminary data, manually gathered.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): With regard to question 52, all non-judge staff is in charge of assisting judges (except at the administrative courts). Therefore, starting from 2017, we do no longer distinguish between staff in charge of administrative tasks and staff assisting judges. Only at the administrative courts there are few persons not assisting judges.

(2021): The category “other non-judge staff” refers to the “référendaires” and the data protection compliance officer of the administrative courts.
The number of “other non-judge staff” has increased by 125% in absolute terms, which corresponds in fact to an increase of 5 persons, representing 5 posts of “référendaires”. Judicial and administrative courts are making greater use of “référendaires” to relieve judges of certain tasks.

(2020): The other non-judicial staff consists of three legal secretaries and a data protection compliance officer from the administrative courts.

(2018): Regarding the category "other non-judge staff", it includes non-judge staff working for administrative courts. The increase of the non-judge staff is due to the fact that we no longer distinguish between the staff in charge of administrative tasks and the staff assisting the judges as court clerks, since all the non-judge staff is in charge of assisting the judges. We interpreted this differently in the previous years. Previously some of the staff was considered as not assisting the judges, because of their statute, this appeared as not correct since none of them is limited to administrative tasks, except at the administrative courts, where six persons are in charge of purely administrative tasks. The revised 2017 data shows an increase of the total non-judge staff assisting the judges of 9.95%.

(2017): With regard to question 52, all the non-judge staff is in charge to assist the judges (except at the administrative courts). Therefore for the year 2017, we did no longer distinguish between staff of administrative tasks and the staff assisting the judges. Only at the administrative courts are 6 persons not assisting the judges.

(2016): Last year the separation of the sections 1, 2 and 3 was not done correctly. This year this task was made by the parquet general RH office.

(2014): The overall administrative tasks concerning ordinary courts are centralized at the level of the Prosecutor General Office. The same applies to technical staff. Among the 192 non-judge staff assisting judges, 117 are women. The category "staff in charge of different administrative tasks" (3 women, 2 men) and the category "technical staff" (1) refer exclusively to the Administrative Court (which was not the case for 2012). The 2014 data reflects the administrative reality, the staff that cannot be categorized to one specific task being attached to the State Prosecutor General. The total remains stable; slight variations are due to temporary replacements. The category "other" does not subsume external staff hired on contractual basis, e.g. in IT matters (as in 2012).

(2013): The overall administrative tasks concerning ordinary courts are centralized at the level of the Prosecutor General Office. The same applies to technical staff. Among the 192 non-judge staff assisting judges, 117 are women. The category "staff in charge of different administrative tasks" (3 women and 2 men) and the category "technical staff" (1) refer exclusively to the Administrative Court staff. The 2013 data reflects the administrative reality, the staff that cannot be categorized to one specific task being attached to the State Prosecutor General. The total remains stable; slight variations are due to temporary replacements. The category "other" does not subsume any more external staff intervening on contractual basis, for example in IT matters.

(2012): Except for categories 1 ('Rechtspfleger') and 2 (non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges), all others carry on their work in the interest of the whole judicial system, that is to say, both for judges and prosecutors.

Malta

(2019): For Technical Staff: This is an issue of recruitment and given the change from a Department to an Agency, the Court Services will be issuing new calls in line with the requirements of the Agency.

(2018): Other non-judge staff include:
- Director Civil Courts and staff
- Director Criminal Court and staff
- Registry Criminal Court
- Chief Marshal
- Senior Marshal
- Marshals
- Judiciary Drivers
- Subasti Personnel

(2017): Other non-judge staff includes:
- Director Civil Courts and staff
- Director Criminal Court and staff
- Registry Criminal Court
- Chief Marshal
- Senior Marshal
- Marshals
- Judiciary Drivers
- Subasti staff

(2016): Other non-judge staff includes:
- Director Civil Courts and staff
- Director Criminal Court and staff
- Registry Criminal Court
- Chief Marshal
- Senior Marshal
- Marshals
- Judiciary Drivers
- Subasti staff

Concerning "Technical Staff", 2 technical staff were employed. Between 2014 and 2015, there was a decrease in the number of tradesman employed with the court administration.

(2015): In the 2015 data, the category 'Non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges' includes 13 Court Attorneys that have been introduced for the first time in October 2015. This staff is meant to assist the judges in the drafting of the sentences and other related matters. However the Court Attorneys are not autonomous and the responsibility for the sentences that they draft ultimately lies with the presiding judge.
The differences noted between 2014 and the previous regarding the categories "staff in charge of administrative tasks" and "other non-judge staff" is due to a change in the distribution. After 2014, some non-judge staff who were included in the category "staff in charge of administrative tasks" were integrated in "other non-judge staff".
The decrease between 2014 and 2015 in the number of "technical staff" is due to a decreases in the number of tradesman.

(2014): The differences noted between 2014 and the previous regarding the categories "staff in charge of administrative tasks" and "other non-judge staff" is due to a change in the distribution.

(2013): In 2013, the number of non-judge staff was detailed as follows: staff assisting judges – deputy registrars (67), court messengers (19), judicial assistants (30), clerical staff (141), ushers (25), senior court recorders (12), court recorder in charge (1), and Children's advocate (2); staff in charge of administrative tasks – Directorate Support Services (86), Directors and staff (12), Asset Management unit (3), Archives (3), one stop shop (7), Subasti (3), Library (1), Publications (3) technical staff – tradesmen (7), Bookbinder (1);
"other" – cleaners (8), Chief Marshal (1), Marshals (20). An exercise at beefing up the Court administration staff was undertaken by the Government in 2013, fas a result of which, the figures for different sub-categories have increased considerably.

(2012): In 2012, the number of non-judge staff was detailed as follows: staff assisting judges – deputy registrars (65), court messengers (19), judicial assistants (30), clerical staff (59), ushers (25), senior court recorders (12), court recorder in charge (1), and Children's advocate (2); staff in charge of administrative tasks – Directorate Support Services (83), Directors and staff (13), Asset Management unit (3), Archives (3), one stop shop (4), Subasti (2), Library (1), Publications (2); technical staff – tradesmen (7), Bookbinder (1); "other" – cleaners (7), Chief Marshal (1), Marshals (20).

Netherlands

(General Comment): Only the total of non-judge staff working in courts is available.

(2021): The Council of the Judiciary is not able to make a distinction between different types of non-judge staff working in courts, and thus, the entry is NA. The Supreme Court can make a distinction for the number of non-judge staff whose task is to assist the judges (fte = 110), and staff in charge of different administrative tasks (fte = 148). The first and second instance court cannot (total fte = 7395).

(2017): the number given is the number of people (posts), the fte is 6719; these can not be separated by gender or line in the table

(2016): Number of FTE = 6530.

(2015): FTE in 2015 is 6.497

(2014): The figure 7 287 pertains to persons; data in FTE is 6 495.

(2013): According to 2013 data, the figure 7.287 pertains to persons, data in fte is 6.495.

Poland

(2021): •Members of the Research and Analyses Office of the Supreme Court (Biuro Studiów i Analiz SN);
Data also includes staff from The Supreme Administrative court and The Supreme court of justice

(2020): probation officers, Specialists of Opinion Teams of Forensic Specialists
*the presented data does not include court assessors (trainee judges). The question should only indicate the number of court employees who are not judges. According to Article 2 § 1a of the Act of 27 July 2001. Law on the Common Court System (Journal of Laws of 2020, item 2072), in district courts, tasks related to the administration of justice are also performed by court assessors/trainee judges, with the exception of:
1) applying temporary detention in pre-trial proceedings in relation to a detainee handed over to the court's disposal together with a request to apply temporary detention;
2) examining complaints against decisions on refusal to initiate an investigation or enquiry, decisions to discontinue an investigation or enquiry and decisions to discontinue an enquiry and on decisions to discontinue an investigation and enter the case in the register of crimes
3) deciding family and juvenile cases.
Since in the remaining scope court assessors perform tasks related to the administration of justice - just like judges - they should be deemed to belong to the professional group of judges. At the same time I would like to inform you that as at 31 December 2020 there were 486 trainee judges employed in district courts, including 317 women and 169 men. 1. number of rechtspflegers of 16 voivodeship administrative courts included (males 23, females 34);
2-4. - In 2020 data include also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court;

(2019): - professional probation officers;
- employed in Consultative Team of Judical Specialist

(2018): Other non-judge staff:
- professional probation officers
- employed in Consultative Team of Judical Specialists

(2017): Other non-judge staff -5790
of which:
Professional probation officers - 5188
Employed in Consultative Team of Judicial Specialists - 602.

(2016): Other non-judge staff - 5859
of which:
Professional probation officers - 5212
Employed in Consultative Team of Judical Specialists - 647.

Portugal

(General Comment): The variations in the number of non-judge staff over the different evaluation cycles seem high due to the small numbers.

(2020): 52-3-In absolute terms, the increase between 2018 and 2020 in the category "Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts" for women is from 94 to 104. Since we are dealing with small absolute values, the identified variation, despite not representing a significant difference in absolute terms, acquires a more relevant expression in terms of relative variation.
52-4- We confirm the increase in the number of "technical staff" in the courts between 2018 and 2020. No specific explanation.

(2019): In 2019, as in previous years there was no other non-judge staff.

(2018): In 2018, as in 2017 there were no other non-judge staff.

(2017): "other non judge staff" - this category includes all staff with a non-specified category or non-specific functions. As this is a residual category, the numbers tend to be small.

(2014): The decrease in the number of staff in charge of administrative tasks is due to retirements that have not been replaced and to the continuous IT modernization.

(2013): The number of judicial staff is decreasing on account of retirements that have been occurring since 2010. In addition, due to the reform of the Public Administration that is taking place since 2009 and the financial constraints of the past few years, the number of public servants has decreased.

Romania

(General Comment): The number indicated for the category “non-judge staff assisting judges” encompasses clerks with judicial tasks; the number indicated for “staff in charge of administrative tasks” concerns registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants; the number indicated for “technical staff” includes IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel (drivers, ushers, procedural agents etc.). The category “other” subsumes assistance magistrates, judicial assistants and probation counselors. o Assistance magistrates work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice. They participate in the trial sessions, have a consultative vote in deliberations and write the minutes of the sessions, as well as the decisions. o Judicial assistants work only within tribunals and are part, together with the judges, of the panels which judge, in first instance, cases regarding labor and social insurances litigations (the panel is composed of 1 judge and 2 judicial assistants; the latter participate in the deliberations with a consultative vote and sign the decisions). o The probation counselors have, in principle, the following attributions: support the activity of judges by elaborating certain evaluation documents in criminal cases with juvenile offenders; support the activity of the judge delegated with enforcing decisions in criminal matters; cooperate with public institutions in order to execute the measure to force a minor to carry out an unpaid activity in an institution of public interest; initiate and carry on special programs of social reinsertion for persons convicted to prison and for minors who committed offences provided by the criminal law; carry out, at request, activities of individual counseling of offenders, with regard to the social, group and individual behavior; initiate and carry out special programmes of protection, social and judicial assistance of minors and youngsters who committed offences.

(2021): 6.665 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 170 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1.701 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 38 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1.723 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (–100 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).
Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (1055): a higher percentage of occupation of vacant positions.
Assistance magistrates: 130 Judicial assistants: 176 Probation counselors: 749

(2019): 6437 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 169 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1646 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 16 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1750 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents..... (– 6 IT staff works only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).
Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (867):
Assistance magistrates: 116 Judicial assistants: 177 Probation counselors: 574

(2018): 6402 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 163 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1645 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 17 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1772 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (–101 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).
Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (843):
Assistance magistrates: 110 Judicial assistants: 176 Probation counselors: 557

(2017): Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (852): Assistance magistrates: 112 Judicial assistants: 176 Probation counselors: 564
The increase observed in the category "other" between 2016 and 2017 is explained by the employment of the respective number of probation counselors.

(2016): 6191 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 165 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1621 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 9 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1822 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (– 109 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).
Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts (663):
Assistance magistrates: 113 Judicial assistants: 173 Probation counselors: 377

(2015): 6149 represents the number of clerks with judicial tasks (- 149 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1615 - the number of registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (– 9 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1844 - number of IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (– 109 work only within the High Court of Cassation and Justice).

Other categories of personnel which function within the Romanian courts: Assistance magistrates: 115 ; Judicial assistants: 176 ; Probation counselors: 352

(2014): In 2014, there were 6072 clerks with judicial tasks (153 within the High Court of Cassation and Justice); 1585 registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants (9 within the HCCJ); 1854 IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel / drivers, ushers, procedural agents (96 within the HCCJ). The category “other” subsumes 101 Assistance magistrates, 175 Judicial assistants and 360 Probation counselors.

(2013): In 2013, there were 5743 clerks with judicial tasks; 1563 registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants; 1784 IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel (drivers, ushers, procedural agents). The category “other” subsumes 92 Assistance magistrates, 176 Judicial assistants and 281 Probation counselors.

(2012): In 2012, there were 5489 clerks with judicial tasks; 1486 registering clerks, documentary clerks, statistician clerks, archivist clerks and public servants; 1762 IT staff, contractual personnel and other personnel (drivers, ushers, procedural agents). The category “other” subsumes 90 Assistance magistrates; 175 Judicial assistants; 281 Probation counselors.

Slovak Republic

(2021): The number of technical staff is included in category 3 (staff in charge of administrative tasks).
The position in line 2. is not atractive for males.

(2020): The number of technical staff and other non-judge staff are included in category 3 (staff in charge of administrative tasks)

(2018): See general comment.
There are no special explanation related to discrepancies in gender composition of court staff

(2017): The slight increase in the number of male non-judge staff originates at the Supreme court of the Slovak republic. The position of the "Judicial assistant" has been established and filled. The assistant helps the judge with legal research, drafting of decisions etc. Out of 86 assistants there are 29 male.

(2014): In 2014, the category “Rechtspfleger” subsumes 967 higher judicial officers and 63 mediation and probation officers. The category “staff assisting judges” includes assistants of judges and court secretaries. The category “staff in charge of different administrative tasks” encompasses court staff responsible for court administration, contact with the public (information centre, filing office), archives and technical staff. It was not possible to extract the accurate number of “technical staff” and “other non-judge staff” from the overall data on “staff in charge of different administrative tasks”.

(2013): In 2013, the category “Rechtspfleger” includes 975 judicial officers, 45 legal assistants at the Supreme Court and 63 mediation and probation officers. The category “non-judge staff assisting judges” includes 1348 assistants and 752 judicial secretaries. The rest of the non-judge staff is subsumed in the category “other”. In 2011 and 2012, the Ministry of Justice decided to increase the total number of the judicial officers with the intention to improve the disposition of certain court agendas.

(2012): In 2012, the category “Rechtspfleger” includes 982 judicial officers and 64 mediation and probation officers. It was not possible to extract the accurate number of “technical staff” and “other non-judge staff” from the overall data on “staff in charge of different administrative tasks”.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The definitions of categories are as follows:
1. “Rechtspfleger” category includes only the staff (judicial assistants and judicial advisers) with autonomous competence to adopt final decisions (decisions on the merits of the case), set explicitly in procedural laws - currently the Claim Enforcement and Security Act, the Financial Operations, Insolvency Proceedings and Compulsory Windingup Act, the Court Register of Legal Entities Act and the Land Register Act.
2. “Non-judge staff” category includes staff, whose tasks are generally set by the Courts Act. These are judicial assistants (filing applications and statements by parties for the record and, by order of a judge, perform less demanding tasks related to preparation for trial proceedings or other procedural acts, making calculations of costs, preparing drafts of decisions and performing other tasks in judicial proceedings under the orders of a judge), judicial advisers (performing work connected with the examination of parties, witnesses and experts (outside the main hearings), performing more complex preparatory work for hearings, reporting at panel meetings, drafting decisions, conducting hearings under the guidance of a judge and performing other work by order of a judge) and judicial trainees (typically do not perform significant amount of work as their role is to learn; however they can participate in hearings and drafting of court decisions in some cases).
3. All the other staff, not mentioned above and not corresponding to 4. “Technical staff” is included in 3. “Administrative staff”. The latter includes, along with the court management staff, the office support staff, whose tasks are not specifically set by the law and include case registering, administrative case preparation, court fees, typing and/or recording of court sessions etc.

(2021): Approx. 3% of all court staff (115 persons) are judicial trainees (reported under “2. Non-judge (judicial staff”).

(2020): Approx. 3% of all court staff (109 persons) are judicial trainees (counted under “2. Non-judge (judicial staff”).
No particular explanation can be given regarding the increase in the number of “3. Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts” / Males.

(2017): Differences with previous evaluation cycles within categories (including male/female ratio):
The number of court staff is reported according to the actual work tasks of the staff. Between years, court staff can be assigned to different departments and tasks and therefore the variation of Rechtspfleger/Non-judge/Administrative staff categories and male/female ratio within categories can change, even though no major hiring or letting go for different categories of court staff had occurred. The relative differences in the Technical staff category are due to the small (absolute) number of staff.

(2016): Differences with previous evaluation cycles within categories (including male/female ratio):
The number of court staff is reported according to the actual work tasks of the staff. Between years, court staff can be assigned to different departments and tasks and therefore the variation of Rechtspfleger/Non-judge/Administrative staff categories and male/female ratio within categories can change, even though no major hiring or letting go for different categories of court staff had occurred. The relative differences in the Technical staff category are due to the small (absolute) number of staff.

(2015): The difference between 2014 and 2015 data is due to the methodology of gathering the data. In this cycle, all the courts were asked to provide the additional data to assure the accuracy of the answer. The reporting method was further improved and some adjustments were made according to the definition of “Rechtspfleger”, “Non-judge staff” and „Administrative staff“ categories.

(2014): In courts, there were 14,55 % of males and 85,45 % of females (judges included) on 31. 12. 2014. In this cycle the reporting method was further improved. The Supreme Court's strategic orientation according to this matter is to decrease the number of judges, while increasing the number of non-judge staff. The Supreme Court can, in order to ensure timeliness of proceedings, distribute additional finances for temporary employment of additional staff to individual courts.

(2013): The category 1 - "Rechtspfleger" includes court clerks, independent and higher judicial advisors in the field of commercial (court) register, land register and civil enforcement procedure, as they have the competence to decide on certain cases, judicial advisers in the field of civil enforcement, who have even slightly broader competences than judicial assistants. The category 2 includes judicial advisers and the remaining judicial assistants. The category 3 includes administrative support to the judge and court management – court director, human resources office, financing-accounting office. The category 4 refers to cleaning, security, system administration, drivers, etc.

(2012): In 2012, the category 1 - "Rechtspfleger" includes court clerks; the category 2 includes judicial advisers. The other court staff was not further categorised.

Spain

(General Comment): The Spanish judicial system distinguishes between three categories of non-judicial staff: Gestión Procesal, Tramitación Procesal and Auxilio Judicial. These bodies have their competences regulated at article 475 and other of the Organic Law of the Judiciary, it is very difficult to distribute them in the previous points of the question because the three groups have functions to assist Judges, make administrative tasks and have technical tasks. The sum of these bodies, destinated to Courts, is the response to Q.52.5 'Other non judge staff'.

(2021): The sum of the bodies [Gestor Procesal, Tramitador Procesal and Auxilio Judicial] destinated to Courts:44651
In adition to that, there are 1147 Forensic Doctors.

(2020): The sum of the bodies [Gestor Procesal, Tramitador Procesal and Auxilio Judicial] destinated to Courts:44289
In adition to that, there are 1144 Forensic Doctors.
Regarding the distribution males / females: This distribution can only be given from the Autonomous Regions of the direct competence of the Ministry of Justice (5 out of 17). In these Autonomoues Regions the proportion of females within the civil servants in Courts is 71'76% (therefore, 28'23% of males). This proportion is possibly applicable to the whole national system.

(2019): The data indicated in the chart as 'other non judge staff' (43556) includes the three kinds of civil servants that work in Courts (Gestión procesal, Tramitación procesal, Auxilio judicial). In addition to that, there are other 1122 Forensic Doctors.

(2018): 1121 Forensic Doctors

(2017): The figure for other non judge staff includes judicial civil servants who are in charge of the processing of files, communication acts, and other tasks, and are distributed in three categories (called Auxilio Judicial,Tramitación Procesal, Gestión Procesal). Forensic Doctors are a special body (not included in the figure provided in this question). Their total number (Forensic Doctors) at 4 April 2018 is 1003.
For 2017, in contrast with previous cycles, data on number of “other non-judge staff” excludes the civil servants that work in Prosecution Offices.

(2016): The figure for other non judge staff includes judicial civil servants who are in charge of the processing of files, communication acts, and other tasks, and are distributed in three categories (called Auxilio Judicial, Tramitación Procesal, Gestión Procesal). Forensic Doctors are a special body (not included in the figure provided in this question). Their total number (Forensic Doctors) at 4 April 2018 is 1003.

(2014): In 2014, there are 44 896 other non-judge staff (judicial clerks) and 3 667 judicial counsellors (this is the new name for the secretario judiciales since October 1st).

Question 052-1

Belgium

(2021): Source: Directorate P&O - HR Department Judicial staff - Directorate General Judicial Organisation, Federal Public Service Justice (FPS Justice)

(2020): Source: HR Service Judicial Personnel-Directorate General Judicial Organization, FPS Justice

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The regional courts in Bulgaria are first and second instance so this is a problem when giving data according to CEPEJ criteria, so this can explain the discrepancies here.
Item 1 "Total non-judge staff working in courts at first instance" includes staff from district and administrative courts. Item 2 "Total non-judge staff working in courts at second instance (court of appeal) level" includes staff from regional and appellate courts although in some types of cases the regional court is first instance.

(2021): 2. "Total non-judge staff working in courts at second instance": the increased number is due to newly opened vacancies for non-judge staff in view of strengthening the courts' activities.

(2020): This answer 5 204 - item 1 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of first instance" includes all employees of the district, regional and administrative courts, although in some types of cases the regional court is the second instance. The number 716 - item 2 "Total number of court employees working in the courts of second instance (appellate court)" includes all employees working in the courts of appeal in the country.

Cyprus

(2021): Positions that were vacant had been filled.

(2020): Cyprus has a two-tier system, therefore the Supreme Court is the second, highest and final instance court. The data for Supreme Court in this question are included in the highest instance courts, but the case flow data of the Supreme Court are included in the second instance cases - questions 97 and 98.

(2018): The Court of Appeal is also the Supreme Court

Denmark

(2020): -

France

(2021): It has not been possible to exclude the legal assistants and specialised assistants working for the public prosecution services for the breakdown of the data provided in the table above (359 in total for the First instance courts, Courts of appeal and Supreme courts, at national level). Also included in these numbers are the 'justice de proximité' contract staff whose recruitment has been authorised from 2020 onwards on the basis of the project contract (see comment of Q52). On the other hand, staff working in the SAR are excluded (contrary to Q52), i.e. 1 766 staff.
Source DSJ

Germany

(2021): Unlike in the case of judges (question 46), non-judge staff are not allocated to individual instances in the staff-assignment statistics of the Länder.

(2020): Unlike in the case of judges (question 46), non-judge staff are not allocated to individual instances in the staff-assignment statistics of the Länder.

(2018): Differentiating non-judge staff at first and second instance level based on their gender is not possible since the ordinary court system in Germany consists of three instances (local courts, regional courts and higher regional courts). At the same time, regional courts function as a court of appeal on fact and law but can also hear cases at first instance. Unlike in the case of judges (question 46), non-judge staff are not allocated to individual instances.

Greece

(2021): At the highest level there is the Court of auditors, whose judicial officials have been included above, the total number of them is 637 and consists of 219 men and 418 women. The above data were provided by the Directorate of judicial officials with the cooperation of Juststat of the Ministry.

(2020): The above figures include civil servants, permanent and those with a private law relationship of indefinite duration

Ireland

(2021): The discrepancies with previous data are explained by staffing fluctuations.

(2020): The total non-Judge staff working in the courts includes staff of the Office of the CEO, Corporate Services staff, Strategy and Reform staff, ICT staff, Regions & C&D Operations, Superior Court Operations staff, as well as quasi-judicial and technical staff. These staff members work throughout the system, and not just in one of the district, circuit, high or supreme courts.

(2018): Question 52 - 1 was answered to provide a breakdown of staff working as registrars and in offices and other support staff in those offices. The reason the figures would not add up to the total is because the figures exclude administrative staff who are employed by the Courts Service in administrative areas away from front line offices, and who cannot be distributed between instances. The wording in the column for the total of such staff (1049) was given on the basis that this column used the same wording as the previous table which presumably covered all Courts Service staff.

Italy

(2018): Since 2018, the figures have also included court staff belonging to Administrative Justice.

Latvia

(2021): In general, at the end of 2021, there were many vacancies for court staff for the first and second instance courts, therefore also there are differences in the number of court staff. In the previous cycles, the numbers for court staff for the first and second instance courts were calculated a little bit different, there were included also vacancies.

(2018): Discrepancy due to court reform (Land Registry offices integrated in general jurisdiction courts and historically high turnover rate)

Luxembourg

(2021): The 27% increase in the number of second instance non-judge staff is explained in particular by the hiring of additional “référendaires”. At the Supreme Court, the number of non-judge female staff decreased by 50% in relative terms; in absolute terms, this corresponds to one woman being replaced by a male member of staff.

Malta

(2020): It is not possible to differentiate the non-judge staff according to these criteria.

(2018): It is not possible, at the moment, to differentiate the staff working at first instance from that working at second instance.

Netherlands

(2021): Comments from the SC:
1.Note that the above also includes the judicial and other staff working for the office of the Procurator General and Advocates General at the Dutch Supreme Court (who are not part of the Dutch public prosecution office).
2.Note that the Dutch Supreme Court has outsourced various tasks such as building maintenance, technical services, facility management, reception, security, cleaning and catering. The individuals performing these services are therefore not included in the numbers above.

(2018): The total of non-judge staff does not include staff of the High Court.

Poland

(2020): Data from the supreme court's human resources Department.
In 2020 data include also employees of the Supreme Administrative Court

Portugal

(2020): We confirm the increase in 2020 in the category of non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level in the Supreme Court of Justice and the Supreme Administrative Court, with a special focus on the administrative and tax courts.

(2018): Since 2016 there has been an increase of non-judge staff to meet the needs of additional staff. There were no legislative or other changes that could directly justify the increase.

Romania

(2021): A higher percentage of occupation of vacant positions for total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level.

(2020): 3. Total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level-
The difference between 2018 (comunicated data) and 2020 is pointedly given by the difference in the methodology for reporting data within the human resources sector. Thus, for 2018, in the total number of auxiliary staff (non-judge staff working at Supreme Court level) was not included the number of staff represented by ushers, procedural agents, drivers. Also, rechecking the communicated data for 2018 on this point (point. 3), it is confirmed that the total number of auxiliary staff (occupied positions) at the High Court of Cassation and Justice is 230 (2018 data, including the staff represented by the professional categories mentioned above).

Slovak Republic

(2021): Total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Administrative Court level - 59 total; 18 males and 41 females, included in line 3.. Some of the staff moved to the Supreme Administrative Court and some left the judicial system.

(2018): All data were provided by the central institution for the court management, The Department of Human Resources Development of the Ministry of Justice

Slovenia

(General Comment): Besides profiles typically working in courts, the non-judge staff at the Supreme court includes also staff at the Centre for Informatics (see Q62-1) – approx. 20 employees, mostly system administrators/engineers (counted at Q52 under “4. Technical staff”) and project managers (counted at Q52 as “3. Administrative staff”).

(2020): No particular explanation can be given regarding the increase in the number of “3. Total non-judge staff working in courts at Supreme Court level” / Males.

Spain

(2018): These figures include the number of "letrados de Administración de Justicia", which are the CEPEJ equivalent of "Rechtspfleger".

Question 055

Austria

(General Comment): Data is presented in full time equivalent.

(2014): The numerical values provided in the table are rounded. The accurate figures are: total – 344,83 (171,52 males and 173,31 females); prosecutors at first instance level – 308,69 (147,13 males and 161,56 females); prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level – 20,94 (13,04 males and 7,90 females); prosecutors at Supreme Court level – 15,20 (11,35 males and 3,85 females).

(2012): In 2012, the various tasks were more exactly assigned to the number of full time equivalents - dealing with tasks of the prosecution on the one hand and the administrative tasks on the other hand.

Belgium

(2021): Source: FPS Justice - Directorate General for the Judiciary, HR Department of the Judiciary, Notaries and Enforcement agents

(2020): Support Service of the College of Public Prosecutors

(2014): In 2014, the number of professional prosecutors includes the heads of division of the 15 public prosecutors' offices and the heads of the 8 prosecution offices within labour courts.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The provided data refers to the actual number of employed persons for the year of reference.

(2016): 1511 is the total number of working prosecutors at 31.12.2016; 888 prosecutors at first instance level includes – the prosecutors from 113 Regional Prosecutor`s Offices and 1 Specialized Prosecotr`s Office; 500 prosecutors work in 28 District Prosecutor`s Offices, 7 Appelate Prosecutor`s Offices and 3 Military District Prosecutor`s Offices; 123 are the prosecutors working in Supreme Prosecutor`s Office of Cassation and Supreme Administrative Prosecutor`s Office and 1 Prosecutor General. (The indicated numbers do not include the number of the investigative magistrates in the investigative departments at District Prosecutor`s Offices and National Investigation Service and their administrative heads.

(2014): For 2014, the number of prosecutors acting at 1st instance includes prosecutors of the regional prosecutor's offices, specialized prosecutor's offices and the military prosecutor's offices. The number of prosecutors acting at 2nd instance includes prosecutors from district and appellate prosecutor's offices. The number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level includes prosecutors from the Supreme Prosecutor's Office of Cassation, Supreme Administrative Public Prosecutor's Office, and the Prosecutor GeneralIn contrast with the 2012 evaluation, the number of investigators in the District Investigation Departments at the District Prosecutor's Offices and the National Investigation Service is not taken into consideration for 2014.

(2012): For 2012, the total includes 512 magistrates with position of "investigator in the Investigation Department at the District Prosecution Office". Conversely, these 512 magistrates are not subsumed in the number of prosecutors at 1st instance level. The number of prosecutors at 2nd instance level including Prosecutor's Office of Appeal and Military District Prosecutor's Office encompasses 451 prosecutors and 433 investigators in the Investigation Departments at the District Prosecution Offices and military investigators. The number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level includes 128 prosecutors and 79 investigators at the National Investigation Service.

Croatia

(General Comment): The provided data encompasses all officials in the public prosecutors' offices, including heads of the public prosecutors' offices (the Public Prosecutor of the Republic of Croatia, county and municipal public prosecutors, the head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime) and all public prosecutors deputies. The number of prosecutors at the first instance level includes all municipal public prosecutors, their deputies, as well as the head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime and his deputies. The number of prosecutors at the second instance (court of appeal) level includes all county public prosecutors and their deputies. The number of prosecutors at the Supreme Court level includes the Public Prosecutor and his deputies.

(2018): The above information includes all officials in the public prosecutor's offices – all public prosecutors (heads of prosecution offices) and public prosecutors' deputies (deputies of the Public Prosecutor, deputies of the Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime and deputies of the county and municipal public prosecutors).
The number of prosecutors at the first instance level includes all municipal public prosecutors (heads of municipal prosecution offices and Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime), their deputies, as well as the deputies of the Head of the Bureau for Combating Corruption and Organised Crime. The number of prosecutors at the second instance level (court of appeal) includes all county public prosecutors (heads of the county prosecutors' offices) and their deputies. The number of prosecutors at the supreme court level includes the Public Prosecutor General and his deputies.

(2012): In 2012, the public prosecutors' Office of the Republic of Croatia employed 21 officials. The county public prosecutors' offices employed 155 officials, and the municipal public prosecutors' offices employed 410 officials. Out of 617 officials, 385 or 62.4% were women. The number of officials remained the same as in 2011. As of 31 December 2012, 7 public prosecutor's posts and 130 deputy public prosecutor's posts were vacant.

Cyprus

(2020): The number includes also legal advisors to the Attorney General's office.
The number increased because more positions of prosecutors were approved.

(2014): All prosecutors appear before all courts.

Czech Republic

(General Comment): The Czech Republic is endowed with a system of 4 levels of State prosecution offices: district, regional, high and supreme. The number of high public prosecutors is included in the number of prosecutors at second instance level.

Denmark

(General Comment): The public prosecutors are the Director of Public Prosecutions, the state prosecutors, the police directors as well as the persons who are assumed to assist them in the judicial processing of criminal cases.
Organizationally, the Prosecution Service consists of the Director of Public Prosecutions and state prosecutor's offices (central prosecution service) with associated police districts (local prosecution service).
The Director of Public Prosecutions and selected employees appear before the Supreme Court. At the end of 2021, 58 prosecutors were employed at the Director of Public Prosecutions office. 6 of them appear before the Supreme Court. The Director of Public Prosecutions is superior to the other public prosecutors and supervises them and handles complaints about decisions made by the state prosecutors office as the first instance. The state prosecutors' offices appear before the high courts (second instance – court of appeal). The state prosecutors supervise the police directors' handling of criminal cases and handle complaints about decisions made by the police directors regarding criminal prosecution.
The directors of police and the public prosecutors who are employed by them appear before the district courts.
The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire. This is why the total number of prosecutors does not add up when compared to the number of males and females.

(2021): The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire. This is why the total number of prosecutors does not add up when compared to the number of males and females.

(2016): The observed discrepancies are due to ordinary changes in staffing.

(2014): The variations over the period 2012-2014 are due to the fact that in 2012, information was missing about prosecutors engaged in tasks concerning administrative cases (Ledelsessekretatiat) and prosecutors employed by the national police (Rigspolitiet).

Estonia

(General Comment): The categorization of questions 55 and 56 regarding public prosecutors do not exist in Estonia.

Finland

(General Comment): The National Prosecution Authority comprises the Office of the Prosecutor General that acts as the general administrative unit, and five prosecution districts: Southern Finland, Western Finland, Northern Finland, Eastern Finland and Åland. The National Prosecution Authority has 34 offices around Finland. The Prosecutor General is the supreme prosecutor and the head of the prosecution service. The Prosecutor General directs and develops prosecutorial activity by issuing general instructions and guidelines to the prosecutors. She/he also appoints district prosecutors. The Prosecutor General may take over a case from a prosecutor, but cannot order a prosecutor to decide the case in any given manner. She/he can also self-decide on the bringing of charges and designate a prosecutor to pursue the case in the courts. The Deputy Prosecutor General decides the matters in his/her competence on the same authority as the Prosecutor General. He/she also acts as a deputy for the Prosecutor General when necessary. For regular prosecutorial tasks, the Office of the Prosecutor General has state prosecutors whose jurisdiction covers the entire country. Most criminal matters (89 256 cases annually) are dealt with by the prosecution areas. The Office of the Prosecutor General deals mainly with criminal cases with wider significance to society as a whole, a few dozen every year. Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances, and every prosecutor is expected to, in a normal situation, to handle and prosecute the criminal case all the way to the Supreme Court, if needed.

(2020): Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

France

(2021): Data taken from an extraction of the LOLFI SIRH - Number of public prosecutors on 31/12/2021. The values are expressed in FTEs.
Source DSJ
The data have been rounded upwards from 0.5 and downwards below, with the exception of the data relating to the number of male prosecutors at the Courts of appeal (the exact figure is 249.6) in order to ensure vertical consistency.

(2020): Only the judicial order is concerned

(2014): For 2014, State prosecutors, heads of public prosecution services, are included.

(2012): For 2012, only prosecutors of courts of law appointed by 31 December 2012 were counted.

Germany

(General Comment): The information relates to the number of job shares for public prosecutors. There are no absolute figures for the number of persons. The information on the job shares count a judge working full-time as 1. A judge working part-time is counted as the fraction of 1 which corresponds to the proportion of his/her working hours to full-time (e.g. 0.5 for a judge working half the usual number of hours).

(2021): Figures represent full-time equivalents as of 31. December 2021
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
It should be noted that one of goals of the ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’ is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

(2020): Figures represent full-time equivalents as of 31. December 2020
"Pact for the Rule of Law" (Pakt für den Rechtsstaat):
The federal level and the Länder on 31 January 2019 agreed on a ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’. The pact foresees additional funding of EUR 220 million from the federal level for the Länder to create 2000 additional posts for judges and prosecutors, including the necessary administrative staff by 31 December 2021. In addition, the federal level is creating 24 additional posts at the Federal Court of Justice and 71 posts at the Prosecutor General of the Federal Court of Justice. New posts that were created after the beginning of 2017 are included into the count.
A joint report by the Federal Government and the Länder on the state of implementation of the pact was presented on 10 June 2021. The report concluded that the implementation has well progressed, noting in particular that over 2 700 post for judges and prosecutors have been created so far, with 2 500 being filled.
It should be noted that one of goals of the ‘Pact for the Rule of Law’ is to address the challenges related to the upcoming wave of retirements of judges and public prosecutors.

(2016): Figures indicate the number of full-time equivalent staff (not the number of individuals). A prosecutor working full hours is counted as a full-time equivalent (i.e. 1). A prosecutor working part-time is counted as a fraction of 1. This fraction corresponds to the number of hours worked in relation to a full-time equivalent (e.g. 0.5 for a prosecutor working half the usual number of hours).

Greece

(General Comment): In the position of Paredron of the court of First Instance and prosecutor's office Of civil and criminal courts are appointed graduates of the National School of judges, according to what is defined in Article 36 of N. 4871/2021 (a' 246). The graduates from the directions of civil-criminal judges and prosecutors of the National School of judges are appointed in the order which have in the relevant tables and are placed preferably, respectively, in the courts of First Instance and in Public Prosecutors ' Offices In Athens, Piraeus, Thessaloniki, Patras, Heraklion and Larissa. The paredroi of First Instance and the prosecutor's office have ten (10) months trial service, during of which they have all the rights and obligations of the ordinary judicial officer and inspected, like regular judges. The reports of the paredroi of the court of First Instance on performance, statistics of their performance and any other useful information or information on the performance or their suitability are stored in a specialist individual file, which, after the end of the trial service the file is submitted to the Supreme Court Council through the Minister of Justice.

(2021): The above data are given by the Directorate of organization and operation of Justice with the cooperation of JUSTSTAT.

(2020): Positions by law have increased.Gender data are not kept.

Hungary

(2021): On 31 December 2021, two prosecutors were serving in the Ministry of Justice, on a temporary basis. They are included in the total number of prosecutors; however, they are not taken into account when giving the number of prosecutors serving at different instances (court levels). All prosecutors are appointed to a full-time job; however, it occurs that some prosecutors perform part-time service on a temporary basis for various reasons, such as raising children.
The 'number of prosecutors at first instance level' is an aggregate of the number of prosecutors serving at district-level prosecution services and other prosecution services equivalent to that level, as well as the number of prosecutors serving at high prosecution services. A part of the prosecutors serving at high prosecution services proceed also at second instance (high court) level. The number of prosecutors serving at high prosecution services is 520 (226 males, 294 females), while the number of prosecutors serving at district-level prosecution services (other prosecution services equivalent to that level) is 1210 (439 males, 771 females).
The 'number of prosecutors at second instance (court of appeal) level' means the number of prosecutors serving at appellate prosecution services.

(2016): Another 9 prosecutors were temporarily serving in the Ministry of Justice. They are included in the total number of prosecutors, but we did not take them into account at each level.

Ireland

(General Comment): Allocation of prosecutors work is not in all instances divided as per the questions above. The sub-categories at 1, 2 and 3 of the question posed do not apply in the Irish system.

(2020): Our court going staff number at the 31st December 2020 is 128 - (50 male / 78 female). This figure includes our Prosecutors and Technical staff - Legal Executive. It also includes 1 Trainee Solicitor. In our Office our Technical Staff and Trainee Solicitors are court going staff and manage the running of a prosecution at trial in the same manner as some of our Prosecutors. In relation to the increase in staff resources for the ODPP, and the context for same, please see the forewords of our Annual Report 2020 and our Annual Report 2019 available at https://www.dppireland.ie/publication-category/annual-reports/.

(2018): There were 108.7 fulltime equivalent lawyers (fte) (headcount 111) on the payroll of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at 31 December 2018 – 65.6 fte (67 headcount) of these were female and 43.1 fte (44 headcount) were male.

(2016): Of the staff complement in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at the end of the reference year, 102 were of professional or technical grade at Prosecutor equivalent level or above.

(2014): Parts' of Full Time Equivalents were counted in decimal figures and have been rounded up. The total represents the number of qualified Solicitors and Barristers employed directly in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). A proportion of these lawyers represent the DPP in the District Court. Members of the police force also prosecute in this court within a prescribed 'delegated authority' from the DPP. Members of the independent Bar act on behalf of the DPP, on a self-employed basis, in first instance and appellate courts. There are a further 32 State Solicitors contracted to provide a solicitor service to the DPP in cases heard outside of the capital.

Italy

(2016): There is no specific explanation concerning the increase in the total number of prosecutors at Supreme Court level. However, numbers are small and therefore percentage changes vary more harshly.

Latvia

(2020): The increase in the number of prosecutors in court district level prosecutor's offices is related to the imposition of an obligation on the prosecutor of the court district level prosecutor's office, and not on the chief prosecutor of the district (city) prosecutor's office to perform the duties of a higher prosecutor.
Regarding the decrease in the number of women working in the Prosecutor General's Office, it must be concluded that in total the number of women working has decreased by 8 persons. One of the reasons could be reaching the maximum age for performing the duties prescribed by law or the death of a person.

(2012): During 2011 and 2012, prosecutors' offices increased the number of posts which resulted in the appointment of new prosecutors. In order to decide on the promotion of prosecutors, their professional qualification has been evaluated and their quality of work performance analysed, as well as their participation in trainings, work statistical indicators, etc. Pursuant to the collected data, more male prosecutors have been promoted to higher posts.

Lithuania

(2020): After the reorganization of the prosecution service in 2011, 5 second instance prosecutors' offices were merged with 51 separate first instance prosecutor's office in their area of operation, and thus 5 regional first-second instance prosecutor's offices were established.

(2014): In 2012, the 56 territorial prosecutor's offices have been reorganised into 5 regional prosecutor's offices with 10 district prosecutor's offices functioning inside them (first instance and second instance levels have been combined). Currently, only two instances exist.

(2012): In 2012, after reorganization of the prosecution service, the first and the second instances have merged. Currently, two instances exist instead of three. Besides, the total number of prosecutors has decreased because some prosecutors have left the service, but no new prosecutors have been recruited.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The figure in point 3 includes both second instance and Supreme Court prosecutors, as they are grouped together in the Superior Court of Justice, which is subdivided into the Court of Appeal and the Court of Cassation.

(2018): Le personnel des juridictions judiciaires et administratives a connu une croissance soutenue ces dernières années, tel que prévu par la loi modifiée du 7 mars 1980 sur l'organisation judiciaire. Ceci explique les variations importantes observées entre 2016 et 2018 au niveau du personnel de la magistrature et du personnel non-juge. Les magistrats appartenant à la cellule de renseignement financier (CRF) sont dorénavant exclus de la question 55.1 (suite au détachement de la CRF du Parquet de Luxembourg) puisqu'ils n'exercent plus de fonction juridictionnelle proprement dite. Au total, la CRF compte 4 magistrats et un attaché de justice en 2018. L'effectif du Parquet d'arrondissement reste toutefois inchangé suite à la création des nouveaux postes affectés à la CRF
Les magistrats du pool de complément sont inclus dans les chiffres de la question 55.3.

(2016): The number of prosecutors indicated here as working at the Supreme Court corresponds to the number of prosecutors working at the Superior Court of Justice (which includes prosecutors intervening at the Court of Appeal and Court of Cassation level).

(2014): The number of male public prosecutors decreased between 2012 and 2014, while the number of female public prosecutors increased for the same period. These variations have for sole explanation the normal progress of career of magistrates of the public prosecution office at first instance.

Malta

(General Comment): All the lawyers working in the Office of the AG prosecute cases in the criminal courts, but it is not possible, as yet to distinguish between 1st and 2nd Instance Courts. All full-time lawyers have been included in the above figure except the AG herself.

(2020): The increase in the number of lawyers working at the Office of the AG follows the reform in 2020 whereby the AG has taken up exclusively the role of prosecutor general (the advisory role to government has been vested in the State Advocate). Given this special focus, the Office of the AG has been recruiting more lawyers in order to meet the case demands of the courts.

(2016): All the lawyers at the Office of the Attorney General work both in Court as well as advisers to the various Ministries and Departments. All prosecuting officers at the Office of the Attorney General act at all court levels. Thus, prosecutors are not classified according to the case instance.

(2014): These past few years there has been an increase in the number of female law graduates, which will definitely reflect in the employment trends within this sector.

Netherlands

(General Comment): The Dutch Supreme Court does not have public prosecutors. The office of the Procurator General and Advocates-General at the Dutch Supreme Court is separate from Dutch public prosecution and the Ministry of Justice. They have a different function.

(2020): The Supreme Court does not have (public) prosecutors. The office of the procurator general and attorneys general that the Supreme Court houses, is separate from the public prosecution and does not function as prosecution. They have a different function.

(2016): total 927,5 358,12 569,38
1 842,25 312,72 529,53
2 85,25 45,40 39,85

(2014): For 2014, the number of prosecutors at first instance level includes 8 prosecutors who are still in education (7 females; 1 male). Prosecutors at Supreme Court level are not employees of the National Prosecution Service and therefore not included in the total.

Poland

(General Comment): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. Whereas under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of a prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices, since according to Article 16 of the Law of 28 January 2016 - Law on Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66) the common organizational units of the prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices. All items (1-3) include prosecutors for military matters.
The inclusion of the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutors' offices only in the total number of prosecutors is due to the design of the table. The table allows prosecutors to be entered: 1. first level, 2. second level 3. highest level. The table does not provide an opportunity to depict the full structure of the prosecutor's office in Poland, which consists of four levels: district, circuit and regional prosecutor's offices and the National Prosecutor's Office with a rank equivalent to the Supreme Court. Regional prosecutors' offices are a separate ('third') level of prosecution and the number of prosecutors employed in them cannot be 'split into instances'.

(2021): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. In contrast, under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of prosecutor of the National Prosecuting Authority. The total is higher than the sum of the sub-categories, as it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 402 prosecutors (154 women and 248 men), as, pursuant to Article 16 of the Act of 28 January 2016 - Law on the Public Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2022, item 1247), the common organisational units of the public prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices.
All items (1 - 3) include military prosecutors, of whom 77 are employed at the district prosecutor's office level, including 19 women and 58 men; at the regional prosecutor's office level, 45 military prosecutors, including 9 women and 36 men; and at the National Prosecutor's Office, 17 military prosecutors (4 women and 13 men).

(2020): The table under item 1 contains the number of district prosecutors and under item 2 the number of circuit prosecutors. Whereas under item 3 is the number of prosecutors in the position of a prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office. The total is higher than the sum of the subcategories because it takes into account the number of prosecutors employed in regional prosecutor's offices - a total of 391 prosecutors (151 women and 240 men), since according to Article 16 of the Law of 28 January 2016 - Law on Prosecutor's Office (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 66) the common organizational units of the prosecutor's office are: National Prosecutor's Office, regional prosecutor's offices, circuit prosecutor's offices and district prosecutor's offices. For 2020, all items (1-3) include prosecutors for military matters, who at the level of the district prosecutor's office are employed by 85, including 22 women and 63 men; at the level of the regional prosecutor's office - 38 prosecutors for military matters, including 8 women and 30 men, and at the National Prosecutor's Office - 13 prosecutors for military matters (2 women and 11 men).

(2018): Within the organizational structure of general organizational units of the prosecution office, there are Appellate Public Prosecutor’s Offices, which function as a third rank and employ altogether 367 prosecutors (149 women and 224 men). Additionally, 65 prosecutors of military affairs (including 16 women and 49 men) are employed at the level related to the Regional Public Prosecutor’s Office; 30 prosecutors of military affairs (including 6 women and 24 men) - at the level related to the District Public Prosecutor’s Office, and 5 prosecutors of military affairs (5 men) - in the National Public Prosecutor’s Office.

Portugal

(General Comment): The communicated data encompasses the number of magistrates of the Public Prosecution Service in courts of first instance, second instance and high superior courts, except the Constitutional Court.

(2020): No specific explanation for the numbers above.

(2018): In absolute terms the decrease from 2016 to 2018 is from 7 to 5 female prossecutors, which is not significative in absolute terms, but acquires a more relevant expression in relative terms.

(2012): The increase in the number of female prosecutors is due to the general tendency of increase of female prosecutors in the last decade at first instance courts. It is natural that gradually the proportion of female prosecutors in the higher courts tends to grow as a result of their career progress. The number of prosecutors in the High Judicial Court and in the High Administrative Court, increased. In particular, in the High Administrative Court there was a strong reinforcement of these professionals in 2011 in order to respond to a pressing need of prosecutors in this court.

Romania

(General Comment): In Romania there are four level of courts/prosecution offices attached to these courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above prosecutors from prosecution offices of the tribunals and of the courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional prosecutors".

(2018): In Romania there are four level of courts/prosecution offices attached to these courts (first instance courts, tribunals, courts of appeal and the High Court of Cassation and Justice). In line with our previous reports in this matters, in the table above prosecutors from prosecution offices of the tribunals and of the courts of appeal shall be included in the category "second instance professional prosecutors".

(2014): The prosecutor’s offices are established in the following hierarchy: the prosecutor’s offices attached to the courts of law (point 1 of the table), the prosecutor’s offices attached to tribunals and prosecutor’s offices attached to the courts of appeal (point 2), and the Prosecutor’s Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (point 3).

(2012): The prosecutor’s offices are established in the following hierarchy: the prosecutor’s offices attached to the courts of law (point 1 of the table), the prosecutor’s offices attached to tribunals and prosecutor’s offices attached to the courts of appeal (point 2), the Prosecutor’s Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (point 3).

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The number of prosecutors at the Supreme Court level also includes prosecutors of the Special Prosecution Bureau. The latter deals with crimes of corruption and the most severe offences including organized crime. It intervenes in first instance, but acts as an organizational part of the General Prosecutor’s Office.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The number is reported in FTE.
In the Slovenian criminal justice system state prosecutors are exclusively authorized to conduct public prosecution in criminal matters on behalf of society and in the public interest. The Constitution and law guarantee autonomy in status and functioning of state prosecutors. Decisions made by the state prosecutor shall not be interfered with, except by way of general instructions and assigning of a case in the manner determined by the law.
Slovenian state prosecutors perform their function in 13 organizational units – prosecution offices. There are 11 District State Prosecutor's Offices and one Specialized State Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Slovenia, where local, district and senior state prosecutors are positioned. At the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia supreme state prosecutors and the State Prosecutor General perform their functions. Some state prosecutors of lower ranks are assigned to the office perform demanding professional tasks.
There are no higher state prosecutor's offices as the proceedings at the courts of appeal are governed by the district prosecutor's offices. According to the State Prosecution Service Act prosecutors with the rank of at least local state prosecutor may represent a case at local courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least district state prosecutor may represent a case at district courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least senior state prosecutor may represent a case before higher courts and only supreme state prosecutors may represent a case at the Supreme Court. Local state prosecutors may also appear at district courts, if authorized by the head of state prosecutor's office for certain categories of matters, for a particular matter, for certain categories of procedural acts or for a particular procedural act. Local and district prosecutors may in their cases appear along with a senior prosecutor at courts of appeal, if authorized by the head of an appellate division of the state prosecutor's office for a particular case. Senior and supreme state prosecutors are competent to represent a case at before first instance courts.
Local and district prosecutors are reported as prosecutors at first instance level, senior prosecutors as prosecutors at second instance level and supreme prosecutors as prosecutors at Supreme Court level, without regard to the court instance where they perform their function, or that they are assigned to another institution for a limited period of time (e.g for the administration of State Prosecutorial Council).
The number of posts of state prosecutors is set by the Government's Regulation. However the actual number of state prosecutors is lower than the number se by regulation due to different factors.

(2021): Before 2021, data was reported in gross numbers. For 2021 data, the FTE format is observed.
The above data does not include six State prosecutors who perform other duties (assigned to The Council of State Prosecutors, appointed to Eurojust, the European Public Prosecutor and the European Delegate Prosecutor).

(2020): The information is in form of gross data. According to the methodology used for reporting judges and court staff (FTE) – by which part-time employees are converted to full-time time by the calculation of working hours, the number amounts to 193, as a number of prosecutors are not working full time.

(2016): Slovenian state prosecutors perform their function in 13 organizational units. There are 11 district prosecutor's offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office of The Republic of Slovenia, where local, district and higher state prosecutors are positioned. At The Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic of Slovenia supreme state prosecutors and State Prosecutor General perform their functions. Here are also some state prosecutors of lower ranks assigned to perform demanding professional tasks.
There are no higher state prosecutor's offices as the proceedings before the courts of appeal are governed by the district prosecutor's offices. According to the State Prosecutor Act prosecutors with the rank of at least local state prosecutor may represent a case before local courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least district state prosecutor may represent a case before district courts, prosecutors with the rank of at least higher state prosecutor may represent a case before higher courts and only supreme state prosecutors may represent a case before the supreme court. Local state prosecutors may also appear before district courts if authorized by the head of a state prosecutor's office for certain categories of matters, for a particular matter, for certain categories of procedural acts or for a particular procedural act. According to amendment of legislation in 2015 local and district prosecutors may in their cases appear along with a higher prosecutor before the courts of appeal if authorized by the head of an appellate division of the state prosecutor's office for a particular case. Higher and supreme state prosecutors are competent to represent a case also before first instance courts.
In the context of question 55 we counted local and district prosecutors as prosecutors at first instance level (164), higher prosecutors as prosecutors at second instance level (42) and supreme prosecutors as prosecutors at Supreme Court level (11) without regard of the rang of court before they perform their function in fact or if they are assigned to other institution for a limited period of time (e.g for the administration of State Prosecutorial Council). The information is in form of full-time equivalent.

(2014): In November 2011, the new State Prosecutor Act came into force. It dissolved the special department of the Office of the State Prosecutor General, responsible for the 2d instance level. Proceedings before courts of appeal are now governed by the 4 State circuit prosecutor offices in towns where the higher courts are located. Prosecutors are organised in 12 offices (11 circuit offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office, where circuit and higher prosecutors work) and the Supreme State Prosecutor Office (where supreme State prosecutors and the general State prosecutor work). The function "assistant State prosecutor" changed in "local State prosecutor". The Specialised State Prosecutor's Office for dealing with the most severe criminal offences was established.

(2012): In November 2011, the new State Prosecutor Act came into force. It dissolved the special department of the Office of the State Prosecutor General, responsible for the 2d instance level. Proceedings before courts of appeal are now governed by the 4 State circuit prosecutor offices in towns where the higher courts are located. Prosecutors are organised in 12 offices (11 circuit offices and one Specialised State Prosecutor's Office, where circuit and higher prosecutors work) and the Supreme State Prosecutor Office (where supreme State prosecutors and the general State prosecutor work). The function "assistant State prosecutor" changed in "local State prosecutor". The Specialised State Prosecutor's Office for dealing with the most severe criminal offences was established.

Spain

(General Comment): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories.
Article 34 of Law 50/1981, (Organic Statute of the Public Prosecutor's Office) distinguishes three categories:
1st Chamber Prosecutors of the Supreme Court, equal to Magistrates of the High Court. The Deputy Prosecutor of the Supreme Court will be considered the President of the Chamber.
2nd Prosecutors, equated to Magistrates.
3. Lawyers-Prosecutors, equated to Judges.

(2021): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category ("Fiscales de Sala") Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 32, Males 21, Females 11 (this category includes the Prosecutors of chamber of Supreme Court).
Second. "Fiscal": Total 1825, Males 701, Females 1124
Third: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 774, Males 178, Females 596

(2020): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, First category ("Fiscales de Sala del Tribunal Supremo") Supreme Court Prosecutor of Chamber: Total 50, Males 36, Females 14
Second. "Fiscal": Total 1830, Males 700, Females 1130
Third: "Abogado-Fiscal": Total 681, Males 158, Females 523

(2018): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First, Total 33, Males 26, Females 7
Second) Total 1779, Males 696, Females 1083
Third) Total 653, Males 161, Females 492

(2016): The structure of the Prosecution services does not distinguish prosecutors by 'instance level'.
However, it distinguishes three categories: First) Total 25, Males 19, Females 6
Second) Total 1826, Males 738, Females 1088
Third) Total 622, Males 155, Females 467

Question 060

Belgium

(2020): V: 1694
M: 730

Bulgaria

(2021): The decrease in the number of staff (non-public prosecutors) in the prosecutor's offices is due to the closing of the majority of the first-instance prosecutor's offices and their merger with those in the regional centers. Thus, the managing and duplicating positions in the closed prosecutor's offices were cut.

(2014): For 2014, the number of actually working servants in the Prosecutors office at 31 December 2014 (2918,5) includes also 66 servants working in the field of recreational craft. The main source of this data is the establishment plan of the Prosecutors office of the Republic of Bulgaria for the number of prosecutors and investigators and a reference for the number of employees in the Prosecutors office of the Republic of Bulgaria at December 2014.

(2012): For 2012, the number of actually employed servants in the Prosecutors Office at 31 December 2012 (2989,5) includes 177 servants in the recreation department.

Cyprus

(2021): In 2021, a significant number of public prosecutors were appointed, as new posts have been approved and vacant posts have been filled.

(2020): trainees are not included

Denmark

(General Comment): In Denmark, the staff attached to the public prosecution service (non-public prosecutors) are shared between the police and the prosecution offices (first instance level).

(2021): The number is the actual number of employees in full-time equivalent as of December 2021. Full-time equivalents are allocated on the 1st of the month, and it is therefore not possible do draw a precise number for 31 December. The number is therefore drawn for 1 December 2021 and scaled up to a full year. The actual numbers of full-time equivalents are calculated as digitals numbers which is not possible to add in the questionnaire.

(2020): In 2020, lawyers and police personnel attached to the Prosecution Service are included in the figures.

(2018): The staff attached to the public prosecution service (non-public prosecutors) are shared between the police and the prosecution offices (first instance level).

Estonia

(2020): More males have been hired.

Finland

(2021): In 2021, more staff was hired.

(2018): More staff has been recruited.
The number of males has increased.

France

(2021): 359 = legal assistants and specialised assistants
Source DSJ

(2016): It should be recalled that court staff are assigned to the services of judges and public prosecutors, and details of this breakdown are not available. For very specific staff, the data are nevertheless known: 60 specialised assistants and 49 legal assistants.

(2014): Staff assisting the public prosecution office are comprised in the whole of the registry staff under the direction of a registry director. The latter works closely with the chairman of the court and the public prosecutor at the court. Therefore, data on staff of the public prosecution office are, to this date, indistinct from those of court staff (question 52). Moreover, some very specialised public prosecution services can be assigned to specialised assistants, sometimes from other jurisdictions, to help them deal with the most complex proceedings. These specialised assistants are at number 44 (including 23 women) in 2014.

Germany

(2021): This figure includes:
- The number of associate prosecutors (i.e. officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience only before the Local Courts – in German: "Amtsanwälte"), the staff at the public prosecution offices and associate prosecutors' offices based at the Regional Courts as well as the staff at the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (full-time equivalent staff as of 31. December 2021)
- The staff (222 in total, 140 female) at the Office of the Federal Prosecutor General (headcount as of 31. December 2021).

(2020): This figure includes:
- The number of associate prosecutors (i.e. officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience only before the Local Courts – in German: "Amtsanwälte" – see question 57), the staff at the public prosecution offices and associate prosecutors' offices based at the Regional Courts as well as the staff at the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (full-time equivalent staff as of 31. December 2020)
- The staff (207 in total, 135 female) at the Office of the Federal Prosecutor General (headcount as of 31. December 2020).

(2018): This figure indicates the number of full-time equivalent staff (not the number of individuals).
- It includes the number of associate prosecutors (i.e. officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience only before the
Local Courts – in German: "Amtsanwälte" – see question 57).
- It covers the public prosecution offices and associate prosecutors' offices based at the Regional Courts (1st instance), the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (2nd instance), and the Office of the Federal Prosecutor General (in this case:
number of individuals).

(2016): This figure indicates the number of full-time equivalent staff (not the number of individuals).
- It includes the number of associate prosecutors (i.e. officials of the public prosecution office with a right of audience only before the Local Courts – in German: "Amtsanwälte" – see question 57).
- It covers the public prosecution offices and associate prosecutors' offices based at the Regional Courts (1st instance), the public prosecution offices based at the Higher Regional Courts (2nd instance), and the Office of the Federal Prosecutor General (in this case: number of individuals).

(2014): According to 2014 data, the indicated figure reflects job shares (not a number of heads). The data submitted relate to the cut-off date of 31 December 2013. No figures are available that are more up-to-date. The number refers to the staff of the public prosecutor’s offices and the offices of associate public prosecutors at the local courts (courts of first instance), of the public prosecutor’s offices at the higher regional courts (courts of second instance), and of the office of the federal prosecutor (Public Prosecutor General at the Federal Court of Justice; in the latter case, the figure reflects the number of heads).

Greece

(2021): The modified response came after the cooperation of the Directorate of judicial officials with Juststat.

(2020): The above figures include civil servants, permanent and those with a private law relationship of indefinite duration.

Ireland

(2018): There were 95.25 fulltime equivalent (fte) administrative/technical staff (headcount 102) on the payroll of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at 31 December 2018 – 54.85 fte (61 headcount) of these were female and 40.40 fte 41 headcount) were male.

(2016): Of the staff complement in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions at the end of the reference year, 77 were administrative grades.

(2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, parts of Full Time Equivalents were counted in decimal figures and have been rounded up or down as appropriate.

Italy

(2021): The number of staff has increased due to the hiring of new personnel through public competition.

Latvia

(2021): Total number of staff working at the Prosecution Office is 357 (103 male employees, 254 female employees): 187 employees (35 male and 152 female) are staff in charge of administrative functions and management of Prosecution Office. 75 employees (40 male and 35 female) perform technical duties. 95 employees are prosecutor assistants (28 male and 67 female). We would like to emphasize that in Latvia assistant prosecutors do not perform the functions of drafting procedural documents. Main duties of assistant prosecutors are preparation of criminal case material copies; drawing up of the case list documents, sewing and numbering of the case materials; preparation of materials to be issued to the process participants; certification of the correctness of document derivatives; delivery of the prepared materials to the addressees and reception of the documents.

(2014): The 2014 data encompasses the administrative director, deputies of the administrative director and other staff of the administrative director office – staff of the Chancellery, interpreters, IT specialists, personal specialists, car drivers, auditors (in total 318 employees, among which 232 women), as well as prosecutors' assistants (in total 74 assistants, among which 55 women). Assistants to prosecutors have no prosecutorial procedural powers. Their competence and jurisdiction are strictly limited. For example, an assistant is entitled to receive visitors, to take action in connection with the preparation of the case (prepare copies of criminal case materials, to produce the list of documents) etc.

(2012): The 2012 data encompassed the administrative director, deputies of the administrative director and other staff of the administrative director office - staff of the Chancellery, interpreters, IT specialists, personal specialists, car drivers, auditors (in total 321 employees, among which 234 woman), as well as prosecutors' assistants (in total 72 assistants, among which 53 women). Prosecutors' assistants have no prosecutorial procedural powers. Their competence and jurisdiction are strictly limited. For example, an assistant is entitled to receive visitors, to take action in connection with the preparation of the case (prepare copies of criminal case materials, to produce the list of documents) etc.

Lithuania

(2021): The decrease in staff numbers is due to:
- natural rotation of human resources (various reasons: career, dissatisfaction with salary or duties, etc.);
- implementation of changes in work organisation;
- a higher number of persons left the institution than were recruited.

(2020): Number of staff does not include trainee prosecutors, only assistants, specialists and other employees. A person, who has been admitted to the service as prosecutor, must complete an assigned traineeship of up to two years. During the traineeship, the trainee prosecutor performs all duties of a prosecutor, but is obliged to coordinate draft procedural decisions and resolutions with the internship supervisor.

(2016): The provided data on the number of prosecution staff includes assistants and lawyers who work directly with prosecutors (total 363: 81 males and 282 females).

Luxembourg

(2020):
"The staff of the judicial and administrative jurisdictions has grown steadily in recent years, as provided for
by the amended law of March 7, 1980 on judicial organization. This explains the significant variations observed between 2018 and 2020 at the
judicial and non-judicial personnel.
In 2018, the FIU was administratively attached to the Parquet Général du Luxembourg. Due to the FIU's functional independence, analysts (13 positions) and administrative staff (6 positions) are no longer counted among the staff of the public prosecutor's office."

(2018): Le personnel des juridictions judiciaires et administratives a connu une croissance soutenue ces dernières années, tel que prévu par la loi modifiée du 7 mars 1980 sur l'organisation judiciaire. Ceci explique les variations importantes observées entre 2016 et 2018 au niveau du personnel de la magistrature et du personnel non-juge. En 2018, la CRF a été rattachée administrativement au Parquet général du Luxembourg. En raison de l'indépendance fonctionnelle de la CRF, les analystes (8 postes) et le personnel administratif (5 postes) ne sont dorénavant plus comptés parmi le personnel du ministère public. L'effectif du Parquet d'arrondissement reste toutefois inchangé, par rapport à 2017, suite à la création des nouveaux postes remplaçant les postes auparavant affectés à la CRF auprès du Parquet.

(2012): The methodology of presentation of data changed between 2010 and 2012 which partly explained the considerable increase observed for this period. Besides, in 2012, there was a general increase of the number of public servants at all levels.

Malta

(2016): This data relates specifically to the staff working int he Office of the AG.

(2014): The number of non-public prosecutors staff declared for 2014, is categorised as follows: supporting paralegal clerical staff – 17 (6 Male/11 Female); civil lawyers acting as attorneys – 13 (11Female/2 Male), legal prosecutors – 3 Female.

Poland

(2020): The table presents information available at the National Public Prosecutor's Office Human Resources Office [Biuro Kadr] and contains the numbers of persons actually employed in universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services, without conversion into full-time equivalents.
The Human Resources Office does not have detailed data on the number of employees in the universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution service who are employed on an indefinite or fixed-term basis. Organisational units of the public prosecution service provide the Human Resources Office with data on employees of the public prosecution service (military part is provided separately) in the following groups:
1)FTE [full time employment] limits,
2)use of the FTE limits (not counted in full-time equivalents and not broken down between men and women) rounded to two decimal places, the actual number of employees (broken down into male and female employees).
The data provided doesnt include trainee prosecutors.

(2018): In the table, were presented total numbers of employees. Personnel's Office does not have detailed data connected with differentiation the number of workers per part time or full-time basis. The Personnel's Office also does not have detailed data connected with the number of workers employed in general organizational units of the prosecution office, for an unspecified or specified period of time.

Romania

(2020): Out of the total of 2408 filled in positions in the prosecution offices country wide, 1997 are occupied by clerks and the rest of 411 are procedural agents (who accomplish activities such as delivering summons, other courier activities etc.) and other staff such as drivers.

(2018): Out of the total of 2468 filled in positions in the prosecution offices country wide, 2044 are occupied by clerks and the rest of 424 are procedural agents (who accomplish activities such as delivering summons, other courier activities etc.) and other staff such as drivers.

(2016): The numbers include the clerks, forensics, auxiliary staff, public servants and contract staff

Slovak Republic

(2020): Staff increased for natural recruitment procedure

(2012): In 2012, the increase of the number of non-prosecutor staff resulted from the organisational changes in the prosecution services in the year 2011. In that year, the military prosecution services (which were administrated by the Ministry of Defence) were abolished and all the staff was assigned to the prosecution services.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The number is reported in FTE. Staff attached to the public prosecution service are civil servants at state prosecutor's offices (state prosecutorial personnel). Staff includes the director general, directors, judicial advisors, trainees, administrators, registrars and other civil servants from state prosecutor's offices. Trainees typically do not perform a significant amount of work as their role is to learn; nevertheless, they participate in hearings and in drafting decisions in some cases.

(2021): Before 2021, data was reported in gross numbers. For 2021 data, the FTE format is observed.

(2020): The information is in form of gross data. According to the methodology used for reporting judges and court staff (FTE) – by which part-time employees are converted to full-time time by the calculation of working hours, the number amounts to 298, as a number of staff are not working full time.

(2016): The information is in form of full-time equivalent.

(2014): The substantial increase of employments in state prosecutor's offices in 2014 is a result of Government's decision to strengthen the fight against corruption and other fields of criminality defined in the Prosecution Policy. In the year 2014, 40 Senior Judicial Advisers took up their post, as well as 7 other types of civil servants. In the year 2015 the employment procedures were concluded for admitting 15 trainees.

Question 132

Austria

(2021): Administrative Courts:
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 75700
Net annual salary: EUR 46900
Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: EUR 133000

(2020): Administrative Courts:
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: Gross annual salary: EUR 75000
Net annual salary: EUR 46600
Judge of the Administrative Supreme Court: Gross annual salary: EUR 130000

(2019): Administrative Courts - First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her Career:
Gross annual salary, in €: 72.900 Net annual salary, in €: 45.100

(2018): Gross annual Salary in € on 31 Dec 2018 First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career 53 865
Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court : 131 227,88
Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career: 57 158,80
Public prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance : 131 227,88
Administrative court:
first instance professional Judge at the beginning of his/her Career: 69 600,00
Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court: 126 000

(2016): Because of the requirement of numerical values the numerical values in the table above are rounded. the correct and exact answer is:
Gross annual Salary in € on 31 Dec 2016 (= Gross annual Salary in local currency on 31 dec 2016):
First instance professional judge at the beginning of his/her career: 59 962,40
Judge of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court (please indicate the average salary of a judge at this level, and not the salary of the Court President): 126 594,16
Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career: 55 139
Public prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance (please indicate the average salary of a public prosecutor at this level, and not the salary of the Public prosecutor General): 126 594,16

(2014): For 2014, the numerical values in the table are rounded. The correct and exact reply concerning the gross annual salary in Euros on 31 December 2014 is: first instance professional judges at the beginning of their career: 50 402,80 Euros; judges of the Supreme Court or the Highest appellate Court: 121 651,25 Euros; public prosecutors at the beginning of their career: 53 485,60 Euros; public prosecutors of the Supreme Court or the Highest appellate instance: 121651,25 Euros.

Belgium

(General Comment): Elements taken into account for salaries: judge at the first instance court or deputy king public prosecutor, with three years' seniority (beginning of career), married with two dependent children. Councillor at the Court of Cassation with 24 years' seniority, married, no dependent children. Advocate General at the Court of Cassation, with 24 years' seniority, no dependent children.

(2019): Judge at the court of first instance or deputy king's prosecutor, with three years of seniority (beginning of career) married and two dependent children.
Advisor to the Supreme Court with 24 years of seniority, married and no dependent children.
Advocate General at the Supreme Court, with 24 years of service and no dependent children.

(2016): Judge at the Court of First Instance or Deputy Crown Prosecutor, with three years seniority (beginning of career) married and two dependent children
Councillor at the Court of Cassation with 24 years seniority, married, no dependent children
Advocate General at the Court of Cassation, with 24 years seniority, no dependent children

Bulgaria

(2021): In the data for Q 132, the line "Prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career" is correct, but refers to the salaries of a district (first instance) prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career. The data for judges and prosecutors is calculated from the salary report collected and summarized by the Judiciary as of December 2021. The gross salary of the lowest judicial/prosecutor level, i.e. district judge and district prosecutor, is calculated. The system also has the position of "junior judge", but at the beginning of their career, they work in second-instance courts (regional courts), and based on the Questionnaire, information is requested about the lowest position in the first instance. The salary of a district judge and a district prosecutor according to "Table No. 1 of the SJC for Determining the Maximum Basic Monthly Salaries of Judges, Prosecutors and Investigators" is the same.
The data for question 132, line "Prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance" for the supreme judges and supreme prosecutors is calculated from the salary report provided by the supreme judicial bodies as of December 2021. The gross salary of a magistrate in the supreme judicial body was calculated. According to "Table No. 1 of the SJC for Determining the Maximum Basic Monthly Salaries of Judges, Prosecutors, and Investigators", the determined remuneration of a supreme judge and a supreme prosecutor is the same.

(2020): In 2019, with a decision of the Plenum of the SJC under item 6 of Protocol № 2 / 24.01.2019, an updated Table № 1 of the SJC was approved to determine the maximum basic monthly salaries of judges, prosecutors and investigators pursuant to Art. 218, para 2 and para 3 of the JSA with an increase of 10%, as of 01.01.2019. With the same decision the ranks for magistrates were increased by BGN 100 per rank, as of 01.03.2019.
In 2020, with a decision of the Plenum of the SJC under item 2 of Protocol № 2 / 30.01.2020, an updated Table 1 of the SJC was approved for determining the maximum basic monthly salaries of judges, prosecutors and investigators on the grounds of Article 218. , para 2 and para 3 of JSA with an increase of 10%, as of 01.01.2020. With the same decision the ranks for magistrates were increased by BGN 50 per rank, as of 01.03.2020.

(2018): The sums shown do not include the amount of the social security contributions, in order to be made comparable to the data given in the previous assessment cycle when they were not included either in the amount of the gross salary for the relevant position. The source of the data was information summarized and analyzed in the “Financial planning and analysis” Department of Supreme Judicial Council of Bulgaria

(2016): Under the provisions of Art. 218 (2) of the Judiciary System Act, the basic monthly remuneration for the lowest judicial, prosecutorial or investigating magisterial position shall be set at the double amount of the average monthly salary of employees in the public-financed sphere according to data of the National Institute of Statistics.
The increase in the salaries of the magistrates that occupy the lowest position is in line with the increase of the average monthly salary of the employees in the public-financed sphere, according to data of the National Statistical Institute and the financial resources of the budget of the judiciary.
Under the provisions of Art. 218, (3) of the Judiciary System Act, the remuneration of the other positions, including judges and prosecutors in the Supreme Court / Supreme Prosecution Office in the bodies of the judiciary, shall be determined by a decision of the SJC Plenum and taking into account the financial possibilities on the budget of the judiciary.

(2014): For 2014, the indicated amounts do not include the insurance contributions for the purpose of data comparability in respect of the previous evaluation scheme, when these amounts have not also been taken into consideration.

(2012): For 2010, the basis for assessment were the data from Table 1 of the Supreme Judicial Council determining the maximum amount of the monthly salary of judges, prosecutors and investigators, while for 2012, the basis for assessment were the data from the Information for the funds for salaries from the establishment plans and the average salary by positions, which is prepared by all the bodies of the judiciary and is summarized in the SJC. This information file reflects the actually received gross salaries, which include the basic salary and additional remuneration for grade and service.

Croatia

(2021): Salaries of judges and other judicial officials are determined by multiplying the base for calculating the salary by the coefficient for a particular official, which are proscribed by the Judges' and other Judicial Officials' Salaries Act (Official Gazette No. 10/99, 25/00, 01/01, 30/01, 59/01, 114/01, 116/01, 64/02, 153/02, 154/02, 17/04, 08/06, 142/06, 34/07, 134/07, 146/08, 155/08, 39/09, 155/09, 14/11, 154/11, 12/12, 143/12, 100/14, 147/14, 120/16, 16/19). Determined salaries are increased by 0.5% for each completed year of service, by a maximum of 20%.

(2020): Salaries of judges and other judicial officials are determined by multiplying the base for calculating the salary by the coefficient for a particular official, which are proscribed by the Judges' and other Judicial Officials' Salaries Act (Official Gazette No. 10/99, 25/00, 01/01, 30/01, 59/01, 114/01, 116/01, 64/02, 153/02, 154/02, 17/04, 08/06, 142/06, 34/07, 134/07, 146/08, 155/08, 39/09, 155/09, 14/11, 154/11, 12/12, 143/12, 100/14, 147/14, 120/16, 16/19). Determined salaries are increased by 0.5% for each completed year of service, by a maximum of 20%.

(2012): Due to the different calculation of tax rates and changes in the amounts of tax reliefs, there is a difference between calculation of salaries in 2010 and 2012.

Czech Republic

(2020): the salaries have risen generally + exchange rate

(2012): In 2012, the salary of public prosecutors was increased in order to bring it closer to the judges' salary.

Denmark

(General Comment): We are not able to inform the net salary. The Danish tax system is progressive. That means that the percentage of tax depends on the income and the municipal tax varies from municipality to municipality.

(2021): The annual salaries are specified without pension. The annual salary for a Public prosecutor of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate is specified based on the average salary for Senior Prosecutors, Special Prosecutors and the Deputy State Prosecutor at The Supreme Court Unit with the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Estonia

(2020): Since 2010 the salary of prosecutors depends of the salary of the President and is indexed by 1 April of each calendar year. In 2018 the salary system of public prosecutors changed and with that the smallest salaries increased the most.

(2019): Since 2010 the salary of prosecutors depends of the salary of the President and is indexed by 1 April of each calendar year. In 2018 the salary system of public prosecutors changed and with that the smallest salaries increased the most.

(2012): The salary of judges was increased on 1 January 2013.

Finland

(General Comment): In Finland, there are several salary categories for judges. The salary depends also on the years of work experience. At the end of 2021 first instance judge is in a salary category T11 in which the gross salary is from 4847,68 €/month to 6301,98€/month depending on his/her experience. A permanent first instance judge has usually at least nine years of work experience which means the salary is 5918,33 €/month. In Finland, the taxation is progressive so the information on net salary varies from person to person and is not available. Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

(2020): Prosecutors in Finland are not bound on Court instances.

(2016): In Finland there are several salary categories for judges. The slary depends also on the experience. A first instance judge has a category of T 11 for which the gross salary is from 4501,79 €/month to 5627,24 €/month depending on his/her experience. A permanent 1st instance judge has usually at least 9 years experience which means the salary is 5177,06 €/month. In Finland we have progressive taxation so the information on net salary is not available.

France

(General Comment): First-instance professional judge (civil and criminal courts) at the beginning of his/her career: judge at the 3rd step of the second grade - lump-sum compensation: 35% - flexible bonus 12%.
Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career: prosecutor of the Public Prosecutor's Office at the 3rd step of the second grade - lump-sum compensation: 38% - flexible bonus 12%.
Judge of the Court of Cassation: President of Chamber CC (F: 1369) - flexible bonus 14%.
Prosecutor at the Court of Cassation: First Advocate General CC (F: 1369) - flexible bonus 14%.

(2021): The data filled in the table are those of the civil and criminal justice, source DSJ.
Concerning the administrative justice, the data are as follows: professional judge of first instance, beginning of career: 50 200, 41 300; judge of the Supreme court or of the last instance of appeal: 95 100, 76 900. Source – Council of State

(2020): "The completed table concerns only magistrates of the judicial order.
For the administrative order: -gross annual salary in euros of a professional judge of 1st instance at the beginning of his career: 47,100 euros
-gross annual salary in euros of a Supreme Court judge: 94,000 euros
-net annual salary in euros of a professional judge of first instance at the beginning of his career: 38,700 euros
-net annual salary in euros of a supreme court judge: 76,000 euros.
sources DSJ and CE."

(2014): In 2014, the annual gross salary of administrative judges was 42,615€ and the annual net salary was 36,318€. At the State Council, the annual gross salary was 108,881€.

Germany

(General Comment): No information on annual net salary is available on the basis of the personal circumstances of judges and public prosecutors. The federal average was calculated unweighted: the annual salaries of the Federal Länder were added and divided by the number of Länder, regardless of how many judges and prosecutors work in the respective Federal Land (the corresponding data are not known).

(2021): Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the Länder. Judges and public prosecutors may be entitled to additional payments depending on -
their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children)
- position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
The conditions and amount of any additional payments are determined by the remuneration laws of the Länder.

(2020): Data represents average base-salaries of judges and public prosecutors according to the remuneration laws ("Besoldungsgesetze") of the Länder. Judges and public prosecutors may be entitled to additional payments depending on -
their individual familial situation (married/partnership, children)
- position and function at the court (eg. judges with administrative tasks)
The conditions and amount of any additional payments are determined by the remuneration laws of the Länder.

(2016): The salaries calculated were based on the following assumptions:
Outset of the career (judge / public prosecutor): remuneration pursuant to R1, salary bracket 1, single, no children
The average was formed as a simple average of the Länder, without weighting the numbers based on the number of judges active in them, since the corresponding data are not known. The figure given as the salary of a judge or public prosecutor of the Supreme Court is the basic salary R6 without any allowance for working at one of the highest federal courts and without family allowance.
No Information on annual net salary is available on the Basis of the personal circumstances of judges and public prosecutors.

(2014): The salaries calculated for 2014 were based on the following assumptions: outset of the career (judge/public prosecutor): remuneration pursuant to R1, salary bracket 1, single, no children. The figure given as the salary of a judge or public prosecutor of the Supreme Court is the basic salary R6 without any allowance for working at one of the highest federal courts and without family allowance.

(2012): The figure given for 2012 as the salary of a judge or public prosecutor of the Supreme Court is the basic salary R6 without any allowance for working at one of the highest federal courts and without family allowance.

Greece

(2016): Data on net annual salaries of judges and prosecutors is not available. In fact, after subtracting from the gross salary the insurance contribution, the amount is still subject to further taxation (22%-35%), depending on the family status of each judge and prosecutor.

(2012): The decrease between 2010 and 2012 of the annual salaries (gross and net) of judges and public prosecutors at the Supreme Court level was a result of a fiscal policy due to the economic crisis.

Hungary

(2020): At its December 2019 session, the National Assembly passed a law increasing the salaries of judges by 32 percent and that of prosecutors by 21 percent.

(2018): The reason for the increase of judicial salaries is the increase of the base salary of judges by 15% in 2017-2018.

Ireland

(2021): The information you are seeking has been retrieved from sources which are available to the public. For figures relating to judicial remuneration please see Association of Judges Ireland and for figures relating to the salaries of other civil servants which includes prosecutors see publicjobs.ie

(2020): The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2020.
Statutory deductions such as PAYE, USC, pension contributions will vary according to personal circumstances. In every case these will
be charged in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions. Prosecuting in the Superior Courts is not necessarily linked to grade

(2019): The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2019.
Statutory deductions such as PAYE, USC, pension contributions will vary according to personal circumstances. In every case these will
be charged in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions. Prosecuting in the Superior Courts is not necessarily linked to grade

(2018): The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2018.
Statutory deductions such as PAYE, USC, pension contributions will vary according to personal circumstances. In every case these will be charged in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions. Prosecuting in the Superior Courts is not necessarily linked to grade

(2016): The judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court as at 31 December 2016.

(2014): The Judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court at December 2014 who were appointed to that courts on or after 1 January 2012. It is noteworthy that following a constitutional amendment in 2011, legislation was passed to allow for the reductions in the remuneration of judges. The Financial Emergency Measures in the Public Interest legislation refers.

(2013): There is no equivalent of a public prosecutor of the Supreme Court and so a summary of all lawyer grade salaries are provided below: Director of Public Prosecutions (€176,350); Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions (€156,380); Head of Directing Division (€142,199 (modified scale)); Professional Officer Grade II (€119,572); Professional Officer Grade III (€81,080); Professional Officer Grade IV (€67,434); Chief Prosecution Solicitor (€149,499); Principal Prosecution Solicitor (€85,127); Senior Prosecution Solicitor (€79,401); Prosecution Solicitor AP1 (€67,434); Prosecution Solicitor (€30,218 (new entrant from 1 January 2013)).

(2012): The Judicial salary reflects that of a judge of the District Court and a judge of the Supreme Court at December 2012. Salary for prosecutor reflects the salary of a new entrant solicitor and the salary of a principal Prosecution Solicitor. In line with the Government's fiscal policy the salary or remuneration of public service staff and office holders has been reduced since the 2010 statistics. Following a constitutional amendment, legislation was passed to allow for the reductions in the remuneration of judges. The Financial Emergency Measures in the Public Interest legislation refers.

Italy

(General Comment): It is noteworthy that the salaries of judges and public prosecutors do not depend on the position held but rather on the experience (i.e. years of service). That means that the salary of a judge working in the lowest courts can be the same as the salary of a judge working in the Highest Appellate Court.

Latvia

(2020): Prosecutors shall be entitled to a supplement for the ranking of the public prosecutor, depending on the degree of office assigned. The ranking of a public prosecutor shall be assigned according to the position, professional knowledge, qualifications and experience of work.
Question 132 indicates the minimum gross and net public remuneration.
Discrepancies with data from the previous cycle are connected with changes in the Law On Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities. Between 2019 and 2020 a gradual increase in salary has been introduced, the gross salary has been increased per EUR 1764 and the net annual salary increase per EUR 1203. The salaries for judges are reviewed annually according to the law.

(2019): Discrepancies with data from the previous cycle are connected with changes in the Law On Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities.
Comments on salaries of prosecutors: The increase in salaries is related to changes in the regulatory framework for prosecutors remuneration, which entered into force on 01.01.2019. The discrepancies in the section of salary for public prosecutor at the beginning of his or her career is connected to that in previous cycle the maximum salary was indicated which first instance prosecutor could get, but now it is indicated the salary at the beginning of the career.

(2018): The changes are related to the Law On Remuneration of Officials and Employees of State and Local Government Authorities, which increased the judge's monthly salary to EUR 1966, and the salaries of judges increased significantly in 2018 compared to 2016. Same for prosecutors.
Comment for prosecutors: Prosecutors shall be entitled to a supplement for the ranking of the public prosecutor, depending on the degree of office assigned. The ranking of a public prosecutor shall be assigned according to the position, professional knowledge, qualifications and experience of work. Question 132 shows the maximum gross and net public remuneration.

(2016): Prosecutors, depending on the grade assigned, are provided with an allowance for a post of prosecutor from 7 to 35 percent of the monthly salary. The position of a prosecutor is assigned according to the occupation, professional knowledge, qualification and work experience.
In above stated amount special additional payment to judges depending of their time of service (starting from 7% after 3 years of service, until 35% - after 20 years of service) is already included.

(2012): During the economic crisis, starting from 01.07.2009, the salaries of judges were reduced by 15% and starting from 01.01.2010, they were reduced by 27 %. Starting from 01.01.2011, the determination of the salaries of judges and prosecutors is a part of the unified remuneration system for the officials and employees of the State and local government institutions. Besides, as the consequences of the crisis diminished, the salaries of judges increased.

Lithuania

(2020): From the 1 January 2019 the official salary ratio of district court judges was increased. In 2019 and in 2020 a higher base amount of official salary (salary) was also applied, which is used to calculate the remuneration of judges and public procesutors (2018 - 132,5; 2019 - 173, 2020 - 176)

(2019): From 2019 January 1 the salaries of district court judges increased due to an increase in their official salary coefficients (the official salary ratio of the president of the court increased from 0.5 to 1.5 basic amounts; deputy chief judge - from 1.2 to 1.9 basic amounts, judge - by 2 basic amounts).
From 2019 January 1 the basic amount of the official salary, which is used to calculate the salaries of both prosecutors and judges, was also increased: in 2018 this basic amount was 132.5 euros, in 2019 - 173 euros.

(2018): In 2017 prosecutors' salaries were increased.

(2016): The salary of public prosecutors at the beginning of the carrier was increased.

Luxembourg

(2021): As a starting salary (professional judge of first instance or prosecutor) we consider the salary of the “attachés de justice” after their first appointment. The salary scale of the magistrates provides for 380 index points as a basis, a possible professional experience can be added to it but is not taken into account by our calculations.
As a theoretical basic salary for a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal we consider the grade M4, level 4, which corresponds to 455 points and to the average seniority of a magistrate appointed to the Court (Court and General Prosecutor's Office). However, it should be taken into account that this salary is strongly influenced by the family situation of the person concerned.
To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point. Between January and September 2021, the value of the index point for a civil servant was 20.17893; after 1 October, the value of the index point was 20.6831871. Taking into consideration these elements, a 12-month salary corresponds to 92 591€ for a first instance professional judge, respectively a salary of 110 865€ for a judge or prosecutor at the Supreme Court. These figures do not include any bonuses, allowances or benefits that may be added to the basic salary depending on the magistrate concerned.
More explanations on the calculation of civil servants' salaries, which also apply to the M career of magistrates, can be found on the civil service website (https://fonction-publique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html).

(2020): "As a starting salary (professional judge of first instance or prosecutor) we consider the salary of the judicial attachés after their first appointment. The salary scale of the magistrates provides for 380 index points as a basis, a possible professional experience can be added to it but is not taken into account by our calculations.
As a theoretical basic salary for a judge or prosecutor at the Court of Appeal we consider the grade M4, step 4, which corresponds to 455 points and to the average seniority of a magistrate appointed to the Court (seat and General Prosecutor's Office). However, it should be taken into account that this salary is strongly influenced by the family situation of the person concerned.
To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point. In December 2020, the value of the index point for a civil servant was 20.17893, which corresponds to a 12-month salary of 92.016€ for a professional judge of first instance, respectively a salary of 110.177€ for a judge or prosecutor at the Supreme Court. These figures do not include any bonuses, allowances or benefits that may be added to the basic salary depending on the magistrate concerned. More explanations on the calculation of civil servants' salaries, which also apply to the M career of magistrates, can be found on the civil service website (https://fonction-publique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html)."

(2019): As a salary at the beginning of the career (first instance professional judge or prosecutor) we consider the salary of the “attachés de justice” after their first appointment. The salary scale for judges and prosecutors is based on 380 points, any professional experience can be added but is not taken into account in our calculations. To calculate the annual salary, these points must be multiplied by the value of the index point. In December 2019, the value of the index point of a civil servant was 20,17893, which corresponds to a salary of €92,016 over 12 months. In 2016, this figure corresponded to €84,185 and in 2018 to €89,771. More explanations on the calculation of civil servants' salaries, which also apply to the M career of magistrates (judges and prosecutors), can be found on the civil service website: https://fonction-publique.public.lu/fr/carriere/parcours-remuneration/fonctionnaire/traitement.html.

(2016): The salary are those of the Court President and the Prosecutor General as no average salary can be calculated.

Malta

(2020): Wages for the lawyers of the AG were improved following a revision of salaries.

(2019): Public prosecutor at the beginning of his/her career: Actually there was an increase in the gross annual salary which is also reflected in the net annual salary. The difference in the net annual salary is then due to the different tax brackets that apply.

(2018): In 2018, following discussions with the Judiciary Association, the Ministry substantially increased the wage package of the members of the judiciary across all grades (Magistrates, Judges and Chief Justice). The agreement saw an increase in the basic salary and allowances received by the judiciary, with further increases planned over the coming 3 years. This improvement in the wage package reflects the commitment of the current administration to improve the working conditions of the judiciary, and continues to build on the reforms already brought into effect by the Constitutional Reforms (Justice Sector) Act of 2016.

(2014): The 2014 figures include the allowances over and above the ‘basic’ wage. A Magistrate has competence to hear all civil cases up to a value of €11,650 and criminal cases up till an imprisonment of 10 years whilst Judges hear all the other cases. The data provided relates to the salary of a Magistrate (in respect of first instance professional judge) and a Judge (in respect of Judge of the Supreme Court). The Net Annual Salary varies according to the Income Tax Bands announced, from time to time, and therefore it is not possible to indicate the amounts. The figures provided for as net income were calculated on the salary above-indicated for a married person.

(2012): In terms of the Judges and Magistrates Salaries Act, the gross annual salary of the Chief Justice for 2012 was €46 456, this of a judge was €40 221, whilst this of Magistrates was €34 188. A Magistrate has competence to hear all civil cases up till a value of €11,650 and criminal cases up till an imprisonment of 10 years whilst Judges hear all the other cases. The figure mentioned relates to the initial salary of Judge, though the beginning of one’s career in the judicial field is as a Magistrate. The Net Annual Salary varies according to the income tax bands announced, from time to time, and therefore it is not possible to indicate the amounts. The figures provided for as net income were calculated on the salary above-indicated for a married person.

Netherlands

(General Comment): Salary of judge / prosecutor 'at the beginning of career': the salary used is the one for a starting judge / prosecutor, after finalizing a training period of several years. During the training there is a fixed saraly, lower than the salary of a fully functional judge / prosecutor.

(2021): Public prosecution: Numbers are including a vacation stipend and 13th month. There is no new collective labour agreement as of yet, so these numbers are the same as last year. As soon as a new agreement is reached, the salary may change retroactively.
Concer
Courts: Salary of a judge / prosecutor ‘at the beginning of career’: the salary used is one for a starting judge / prosecutor, after finalizing a training period of several years. During the training, there is a fixed salary, lower than the salary of a fully functional judge/prosecutor. Salary includes a holiday stipend, as well as a 13th month.
Supreme Court: the above amount is the average gross salary (11.163,63 euro per month) for a regular Supreme Court judge and includes a holiday allowance (8% of annual salary) and a so-called 13th month (8.3% of annual salary). Please refer to legislation (https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0008365/2021-07-01) on this subject as well as the salary scheme (https://nvvr.org/uploads/documenten/Salaristabellen-RM-juli-2021.pdf).

(2020): Public prosecutor at the beginning of his / her career: The recent salary table RM of the end of 2020 is used (Scale 9, first step). On top of this the holiday stipend and end of year stipend is calculated. The 42.900 is a rough estimate of the net annual salary, after taxes, pensions etc.

(2016): The discrepancy of the answers for gross salary is not clarified.

Poland

(2021): Judges: The basic salary of a judge is determined in rates, the amount of which is determined using multipliers of the basis for determining basic salary. The rates of basic salary in particular judge's positions and multipliers, used for determination of basic salary of judges in particular rates, are specified in the appendix to the Act.
A judge is entitled to a function-related allowance in connection with the performance of his duties.
Judges' remuneration is also differentiated by a long service bonus, amounting, beginning with the sixth year of service, to 5% of basic salary and increasing after each year by 1% until it reaches 20% of basic salary. No social security contributions are payable on judges' salaries. Prosecutors:
The base salary for public prosecutors of universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services shall be determined based on the table of base salary scale for public prosecutors of universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services Pursuant to Article 123 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor’s Office of 28 January 2016, the basis for determining the base salary of a public prosecutor in a given year is the so-called base amount, i.e. the average salary in the second quarter of the previous year, announced in the Official Journal of the Republic of Poland "Monitor Polski" by the President of the Main Statistical Office “Statistics Poland” [GUS]. At the same time, according to Article 124 § 11 of the quoted Act on Public Prosecutor's Office, a public prosecutor is entitled to an supplement for long-time service amounting to 5% of the base salary currently received by the public prosecutor, beginning from the 6th year of his/her employment, and increasing after each successive year of his/her employment by 1% of this salary, until reaching 20% of the base salary. After 20 years of service the long-service supplement shall be paid, irrespective of the length of service beyond that period, at the rate of 20% of the public prosecutor's current base salary.
Supreme court and Main Public Prosecutor Office: Pursuant to Article 124 § 1 of the above-mentioned Act, the base salary of public prosecutors of the National Public Prosecutor’s Office is equal to the base salary of judges of the Supreme Court. Pursuant to Article 48 of the Act on the Supreme Court [Ustawa o Sądzie Najwyższym] of 8 December 2017 (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 154, as amended), the remuneration of a judge of the Supreme Court is determined at either the basic rate or the promotion rate. The promotion rate is 115% of the base rate. Upon taking up his/her post, a judge of the Supreme Court receives base pay at the basic rate. After 7 years of service in the Supreme Court, the base salary of a judge of the Supreme Court shall be increased to the promotion rate.

(2020): Judges: The basic salary of a judge is determined in rates, the amount of which is determined using multipliers of the basis for determining basic salary. The rates of basic salary in particular judge's positions and multipliers, used for determination of basic salary of judges in particular rates, are specified in the appendix to the Act.
A judge is entitled to a function-related allowance in connection with the performance of his duties.
Judges' remuneration is also differentiated by a long service bonus, amounting, beginning with the sixth year of service, to 5% of basic salary and increasing after each year by 1% until it reaches 20% of basic salary. No social security contributions are payable on judges' salaries. Prosecutors:
The base salary for public prosecutors of universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services shall be determined based on the table of base salary scale for public prosecutors of universal prosecutorial bodies of the public prosecution services Pursuant to Article 123 of the Act on the Public Prosecutor's Office of 28 January 2016, the basis for determining the base salary of a public prosecutor in a given year is the so-called base amount, i.e. the average salary in the second quarter of the previous year, announced in the Official Journal of the Republic of Poland "Monitor Polski" by the President of the Main Statistical Office "Statistics Poland" [GUS]. At the same time, according to Article 124 § 11 of the quoted Act on Public Prosecutor's Office, a public prosecutor is entitled to an supplement for long-time service amounting to 5% of the base salary currently received by the public prosecutor, beginning from the 6th year of his/her employment, and increasing after each successive year of his/her employment by 1% of this salary, until reaching 20% of the base salary. After 20 years of service the long-service supplement shall be paid, irrespective of the length of service beyond that period, at the rate of 20% of the public prosecutor's current base salary.
Supreme court and Main Public Prosecutor Office: Pursuant to Article 124 § 1 of the above-mentioned Act, the base salary of public prosecutors of the National Public Prosecutor's Office is equal to the base salary of judges of the Supreme Court. Pursuant to Article 48 of the Act on the Supreme Court [Ustawa o Sądzie Najwyższym] of 8 December 2017 (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 154, as amended), the remuneration of a judge of the Supreme Court is determined at either the basic rate or the promotion rate. The promotion rate is 115% of the base rate. Upon taking up his/her post, a judge of the Supreme Court receives base pay at the basic rate. After 7 years of service in the Supreme Court, the base salary of a judge of the Supreme Court shall be increased to the promotion rate.

(2019): The base salary for public prosecutors of common organisational units of the prosecutor's office is determined on the basis of the table of base salary for prosecutors of common organisational units of the prosecutor's office and the Institute of National Remembrance - Commission for the Prosecution of Crimes against the Polish Nation, and the multipliers used to determine this salary, which constitutes appendix no. 1 to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 29 February 2016 on the base salary of the prosecutors and the amount of functional allowances to which the prosecutors are entitled. The above table sets out the rates of base salary for different prosecutorial positions and the corresponding multiplier, which is used to determine the base salary for this position.
Pursuant to Article 123 of the Act of 28 January 2016 – The Prosecutor's Office Law, the basis for determining the base salary of a prosecutor in a given year is the so-called base amount, i.e. the average salary in the second quarter of the previous year, published in the Official Journal of the Republic of Poland "Monitor Polski" by the President of the Central Statistical Office. Pursuant to Article 124 § 1 of the abovementioned Act, the base salary of prosecutors of the National Prosecutor's Office is equal to the base salary of the Supreme Court judges. Pursuant to Article 48 of the Act of 8 December 2017 on the Supreme Court (Journal of Laws of 2018, item 5, as amended), the salary of a judge of the Supreme Court is determined at the base rate or the promotion rate. The promotion rate is 115% of the base rate. A judge of the Supreme Court, taking up a position, receives the base salary at the base rate. After 7 years of service in the Supreme Court, the base salary of a Supreme Court judge is increased to the promotion rate.
At the same time, pursuant to Article 124 § 11 of the quoted Act – The Prosecutor's Office Law, a prosecutor is entitled to an allowance for long-term work amounting to, starting from the 6th year of work, 5% of the base salary currently earned by the prosecutor and increasing after each consecutive year of work by 1% of this salary, until 20% of the base salary is reached. After 20 years of work, the allowance is paid, irrespective of the length of service beyond that period, in the amount of 20% of the base salary currently earned by the prosecutor.
Moreover, pursuant to Article 124 § 10 of the quoted Act – The Prosecutor's Office Law, in connection with the function of a prosecutor, the prosecutor is entitled to a functional allowance, which results from appendix no. 2 Table of functions and multipliers used to determine the amount of functional allowances to the Ordinance of the Council of Ministers of 29 February 2016 on the base salary of the prosecutors and the amount of functional allowances to which the prosecutors are entitled..
Additionally, pursuant to Article 111 § 2 and 4 of the abovementioned Act, due to the nature of work and the scope of tasks performed, a special bonus may also be granted to the prosecutor of the National Prosecutor's Office, in the amount not exceeding 40% of the total base salary and the functional allowance. The allowance shall be granted for a fixed period, and in justified cases - also for an indefinite period.

(2018): Base salary for prosecutors related to general organizational units of the prosecution office is determined by virtue of the Table regarding rates, connected with the base salary for prosecutors related to general organizational units of the prosecution office and for prosecutors related to the Nation's Memory Institute - Commission for the Prosecution of Crimes against Polish Nation. The aforementioned table also includes multipliers used for determining the aforementioned salary and it constitutes Schedule No 1 enclosed to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 29th February 2016 on the base salary for prosecutors and the amount of extra duty allowance for prosecutors. The aforementioned table determines rates of the base salary related to particular prosecutor's position and appropriate multiplier used for determining the amount of base salary connected with this position. Pursuant to art. 123 of the Law on Prosecution Act of 28th January 2016 (published in the Journal of Laws 2017, item 1767 and later amendments), the basis of the prosecutor's base salary in a given year shall be - so called - base amount, that is average salary related to second quarter of the previous year, published in the Official Journal of the Republic of Poland by the Chairman of the Central Statistics Office.
Pursuant to art. 124 § 1 of the aforementioned Act, base salary for prosecutors related to the National Public Prosecutor's Office is equal to base salary for the Supreme Court judges.
Pursuant to art. 48 of the Supreme Court Act of 8th December 2017 (published in the Journal of Laws 2018, item 5 and later amendments) salary for the Supreme Court judge is determined at the basic rate or promotion rate. The amount of a promotion rate constitutes 115% of a basic rate. The Supreme Court judge, while taking over the post, acquires base salary related to the basic rate. After seven years of duty connected with the Supreme Court, base salary for the Supreme Court judge is raised up to the promotion rate. At the same time, pursuant to art. 124 § 11 of the aforementioned Law on Prosecution Act, prosecutor is entitled to allowance connected with a long-term service. This allowance constitutes, starting with the 6th year of service, 5% of the base salary currently received by the prosecutor and it rises - after each following year of service - by 1% of the base salary, until it reaches the level of 20% of the base salary. After twenty years of service, the allowance constitutes, independently on the period of service exceeding this time, 20% of the base salary currently received by the prosecutor.
What is more, pursuant to art. 124 § 10 of the aforementioned Law on Prosecution Act, in connection with certain position, prosecutor in entitled to extra duty allowance, which stems from Schedule No 2 of the Table regarding positions and multipliers used for determining the amount of extra duty allowance, enclosed to the Regulation of the Council of Ministers of 29th February 2016 on the base salary for prosecutors and the amount of extra duty allowance for prosecutors.
Additionally, pursuant to art. 111 § 2 and 4 of the aforementioned Act, the National Public Prosecutor - due to the character of service and the scope of duties - can be entitled to the special allowance as well. The amount of the special allowance shall not exceed 40% of base salary and extra duty allowance altogether. The special allowance is granted for a specified period of time or - under particularly justified circumstances - for an unspecified period of time. Salaries of judges and public prosecutors of the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Instance - we indicated average salary which contains base salary, allowance connected with a long-term service and allowance connected with occupying post.

Portugal

(General Comment): The net annual salary depends on various factors: personal tax situation; other personal revenues. It would not be accurate to provide a number under this category.

(2020): Source of data: Directorate-General for the Administration of Justice and the High Council for the Judiciary
The increase of salaries resulted from the revision of the statute of judges and prossecutors.

(2019): The increase of the Public Prosecutors' salary in the Supreme Court was due to the revision of the Statute of Judicial Magistrates

Romania

(2016): The increase between 2014 and 2016 is resulting from legislative changes, including the way in which specific legislation is applied in the light of the jurisprudence of the Constitutional Court. The calculation method did not change, but the base of the monthly salaries has grown during the last two years, according to the legislation concerning the public remuneration, as it was interpreted by the Constitutional Court and the ordinary courts of law. Currently, the differences between salaries in the judicial system are eliminated. Since 2000 to the present, the magistrates' salaries have risen steadily, including the latest law on salaries in the public domain (Law no. 153/2017) has set a has set a salary level for magistrates well above the average of the budgetary staff. This law will have its full effect until 2022.

(2012): The 2012 data was based on the Law regarding the unitary remuneration of personnel paid from public funds, no.284/2010, with subsequent amendments and additions.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The stated sums represent the basic gross salary of judges/prosecutors without bonuses and supplements. According to the Act on Judges (No. 385/2000 Coll.) the average monthly salary of the judge equals the monthly salary of the Member of Parliament. The monthly salary of the judge at the beginning of the career is 90% of this salary. The monthly salary of the judge of the Supreme Court is 130 % of the monthly salary of the Member of Parliament. The judge is entitled to have 2 additional monthly salaries (in May and in November) unless he/she do not meet the conditions stipulated in law. The sum of annual average salary stated in this questionnaire counts 14 months salaries.
All bonuses and supplements are stipulated by law. Specific supplement belongs to the judges of the Specialized Criminal court and to the judges of the Supreme court deciding on the remedies against the decisions of that court. The value of the net salary depends on several individual criteria, e. g. the number of children, the voluntary pension security scheme etc. Similar rules govern the salaries of prosecutors (Act on Prosecutors and Trainee Prosecutors No.154/2001 Coll.). The average salary of the prosecutor equals the average salary of the judge. The salary of the beginning prosecutor is 85% of this salary, the salary of the prosecutor at the General Prosecutors office is equal to the salary of the Supreme Court judge. Prosecutors are also entitled to 2 additional monthly salaries. Supplements for the heads of the prosecutor offices are similar to supplements of the court presidents at the same level.The prosecutors of the Special Prosecutor´s Office are entitled to same supplement as the judges of the Specialized Criminal Court.

(2019): The stated sums represent the basic gross salary of judges/prosecutors stipulated by law without supplements (methodology comparable to previous years data in the questionnaire). See general comment for details.

(2018): The stated sums represent the basic gross salary of judges/prosecutors stipulated by law without supplements. See general comment for details.

(2014): The salaries of judges and prosecutors in 2014 were at the same level as in 2012. The adjustments of salaries for all State officials (Members of Parliament, Government, judges) were stopped in the years 2013 and 2014 due to State expenditures restrictions.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The basic salary for judges and prosecutors is regulated by law, as well as promotion. The salary of the prosecutor is determined on the same basis, with the same supplements and in the same way as the salary of the judge. All employees in the country (including judges and public prosecutors) are also entitled to the supplement for the period of employment. As the calculation of the average pay would be too complicated, we report figures calculated from above criteria. Please note all figures reported include the supplement for the period of employment.
Judge/prosecutor at the beginning of the career: starting salary for local court judge and for local state prosecutor (without promotion), including the supplement for the period of employment (5 years) - approx. 1-2% of the reported amount.
Judge/Prosecutor at the highest instance: starting salary of a supreme court judge and supreme state prosecutor – counselor (not president of the Supreme Court or State Prosecutor General) including the supplement for the period of employment (44 years) - approx 15% of the reported amount.

Spain

(General Comment): In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: Remuneration for objectives and professional substitutions.
Remuneration according to objectives can be considerable in both cases (judges and prosecutors). Substitution refers to cases in which, according to the law, one judge substitutes another, thereby accruing an increase in remuneration, depending on the circumstances and duration of that substitution

(2021): In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Prosecution 3.391.688,99 euros, Judges 6.719.737,10 euros.
- Professional substitutions. Prosecution 596.210,59 euros, Judges 7.666.770,44 euros.

(2020): In addition to salary, other concepts must be taken into account: - Remuneration for objectives: Prosecution 3.364.701,68 euros, Judges 6.760.485,89 euros.
- Professional substitutions. Prosecution 624.438,54 euros, Judges 8.852.605,61 euros.

(2019): Other two concepts have to be taken into account:
- Remuneration for objectives. (For 2019, Judges 6.560.790,81, Prosecutors 3.298.733,53)
- Professional substitutions. (For 2019, Judges 6.028.864,05; Prosecutors 726.720,41)
Remuneration according to objectives can be considerable in both cases.Substitution refers to cases in which, according to the law, one judge substitutes another, thereby accruing an increase in remuneration, depending on the circumstances and duration of that substitution.

(2018): Other two concepts have to be taken into account:
- Remuneration for objectives. (For 2018, Judges 6.474.050,91, Prosecutors 3.220.851,03)
- Professional substitutions. (For 2018, Judges 3.220.851,03; Prosecutors 646.740,23)

Question 133

Austria

(General Comment): Judges at Administrative Courts get the same benefits as functionaries (e.g. anniversary reward, child allowance, possibly cost of living bonus, travel fees of transportation allowance)

(2018): Judges at Administrative Courts get the same benefits as functionaries (e.g. anniversary reward, child allowance, possibly cost of living bonus, travel fees of transportation allowance)

(2016): Judges at Administrative Courts get the same benefits as officials (i.e. anniversary reward, child allowance, possibly costs of living Bonus, travel fees or Transportation allowance).

Belgium

(2021): Judges and prosecutors have a specific pension scheme (age limit at 67 + preferential rate).

(2020): Magistrates have a specific pension scheme (age limit at 67 + preferential rate).

Bulgaria

(2021): Pursuant to Article 223 of the Judiciary System Act, judges and prosecutors may use dwellings from the institutional housing stock of the judiciary.

(2020): Pursuant to Article 223 of the Judiciary System Act, judges and prosecutors may use dwellings from the institutional housing stock of the judiciary

(2019): Persuant to art. 223 of the Judiciary System Act, judges and prosecutors may use housing of the departmental housing fund of the judicial authorities.

Croatia

(2019): Additional benefits was recently introduced by the Law amending the Law on Salaries of Judges and Other Judicial Officials (Official Gazette 16/19).

Czech Republic

(2018): Judges and prosecutors are entitled to obtain housing only if they are temporarily transferred to another court/prosecution office.

(2016): Judges and prosecutors are entitled to obtain housing only if they are temporarily transferred to another court/prosecution office.

Estonia

(2012): On the occasion of the 2012 evaluation, it has been stressed that the salary of judges was increased on 1 January 2013. On the same time, the special pension was abolished for judges who are appointed to office after 30 June 2013, while judges appointed to office before 1 July 2013 retain their special pension.

France

(2020): Pursuant to the provisions of the order of April 5, 2017, establishing the lists of functions of the State services of the Ministry of Justice provided for in Articles R. 2124-65 and R. 2124-68 of the General Code of the Property of Public Persons that may give rise to the granting of a concession of housing by absolute necessity of service or of a precarious occupation agreement with penalty, certain heads of courts and jurisdictions benefit from a precarious occupation agreement with penalty._x000D_
A fee is charged to the beneficiary of this agreement. It is equal to 50% of the real rental value of the occupied premises._x000D_

Greece

(2021): judges, except salary, receive two allowances (Article 30 of N.3205/2003), the faster processing allowance and attendance costs. These are not taxed.Article 6, paragraph 6 subparagraph 4, of the decision numbered A.1275 (B ´6375/31.12.2021) indicating what is not included in the certificates of remuneration(page 81063 of the decision).However, if we are to be legally precise, the correct answer to the Cepej question is no. It is not a reduced taxation,but for sums granted, as to other classes of wage-earners, and they face expenses to which they are subjected for the exercise of their work.

Lithuania

(2019): no other financial bennefit.

Malta

(General Comment): Act 44 Constitutional Reforms (Justice Sector) Act of 2016 also enhanced the independence of the judiciary through the introduction of an adequate pension scheme that respects the service that has been offered by the retired judiciary, as well as their widows/ widowers.
The special pension was introduced in 2016 for the judiciary, so it was not present in the previous cycles and it is not applicable to the lawyers working in the Office of the Attorney General.

(2020): In respect of 'Special Pension' for Public Prosecutors, The Pensions Ordinance, Chp 93 of the Laws of Malta, stipulates a special pension for the Attorney General only.

(2018): Act 44 Constitutional Reforms (Justice Sector) Act of 2016 also enhanced the independence of the judiciary through he introduction of an adequate pension scheme that respects the service that has been offered by the retired judiciary, as well as their widows/ widowers.
The special pension was introduced in 2016 for the judiciary, so it was not present in the previous cycles and it is not applicable to the lawyers working in the Office of the Attorney General.

(2016): Act 44 Constitutional Reforms (Justice Sector) Act of 2016 also enhanced the independence of the judiciary through he introduction of an adequate pension scheme that respects the service that has been offered by the retired judiciary, as well as their widows/ widowers.
The special pension was introduced in 2016 for the judiciary, so it was not present in the previous cycles and it is not applicable to the lawyers working in the Office of the Attorney General.

Netherlands

(2021): SC: Other financial benefits for a regular Supreme Court judge would be a tax free monthly allowance for expenses of 1.502 euro. Please refer to the legislation (https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0008365/2021-07-01) and regulation (https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0031765/2021-01-23) on this subject.

Poland

(2021): 1.A judge/prosecutor who retires or is retired due to age, illness or physical incapacity is entitled to an emolument equal to 75 percent of the basic salary and seniority allowance received at the most recent post.
2) Financial support. A judge/prosecutor may be granted financial support, in the form of a loan, to satisfy their residential needs.
3) Paid health leave. A judge/prosecutor may be granted paid health leave to undergo the prescribed treatment if the treatment requires to refrain from carrying out service. The health leave cannot exceed six months ..
3) Annual additional leave. A judge/prosecutor is entitled to annual additional leave of:
–six business days – after ten years of work,
–twelve business days - after fifteen years of work.
4) Jubilee award. A judge/prosecutor is entitled to a jubilee award . 5) If a judge/prosecutor is posted to a locality other than the locality in which the judge's place of work is located, which is not the judge's place of permanent residence, the judge posted during the period of posting, as an employee on a business trip, is entitled to the following dues, compensating for the inconveniences resulting from the posting outside the permanent place of service: 1) the right to accommodation, free of charge; ; - a monthly lump sum - in an amount not exceeding 78% of the judge's basic salary; - reimbursement of costs of the first journey from the place of permanent residence to the place of secondment, reimbursement of costs of the last journey from the place of secondment to the place of permanent residence and reimbursement of the costs of journeys made not more often than once a week to the place of permanent residence and back under conditions' - a lump sum to cover the costs of travel by means of local transport, - reimbursement of costs incurred for the use of vehicles owned by the employee for business purposes, - reimbursement of costs of daily commuting to the place of delegation;

(2020): 1.A judge/prosecutor who retires or is retired due to age, illness or physical incapacity is entitled to an emolument equal to 75 percent of the basic salary and seniority allowance received at the most recent post.
2) Financial support. A judge/prosecutor may be granted financial support, in the form of a loan, to satisfy their residential needs.
3) Paid health leave. A judge/prosecutor may be granted paid health leave to undergo the prescribed treatment if the treatment requires to refrain from carrying out service. The health leave cannot exceed six months ..
3) Annual additional leave. A judge/prosecutor is entitled to annual additional leave of:
–six business days – after ten years of work,
–twelve business days - after fifteen years of work.
4) Jubilee award. A judge/prosecutor is entitled to a jubilee award . 5) If a judge/prosecutor is posted to a locality other than the locality in which the judge's place of work is located, which is not the judge's place of permanent residence, the judge posted during the period of posting, as an employee on a business trip, is entitled to the following dues, compensating for the inconveniences resulting from the posting outside the permanent place of service: 1) the right to accommodation, free of charge; ; - a monthly lump sum - in an amount not exceeding 78% of the judge's basic salary; - reimbursement of costs of the first journey from the place of permanent residence to the place of secondment, reimbursement of costs of the last journey from the place of secondment to the place of permanent residence and reimbursement of the costs of journeys made not more often than once a week to the place of permanent residence and back under conditions' - a lump sum to cover the costs of travel by means of local transport, - reimbursement of costs incurred for the use of vehicles owned by the employee for business purposes, - reimbursement of costs of daily commuting to the place of delegation;

(2019): retirement
Pursuant to Article 127 § 1 of the Act of 28 January 2016 – The Prosecutor's Office Law in connection with Article 69 -71 and Article 100 of the Act of 27 July 2001 - Law on the system of common courts (Journal of Laws of 2020, item 365, as amended), the prosecutor shall retire when they reach the age of 65, unless, not later than six months and not earlier than twelve months before reaching this age, they declare to the General Prosecutor their willingness to continue holding the position and present a certificate stating that they are able, due to their health condition, to perform their prosecutorial duties, issued on the terms specified for a candidate for the prosecutor's position. A prosecutor shall, at their request, retire, with the right to the emolument referred to in Article 100 § 2 - in the amount of 75% of the base salary and the length of service allowance earned on their last position - after the age of 55 for a woman, if she has worked for not less than 25 years in the position of a judge or a prosecutor, and the age of 60 for a man, if he has worked for not less than 30 years in the position of a judge or a prosecutor. A prosecutor who is a woman shall, at her request, retire after reaching the age of 60, regardless of the period of service as a prosecutor or judge. A prosecutor who retires or is retired due to age, illness or loss of ability shall be entitled to an emolument of 75% of the base salary and the length of service allowance earned on their last position. The emolument shall be increased in accordance with changes in the base salary of active prosecutors. In addition, a retired prosecutor shall be entitled to a one-time severance payment of six months' salary.
Judges and prosecutors are not given housing, but have, for example, the possibility to apply for financial support - in the form of a loan - to meet possible housing needs.

(2016): A judge who retires or is retired due to age, illness or physical incapacity is entitled to an emolument equal to 75 percent of the basic salary and seniority allowance received at the most recent post.
The emolument is icresed in line with changes of the basic solaries of active judges. A judge who retires is entitled to a one-off severance payment in the amount of six months' remuneration.

Romania

(2021): Other financial benefits are essentially related to medical expenses and travel expenses (limited).

(2020): Other financial benefits are essentially related to medical expenses and travel expenses (limited).

(2019): Other financial benefits are essentially related to medical expenses and travel expenses (limited).

(2018): Other financial benefits are essentially related to medical expenses and travel expenses (limited).

Slovak Republic

(2020): The regulation about housing was included in the Decree of the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic no. 293/2019
Coll., which lays down the conditions and scope of reimbursement of increased expenses for traveling of the hosting judge, or the hosting court can offer accommodation for the judge.

(2019): The regulation about housing is newly included in the Decree of the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic no. 293/2019 Coll., which lays down the conditions and scope of reimbursement of increased expenses for traveling of the hosting judge, or the hosting court can offer accommodation for the judge.

Slovenia

(General Comment): There is a possibility for judges, public prosecutors and state attorneys (as well as other public servants in judiciary) to apply for a non-profit tenancy in an apartment, owned by the Ministry of Justice. However, the number of available apartments is very low (less than 0,5% of all functionaries and public servants in judiciary).

(2018): There is a possibility for judges, public prosecutors and state attorneys (as well as other public servants in judiciary) to apply for a non-profit tenancy in an apartment, owned by the Ministry of Justice. However, the number of available apartments is very low (less than 0,5% of all functionaries and public servants in judiciary).

Question 144

Austria

(General Comment): .

(2021): 2 disciplinary proceedings concern administrative judges, it was not possible to distinguish between different subtypes or categories of grounds. Therefore, only the total of disciplinare proceedings can be provide.

(2020): 2 disciplinary proceedings concern administrative judges, it was not possible to distinguish between different subtypes or categories of grounds. Therefore, only the total of disciplinare proceedings can be provide.

(2016): Austria does not differentiate between the categories mentioned above (numbers 1 to 4). Therefore, we can only refer to the number of disciplinary cases as a whole.

Belgium

(General Comment): These are proceedings before the disciplinary courts competent for major sanctions. There is no consolidated register for disciplinary proceedings at the level of the courts or public prosecutor's offices that have resulted in a dismissal or a minor sanction. The disciplinary sanctions applicable to judges and public prosecutors are set out in Article 405(1) of the Judicial Code. According to this article, minor disciplinary sanctions are: a call to order; a reprimand. Major disciplinary sanctions are: reduction of salary; disciplinary suspension; regression in salary scales or loss of the last salary supplement; position downgrade or withdrawal of the mandate referred to in Article 58 bis; ex officio resignation; removal from office or dismissal.

(2014): A new legislation entered into force in September 2014, establishing disciplinary courts. As a result, the number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges decreased between 2012 and 2014.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): Professional inadequacy refers to "systematic non-compliance with the time limits provided for in the procedural laws", "action or inaction that unjustifiably delays the proceedings", "action or inaction that damages the prestige of the judiciary", "Failure to perform official duties".

(2021): Concerning the category "Professional inadequacy": with regard to judges: in 2021, disciplinary proceedings were initiated for culpable failure to fulfil other official duties, resulting in not appearing at work for two consecutive working days. With regard to prosecutors: in 2021, 1 (one) proceeding was instituted for "systematic failure to comply with the deadlines provided for in the procedural laws"; 5 (five) proceedings were instituted for "action or inaction which unjustifiably delays the proceedings".

(2020): Others - 2 / two / disciplinary proceedings have been instituted for culpable non-fulfillment of official duties, expressed in systematic non-observance of the terms, provided in the procedural laws; 1 / one / disciplinary proceeding is instituted for action or inaction, which damages the prestige of the judiciary and 1 / one / disciplinary proceeding is instituted for action or inaction, which unjustifiably delays the proceedings and non-fulfillment of other official duties.
Others - "systematic non-compliance with the time limits provided for in the procedural laws"; "action or inaction that unjustifiably delays the proceedings"; "action or inaction that damages the prestige of the judiciary"; "Failure to perform official duties".

(2018): Other – „ any systematic failure to keep the deadlines provided for in the procedural laws “; „ any act or omission that unjustifiably delays the proceedings“; „any act or omission, which damages the prestige of the Judiciary“; „failure to discharge the official duties“

(2016): "Other": Systematic failure to comply with the deadlines provided for in procedural laws and / or action or omission which unduly slows down proceeding; non-performance of other official duties.

(2014): For 2014, the category “other” refers to “consistent non-observance of the deadlines provided for in the procedural laws”, “action or inaction, which unduly delays the proceedings”, “action or inaction, which undermines the prestige of the judiciary”, “non-observance of the official duties”.

(2012): For 2012, the category “other” refers to “consistent non-observance of the deadlines provided for in the procedural laws”, “action or inaction, which unduly delays the proceedings”, “action or inaction, which undermines the prestige of the judiciary”, “non-observance of the official duties”.

Croatia

(General Comment): Pursuant to the State Judiciary Council, disciplinary offences are: careless performance of judicial office; failure to act pursuant to a decision regarding the right to trial within a reasonable time; performance of any other service or job incompatible with a judicial function; performance of any service, tasks or activities incongruent with judicial office; causing of disruptions in the work of a court which have a significant impact on the exercise of judicial power; disclosure of an official secret concerning the performance of judicial office; damaging of the reputation of the court or of judicial office in any other way; failure to submit a declaration of assets or the untruthful presentation of data in the declaration of assets; failure to subject to the physical and mental evaluation in order to assess the ability to perform judicial duties.

(2021): One disciplinary proceeding against a judge because of damage to the reputation of the court.

(2020): Two disciplinary sanctions against judges because of damage to the reputation of the court.

Czech Republic

(2021): Other: Judges:
- professional incompetence

Prosecutors:
- alcohol consumption

(2020): alcohol consumption

Denmark

(2021): Decorum

(2018): Of the two disciplinary proceedings mentioned regarding judges; one was against a judge and the other was against a deputy judge.
Of the five disciplinary proceedings mentioned regarding prosecutors as "other"; includes 3 breaches of personal data due to loss of documents / files (2) and loss of work computer (1) that was left in court by mistake. Furthermore, it includes incorrect registration of working hours (1) and unacceptable communication with co-workers and leader (1).

Finland

(General Comment): In Finland, anyone who suspects that a public authority or an official has not observed the law or failed to perform a duty may file a complaint with the Ombudsman or with the Chancellor of Justice. Anyone can complain in a matter concerning themself, but a complaint can also be made on behalf of someone else. Most of the complaints initiating disciplinary proceedings do not call for any action. Accordingly, there is a considerable difference between the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings and the number of sanctions.

(2021): Judges: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office registered 254 new proceedings. However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently. Cases that relate to, for example, tax cases in administrative courts, dept recovery proceedings in the district courts, cases in Insurance Court and land cases are filed under the relevant substance matter and not court cases. Therefore, the Ombudsman handles more court related cases that it statistically looks. The Chancellor of Justice received 237 complaints against the general courts, 50 against the administrative courts and 19 against the specialist courts. So in total he received 306 complaints. He also randomly checked 3 930 criminal judgments, out of which 65 were looked at more closely. In addition, he received 31 notifications of suspected crime in office related to a judge. In addition, on his own initiative, he looked into 2 cases related to conduct of the court. Prosecutors: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office registered 107 new proceedings in 2021. However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently and some cases that relate also to prosecutors are filed under the police or court cases. Chancellor of Justice received 85 complaints against the prosecutors in 2021.

(2020): Judges: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office registered 257 new proceedings. However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently. Cases that relate to, for example, tax cases in administrative courts, dept recovery proceedings in the district courts, cases in Insurance Court and land cases are filed under the relevant substance matter and not court cases. Therefore, the Ombudsman handles more court related cases that it statistically looks. The Chancellor of Justice received 274 complaints against the general courts, 67 against the administrative courts and 19 against the specialist courts. So in total he received 360 complaints. He also randomly checked 3 106 criminal judgments, out of which 43 were looked at more closely. In addition, he received 55 notification of suspected crime in office related to a judge. Prosecutors: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office registered 96 new proceedings. However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently and some cases that relate also to prosecutors are filed under the police or court cases.
Chancellor of Justice received 163 complaints against the prosecutors.

(2018): The Parliamentary Ombudsman initiated 199 disciplinary proceedings against judges and the Chancellor of Justice 466 (out of which 356 complaints, 80 disciplinary proceedings initiated after randomly checking criminal judgments and 30 notifications from the police and the courts of appeal to the Chancellor of Justice regarding suspected criminal offences committed by judges). The category 'criminal offence' includes notifications from the police and the courts of appeal to the Chancellor of Justice regarding suspected criminal offences committed by judges. The category 'other' includes all the other cases for which exact data on which grounds they were initiated is not available.
The Parliamentary Ombudsman initiated 47 disciplinary proceedings against prosecutors , The Chancellor of Justice 101 and the Office of the Prosecutor General 37.

(2016): The number of initiated cases was 737 from which 30 was criminal offence. The category other includes all the other cases for which exact data on what ground they ware initiated is not available. Among the 737 disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges or courts, 404 were before the Chancellor of Justice and 333 before the Parliamentary Ombudsman. However, the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was: the Chancellor of Justice: 10, the Parliamentary Ombudsman: 10. In most of the cases no measure is taken.
Total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors were 165 (The Chancellor of Justice: 91, the Parliamentary Ombudsman: 72, the Prosecutor General: 2) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was (The Chancellor of Justice: 5, the Parliamentary Ombudsman: 4, the Prosecutor General: 2) . In most of the cases no measure is taken.

(2014): In 2014, the total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges or courts were 620 (376 by the Chancellor of Justice; 244 by the Parliamentary Ombudsman) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was 28. Likewise, the total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors was 160 (86 by the Chancellor of Justice; 74 by the Parliamentary Ombudsman) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was 7.

(2012): In 2012, the total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges or courts were 642 (372 by the Chancellor of Justice; 270 by the Parliamentary Ombudsman) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was 13. Likewise, the total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors was 173 (87 by the Chancellor of Justice; 786 by the Parliamentary Ombudsman) but the number of complaints effectively followed by a sanction was 4.

France

(2021): The data filled in the table are those of the civil, criminal and administrative justice.
Source: DSJ and Council of State

(2020): Four of these magistrates have been the subject of a procedure of prohibition from exercising their functions (precautionary procedure taken in the interest of the service)_x000D_
Data from the judicial order.

(2014): In 2014, with regard to administrative judges, there was an ethical misconduct (counted in the table).

Germany

(General Comment): Not all Länder collect data on disciplinary measures. Data are available only in individual cases, meaning that no representative result can be reported.

(2021): Five Länder could not provide any data on the disciplinary proceedings and selected "NA". Three Länder reported "0" for all categories (judges and prosecutors). Therefore, no reliable numbers for the whole of Germany are available.
Länder that could provide data, mentiones the following "other" proceedings: Violation of the duty to provide truthfull information toward the employer.

(2020): Violation of the duty to provide truthfull information toward the employer
These figures were provided by the Länder of Baden-Württemberg, Bayern, Brandenburg, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Nordrhein-Westfahlen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Sachsen, Sachsen-Anhalt and Schleswig-Holstein. Other Länder could not provide any relevant data.

(2018): - stating incorrect professional title on social media (Ordinary jurisdiction - judges)
- unspecified (3 cases)
These figures were provided by the Lander of Baden-Württemberg, Bavaria, Berlin, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, North Rhine-Westphalia, Rhineland-Palpatinate, Saxony and Thuringia.

Greece

(2021): The answers given by the courts are either numerical, or that the number of disciplinary procedures is zero or that the data is not available. It is noted that the supreme courts have answered numerically. Regarding the choice other to the above question the answer is the petitions of citizens against judicial officers.

(2020): From the majority of the courts, the answer that has been given is not available.

(2016): "Other": Dismissal due to serious illness: 1 Judge; Inadmissible case: 6 Judges

(2014): According to 2014 data, professional inadequacy is considered to be the delay in issuing decisions.

Hungary

(2021): Other for judges: breach of the rules of court management as a court executive

(2020): Prosecutors: In 3. A crime has been suspected and the cases are still under investigation.
Judges: Other category includes a case when a judge carried out an activity for remuneration that (s)he was not allowed by the law.

(2018): "other": the case covered ethical and professional issues as well

(2016): Prosecutors: "Other" - the authority of the profession is violated or threatened by the prosecutor's conduct or behaviour
Judges: A judge commits a disciplinary breach if he/she violates the obligations stemming from his/her service relationship, or his/her lifestyle and/or his/her behaviour harms or jeopardises the reputation of the judiciary.
"Other": 11 procedures were initiated because of the violation of the obligations stemming from the judicial service; 3 procedures were initiated because of the violation of the obligations stemming from the judicial service and also breaching professional ethics.

(2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been specified that item 3 refers to criminal offences for which a disciplinary action can be ordered pursuant to the UJT, 82 § 1 b) (abusive or threatening lifestyle to the profession prestige).
The sum of the subcategories does not correspond to the total due to the fact that the number of criminal offenses (2) is also included in the third category "professional inadequacy" (3). As a general rule, in case of criminal offense, the disciplinary action can be ordered on the basis of the Law on prosecutors, article 82 §(1) b) (abusive or threatening lifestyle to the profession prestige).

(2012): In 2012, the category “other” included in respect of judges misdemeanour proceedings. Besides, the attention was drawn on the fact that the proceedings encompassed in items 1 and 2 are the same that the proceedings subsumed in items 3 and 4. As to the disciplinary proceeding against a public prosecutor for professional inadequacy, the penalty was imposed in 2013.

Ireland

(2021): The judicial conduct regime as set out in the Judicial Council Act 2019 has not yet commenced. Draft Guidelines on Conduct and Ethics have been submitted by the Judicial Conduct Committee to the Board of the Council in accordance with this legislation and once adopted by the Council as a whole, the relevant sections of the Act may then be commenced. The legislative timeframe provides that adoption by the Council be done by the end of June 2022

(2020): The judicial conduct regime as set out in the Judicial Council Act 2019 has not yet commenced. Draft Guidelines on Conduct and Ethics have been submitted by the Judicial Conduct Committee to the Board of the Council in accordance with this legislation and once adopted by the Council as a whole, the relevant sections of the Act may then be commenced. The legislative timeframe provides that adoption by the Council be done by the end of June 2022

(2018): There is currently no mechanism in Ireland for disciplinary proceedings against judges. The Judicial Council, when established will provide such a mechanism.

Italy

(General Comment): Figures at Q.144 do not include disciplinary proceedings against administrative judges

(2021): The total number of disciplinary proceedings initiated in Italy in 2021 is 148. Unfortunately, we cannot distinguish neither between judges and prosecutors nor by type of proceeding.
In Italy both judges and prosecutors are governed by the same body, and they are seen as a whole (magistrates). For this reason, when it comes to disciplinary proceeding judges and prosecutors follow the same procedures, hence our statistics do not distinguish between judges and prosecutors. For this cycle the High Judicial Council has only provided the total.

(2018): The above figures do not include 2 disciplinary proceedings against administrative judges.

(2016): "Other" refers to disciplinary proceedings which involve more than one category (e.g. "Breach of professional ethics" and "Professional inadequacy").

Latvia

(2020): Other of prosecutors: By 1 July 2020, the public prosecutor had been held to disciplinary action for the commission of an administrative violation, such as non-compliance with road traffic rules.

(2018): Other for prosecutors - A public prosecutor shall not be held liable for disciplinary action for committing a criminal offence, but shall be held liable for disciplinary action for committing an administrative violation, for example, failure to comply with road traffic regulations.

(2016): not intentionally breach of law, but negligence (breach of procedural terms, accidentally has not observed criminal procedure norms or substantive legal norms).

(2014): According to 2014 data and pursuant to the Judicial Disciplinary Liability Law, a judge may be held liable for: intentional breach of law in adjudication of cases – 14 cases in 2014; non-execution of job responsibilities or gross negligence committed during adjudication – 4 cases in 2014; disrespectful action or gross violation of norms of the Code of Judicial Ethics; administrative violations - 4 cases in 2014; refusal to suspend association with political party or political organisation – no cases in 2014; non-observance of restrictions and prohibitions stipulated in the Law on Prevention of Conflict of Interests in Activity of the State Officials – no cases in 2014.
As to public prosecutors, the category “other” encompassed not intentionally breaches of law, but negligence (breach of procedural terms; the prosecutor has accidentally not observed criminal procedure norms or substantive legal norms).

(2012): For 2012, the category “other” referred to reprimands in respect of judges. As to public prosecutors, the same category encompassed not intentionally breaches of law, but negligence (breach of procedural terms; the prosecutor has accidentally not observed criminal procedure norms or substantive legal norms).

Lithuania

(2021): note as a sanction.

(2020): 2 cases where disciplinary proceedings have not been instituted without evidence of disciplinary action, and
1 case when the disciplinary proceedings were terminated without the subject of disciplinary liability (the judge reached seniority and was dismissed).
in two cases a violation (professional inadequacy) was established, but limited to its consideration, no disciplinary proceedings were instituted; two cases (pbreach of professional ethics) were referred to the Juditial Court of Honor.

(2018): Concerning judges: only 2 of the initiated disciplinary proceedings (16) have been brought to the Judicial Court of Honor. Concerning prosecutors: the decrease of the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings (comparing with 2016) was the outcome of the fact that there were received fewer requests to initiate the inspection of prosecutor's activity or to conduct an investigation at the Prosecutor's Ethics Commission.

(2012): In 2012, the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission instituted 9 disciplinary actions (4 on the ground of breach of professional ethics and 5 on the ground of professional inadequacy).

Luxembourg

(2021): Since disciplinary proceedings may also be initiated for acts relating to the magistrate's personal (non-professional) behaviour, the category “other” has been used to take account of such situations.

(2020):
Since disciplinary proceedings may also be initiated for facts relating to the magistrate's personal (non-professional) conduct, the heading OTHER has been used to take account of such situations.

Malta

(General Comment): This data is not available due to issues of professional secrecy.

(2018): This information is not made publicly available.

Netherlands

(2021): Courts: There was one disciplinary proceeding for a replacement-judge (these are usually lawyers, professors, etc. and replace judges when they are absent, ill, etc.), not counted here.
SC: the two disciplinary proceedings concerned a dismissal of a deputy judge. Deputy judges usually perform a main position outside the judiciary. The law has provided for the possibility of the dismissal of a judicial official by the Supreme Court if the judicial officer has not been called upon to perform activities by his or her court leadership for two years. In addition, there should be a sufficiently compelling reason justifying the request for dismissal. In one of the cases, the deputy judge had systematically failed to respond to call notices asking for her availability to perform judicial duties. Nor had she responded to other correspondence. In the other case, the appointment to the position of deputy judge was related to the individual's main position as civil-law notary. Disciplinary measures were imposed on the individual in question. A Disciplinary Court disqualified the individual from acting as a civil-law notary. As a result, this individual lacked authority and credibility. In both cases, the Supreme Court held that there was a sufficiently compelling reason for dismissal.

(2020): A combined integrity issue in work and private life

(2018): private use of a company car

Poland

(General Comment): A judge shall be disciplinarily liable for official (disciplinary) offences, including: - a manifest and flagrant violation of the law; - acts or omissions likely to prevent or substantially impede the functioning of the judicial authority; - actions that question the existence of the official relationship of a judge, the effectiveness of the appointment of a judge or the legitimacy of the constitutional organ of the Republic of Poland; - public activities incompatible with the principles of independence of courts and judges; - offence against the dignity of the office. A judge shall also be held disciplinarily liable for his conduct prior to assuming office if by such conduct he has breached the duties of the state office then held or has proved himself unworthy of the office of judge.
The disciplinary penalties shall be:
- admonition;
- reprimand;
- reduction of the basic salary by 5%-50% for a period from six months to two years;
- a pecuniary penalty in the amount of one month's basic salary, plus the judge's long-service allowance, function allowance and special allowance, payable for the month preceding the issuance of the final sentence; - removal from office (for example, chair of a division) ;
- transfer to another place of employment;
- dismissal of a judge.
A prosecutor is liable to disciplinary action for official (disciplinary) offences, including: - an obvious and gross violation of the law; - acts or omissions which may prevent or seriously obstruct the functioning of the body of justice or the public prosecutor's office; - actions that question the existence of the official relationship of a judge or prosecutor, the effectiveness of the appointment of a judge or prosecutor or the constitutional authority of the Republic of Poland; - public activity incompatible with the principle of independence of the prosecutor; - misconduct on the part of the judge or prosecutor. An act or omission of a prosecutor undertaken exclusively in the public interest shall not constitute a disciplinary offence.
A public prosecutor shall also be liable to discipline for his or her conduct prior to assuming office if he or she has breached the duties or the dignity of the public office then held, or has proved unworthy of the office of public prosecutor.
A public prosecutor shall be liable only to disciplinary action for abuse of freedom of speech in the performance of his or her official duties, constituting a privately prosecutable insult to a party, his or her agent or defence counsel, curator, witness, expert or interpreter.
The disciplinary penalties are:
- admonition;
- reprimand;
- reduction of basic salary by 5% - 50% for the period from six months to two years; - a fine in the amount of one month's basic salary plus the prosecutor's long-service bonus, function bonus and special bonus payable for the month preceding the final conviction; - removal from office;
- transfer to another official position;
- expulsion from the prosecution service.

(2021): "Other": excessive length of the proceedings.
Prosecutors Office: providing information on a common type of disciplinary proceedings is not possible as no statistics are kept in this area. Disciplinary proceedings are carried out at the level of regional public prosecutor's offices by deputies of the disciplinary spokesman.

(2016): The data concern reasons of undertaken disciplinary proceedings agains judges is not available.

Portugal

(General Comment): Judges: the annual report of the High Judicial Council doesn't discriminate the categories of disciplinary proceedings.

Romania

(General Comment): Disciplinary breeches may have only a disciplinary liability. Nevertheless, judges and prosecutors are responsible for criminal acts as any other citizen, according to an ordinary proceeding.

(2021): As previously, in the table above we have indicated the number of disciplinary actions registered in the reference year (2021) before the Sections for judges and prosecutors of the Superior Council of Magistracy in disciplinary matters.
The discrepancies between the number of disciplinary actions and the number of breaches of professional ethics + breaches of the professional inadequacy are due to the fact that one disciplinary action can refer to not only one but more disciplinary offences, as well as to not only one but more magistrates.
The disciplinary offences are expressly regulated under the provisions of art. 99 of the Law no.303/2004 amended and republished in 2018.

(2020): As previously, in the table above we have indicated the number of disciplinary actions registered in the reference year (2020) before the Sections for judges and prosecutors of the Superior Council of Magistracy in disciplinary matters (9 disciplinary cases/disciplinary actions were registered before the Section for Judges of the SCM in disciplinary matters and 9 disciplinary cases were registered before the Section for Prosecutors of the SCM in disciplinary matters).
The discrepancies between the number of disciplinary actions and the number of breaches of professional ethics + breaches of the professional inadequacy are due to the fact that one disciplinary action can refer to not only one but more disciplinary offences, as well as to not only one but more magistrates.
The disciplinary offences are expressly regulated under the provisions of art. 99 of the Law no.303/2004 amended and republished in 2018.

(2018): In the table above we have indicated the number of disciplinary actions registered in the reference year (2018) before the Sections for judges and prosecutors of the Superior Council of Magistracy in disciplinary liability matters.
The inadvertence between the number of disciplinary actions and the number of breaches of professional ethics + breaches of the professional inadequacy is due to the fact that one disciplinary action can refer to not only one but more disciplinary offences, as well as to not only one but more magistrates.
The disciplinary offences are expressly regulated under the provisions of art. 99 of the Law no.303/2004 amended and republished in 2018.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): Criminal offences of judges and prosecutors are not tried at discipilinary proceedings.

(2021): We would like to draw your attention to the judicial reform adopted in the Slovak Republic last (reference) year, which had also an impact on the disciplinary proceedings against judges and public prosecutors. The Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic (SAC) was established on 1 January 2021 and became fully operational on 1 August 2021; the competence to decide on the disciplinary liability of judges and prosecutors was transferred to it. The authority responsible for decision-making on the disciplinary liability of judges until the establishment of the SAC was the disciplinary chambers elected by the Judicial Council of the Slovak Republic. Disciplinary Proceedings Code of the Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic came into force on 1 December 2021. In the absence of this concrete legal regulation of disciplinary proceedings, the disciplinary chambers of SAC were not able to commence their decision-making. The number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges refers to the disciplinary proceedings brought before the SAC since 1 August 2021 and those which were brought before the disciplinary chambers of the Judicial Council from 1 January 2021 till 31 July 2021, were pending as of 1 August 2021 and transferred to the SAC.
The number of disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors refers to the proceeding which was brought before the SAC from 1 August 2021. From 1 January until 31 July 2021, there might have been some other disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors, which were brought before the disciplinary committees appointed by the Prosecutor General - the authority responsible for decision-making on the disciplinary liability of public prosecutors before the establishment of the SAC. None of the cases were transferred to the SAC and the SAC therefore does not have the data or statistics of the decision-making of those disciplinary committees.
Besides the disciplinary proceedings heard and decided by the SAC, there is a possibility to impose a sanction of minor importance to a judge. According to Article 117 paragraph 7 of the Act on Judges, deficiencies in the work/ethics of minor importance can be dealt with by giving a written warning to a judge if this is sufficient. The SAC does not have the competence to collect the information regarding the written warnings unless the judge proposes to invalidate the written warning since the review of those written warnings is carried out by the SAC. In 2021, there were 6 proposals for determining the written warning as invalid brought before the SAC and the disciplinary chambers of the Judicial Council.

(2020): In the line 4. "Other" are counted motions for a declaration that the written warning is invalid.

(2018): In 2018 there were 21 disciplinary proceedings initiated against judges for these reasons:
Professional inadequacy: 19 disciplinary proceedings, e.g. violation of the duties of a judge; a deliberate breach of the judge's duty to decide impartially and impartially; presence in the workplace under the influence of alcohol, narcotic or psychotropic substances; culpable conduct of a judge resulting in delays in court proceedings, Other: 2 disciplinary proceedings for failure to submit the written declaration along with asset declaration

(2016): With respect to the judges the majority of "other" disciplinary proceedings was initiated due to causing the procedural delays (23 cases), filing an application for declaration of invalidity of a written reprimand filed by a judge itself (3 cases) and failure to meet the obligation of standby duty performance duly and timely and failure to meet the obligation of overtime function performance (1 case).

(2014): In 2014, the category “other” included 1 deliberate violation of the obligation to impartial and unbiased deciding, 9 deliberate conducts of judges leading to undue delays, 1 arbitrary decision, 2 repeated committing of a serious breaching of discipline.

(2012): In 2012, there were 19 disciplinary proceedings against judges for professional inadequacy - undue delays in proceedings (10), failure to elaborate the judgments within the statutory time period (3); failure to decide within the statutory time period (3); other breaches of the professional duties (3). As to the category “other”, it encompassed one misdemeanor against the public order.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The Judicial Service Act provides for 27 different types of conduct of judges that represent a disciplinary breach and the state State Prosecution Service Act provides for 31 different types of conduct of public prosecutors that represent a disciplinary breach.

(2016): Judges: Seven disciplinary proceedings were initiated in 2015.
Prosecutors: One disciplinary proceeding was initiated in 2015 for the reason of professional inadequacy.

(2014): o breach of professional ethics: one disciplinary proceeding was initiated in 2014 because of an action or behaviour on the part of the judge that conflicts with the judge’s impartiality or that damages the reputation of the judicial profession and inappropriate, indecent or insulting behaviour or expression towards individuals, organs of the State and legal entities in connection within the judicial service or outside of it;
o professional inadequacy: two disciplinary proceedings were initiated in 2014 because of careless, untimely inappropriate or negligent performance of judicial service;
o criminal offence: one disciplinary proceeding was initiated in 2014 because of commission of an act that has the statutory definition of a criminal offence while holding judicial office.
o “other”: 11 different breaches, such as illegal or irrational use of means of work, abuse of right to absence from work, infringement of the rules on safety at work, infringement of the Court Rules on the use of service uniform etc.; however there were no discipline proceedings corresponding to such breaches in 2014.

(2013): With regard to public prosecutors, to provide a more comprehensive picture it was mentioned that there were 3 disciplinary proceedings initiated in year 2013.

(2012): In 2012 one disciplinary proceeding was initiated against a judge because of an action or behaviour on the part of the judge that conflicts with the judge’s impartiality or that damages the reputation of the judicial profession. The proposal of the disciplinary prosecutor for the pronouncement of disciplinary sanction was refused.
According to the Judicial Service Act, there are 27 types of breach of discipline in respect of judges. For the purpose of these questions, they were divided to 4 corresponding groups:

Spain

(2020): Other Judges: affiliation to a political party or union; unjustified absence; incompatible activity.
Other Prosecutions: lack of consideration; delay.

(2018): The number total in case of Prosecutors expresses the number of information proceedings opened.

(2016): 2 - Delay 1 - To break the regime of incompatible activities (data for Prosecutors)

Question 145

Austria

(General Comment): The difference between the data of disciplinary proceedings/sanctions against judges and prosecutors is mainly a result of the fact that there are much more judges than prosecutors in Austria. The bulk of disciplinary proceedings against judges are conducted on the ground of the long term of making out/transcription of judgments.

(2016): ---

(2012): In the frame of the 2010 and 2012 exercise, it was specified that “other” does apply to conviction and the order for costs of proceedings. Besides, it was stressed that 16 disciplinary (judge) cases were pending, partly because of pending penal cases, partly because of other reasons, while 3 disciplinary (public prosecutors) cases were pending mainly due to pending penal cases.

Belgium

(General Comment): Number of major disciplinary sanctions pronounced by disciplinary courts and disciplinary courts of appeal. There is no consolidated register of minor sanctions (call to order and reprimand) pronounced by local heads of corps.

(2021): Clarification for one case of suspension: it is a one-month suspension with a 3-year carry-over. Sources: the Dutch-speaking Disciplinary court in Ghent, the French-speaking Disciplinary court in Namur, the Dutch-speaking Disciplinary court of Appeal in Brussels and the French-speaking Disciplinary court of Appeal in Brussels
Disciplinary sanctions foreseen by the Judicial Code (Article 405 §1).

(2020): The number of new disciplinary cases may differ from the number of completed disciplinary cases because some cases are completed in a calendar year later than the year the case was opened.

Bulgaria

(General Comment): The temporary suspension from office (temporary suspension of functions) is not a disciplinary sanction, and for that reason the number of such suspensions is not included in the total number of imposed sanctions. The difference between the number of the initiated disciplinary proceedings and the number of the imposed disciplinary sanctions is due to the fact that part of the imposed sanctions are under proceedings, initiated during the preceding reporting period or are imposed by order of the administrative head.

(2021): There is no such sanction "reprimand" in Article 308 of the Judiciary System Act, since the lightest disciplinary punishment is a "remark". With regard to judges: - a total of 6 /six/ disciplinary proceedings, initiated in previous periods, were concluded, and the Judges' College of the Supreme Judicial Council (SJC) ruled on them as follows:
- "remark" penalty imposed - 1 /one/ disciplinary proceeding;
- imposed sanction "reduction of basic remuneration" - 1 /one/ disciplinary proceeding;
- 1 /one/ disciplinary proceeding was terminated
- in 2 /two/ disciplinary proceedings, the proposals to impose a disciplinary penalty were not accepted.
With a decision of the Judges' College of the SJC, the judge's "remark" imposed by order of the administrative head was confirmed.
Regarding prosecutors:
In 2021, a total of 11 (eleven) disciplinary proceedings were concluded, on which the Prosection College of the SJC ruled as follows:
- Imposed disciplinary punishment "remark" - 8 items (the Prosection College of the SJC issued decisions by which it confirmed on the basis of Art. 314, para. 4 of the Judiciary System Act, 8 (eight) orders of administrative heads to impose disciplinary punishment "remark");
- imposed disciplinary penalty "reduction of basic remuneration by 10 (ten) percent for a period of 7 (seven) months" - 1 ";
- in 2 (two) disciplinary proceedings, the collegium did not impose disciplinary punishments, having accepted that in one case the magistrate did not commit a disciplinary violation, and in the other case, due to the absence of committed disciplinary violations;
For the specified period, 4 (four) disciplinary proceedings have been suspended.

(2020): In 2020 a total of 11 / eleven / disciplinary proceedings, initiated in previous periods, have been completed, and the Judges' College of the SJC has ruled as follows:
- imposed penalty "remark"/"reprimand" - 4 / four / disciplinary proceedings /;
- imposed penalty "disciplinary dismissal" - 1 / one / disciplinary proceedings;
- 6 / six / disciplinary proceedings have been terminated.
In 2020, a total of 9 (nine) disciplinary proceedings were completed, on which the Prosecutors' College of the SJC ruled as follows:
- Imposed disciplinary sanction "remark" /"reprimand"- 4;
(The PC of the SJC has ruled, on the basis of Article 314, paragraph 4 of the JSA, on 3 (three) orders of administrative heads for imposing a disciplinary sanction "remark", and 1 (one) disciplinary proceedings on the list of the Supreme Judicial Council was completed with a decision of the PC of the SJC to impose a disciplinary sanction "remark"/"reprimand")
- 2 (two) disciplinary proceedings have been terminated due to dismissal of the magistrate and death of the magistrate;
- in 2 (two) disciplinary proceedings the college did not impose disciplinary sanctions by assuming that in one case the magistrate had not committed a disciplinary violation,and, on the other, that the subjective element of the infringement was missing, since the magistrate could not understand the nature and significance of what had committed and direct his actions during the period in which the acts had been committed;
- imposed disciplinary sanction "reduction of the basic salary by 20 percent for a period of one year" -1.

(2018): Transfer to another geographical (court) location- in our legal system there is no such sanction, but it's possible the position downgrade to lead to transfer to another geographical (court) location. For 2018 there are no such cases.

(2016): There are imposed sanctions "reprimand" and "removal from post of administrative head and deputy administrative head". The disciplinary proceedings initiated in previous years have been completed. "Suspension" is possible when a judge, prosecutor or investigating magistrate is constituted as a party accused of a publicly prosecutable offence but it is not a disciplinary sanction.

(2014): For 2014, the category "other" subsumes the following disciplinary sanctions: reprimand, demotion in rank at the same judicial system body for a term of one to three years, relief from office as administrative head or deputy of an administrative head.

(2012): For 2012, the category "other" subsumes the following disciplinary sanctions: remark and reprimand.

Croatia

(2016): Conditional dismissal

(2014): In 2014, the following disciplinary sanctions have been declared against judges for committed disciplinary acts: suspended sentences of dismissal from office (5), reprimand (1), temporarily salary reduces (11). In 2 cases, disciplinary proceedings ended with a dismissal, while 3 ended with an acquittal.
In 2014, 2 disciplinary sanctions have been declared against State attorneys for the committed disciplinary acts: one relating to the disciplinary proceeding initiated in 2014 and the second relating to the disciplinary proceeding initiated in 2013, which ended in 2014. For this reason, the number of sanctions imposed in 2014 increased in comparison to the number of disciplinary proceedings initiated in 2014.

Cyprus

(2014): In 2014, there were no sanctions pronounced against judges.

Czech Republic

(2021): Other:
Judges:
1 discharging from sanction
1 acquittal of disciplinary charges
1 discontinuance of disciplinary proceeding
3 proceedings are not finished.
Prosecutors: 1 acquittal of disciplinary charges

(2018): Other:
Judges:
1 acquittal of disciplinary charges
2 discontinuance of disciplinary proceeding
1 dismissal of a motion for a new trial
2 proceedings are not finished.
Prosecutors: 1 acquittal of disciplinary charges
1 discontinuance of disciplinary proceeding

(2016): Judges:
1 removing a judge from the office
1 acquittal of disciplinary charges
1 discharge from disciplinary punishment 5 discontinuance of disciplinary proceeding
3 proceedings are not finished.
Prosecutors: 2 acquittal of disciplinary charges.

(2014): In 2014, the following other disciplinary sanctions have been pronounced against judges: 2 discharges from disciplinary punishment; 1 acquittal of disciplinary charges; 6 discontinuances of proceedings. As for public prosecutors, there were 1 acquittal of disciplinary charges and 3 discharges from disciplinary punishment.

(2012): In 2012, the following other disciplinary sanctions have been pronounced against judges: 2 discharges from disciplinary punishment; 4 acquittals of disciplinary charges; 12 discontinuances of proceedings. As for public prosecutors, there were 5 acquittals of disciplinary charges and 7 discharges from disciplinary punishment.

Denmark

(2018): Of the two sanctions mentioned regarding judges; one was against a judge and the other was against a deputy judge. Of the 9 sanctions mentioned regarind prosecturs as other: 2 cases are yet to be resolved. 7 cases were resolved by a meeting between Human Resources and the employee. The meetings were not a reprimand (disciplinary), however the importance of preventing a similar incident in the future was emphasized. The minutes of the respective meetings have been made part of the personal file of the individual employees.

(2016): Prosecutors: In the reference years, there have been two disciplinary proceedings initiated against public prosecutors, but there have not yet been any sanctions pronounced against public prosecutors.

Estonia

(2012): In 2012, one disciplinary proceeding against a judge was initiated but the sanction was not pronounced in 2012.

Finland

(General Comment): Most of the complaints initiating disciplinary proceedings do not call for any action. Accordingly, there is a considerable difference between the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings and the number of sanctions.

(2021): Judges: The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office gave 283 decisions in 2021. Ombudsman has issued a decision with his position on the matter as well as the steps to be taken in 11 cases. One of those was a reprimand and 9 were opinion which can be either guidance (ohjaava) or reprehension (moittiva). In addition, 1 case lead to rectification (korjaus). However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently. Cases that relate to, for example, tax cases in administrative courts, dept recovery proceedings in the district courts, cases in Insurance Court and land cases are filed under the relevant substance matter and not court cases. Therefore, the Ombudsman handles more court related cases that it statistically looks. The Chancellor of Justice issued 33 reprimands and 49 instructions. In six cases he applied the Supreme Court to nullify a decision.
Prosecutors:The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office gave 105 decisions in 2021. Ombudsman has issued a decision with his position on the matter as well as the steps to be taken in 2 cases. Those were guidance (ohjaava).
Chancellor of Justice issued 2 reprimands and 1 other action. The Office of the Prosecutor General publishes summary descriptions of cases where the decision taken by a prosecutor or their action has resulted the Prosecutor General to take action. In 2021 there were 20 of such published cases. More here (in Finnish):
https://syyttajalaitos.fi/kanteluratkaisuja?tab=2020

(2020): Judges:
The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office gave 228 decisions. Ombudsman has issued a decision with his position on the matter as well as the steps to be taken in 16 cases. 12 of those were guidance (ohjaava) or reprehension (moittiva). In 2 cases he gave a recommendation (esitys) and 2 cases lead to other action (muu toimenpide). However, the Parliamentary Ombudsman compiles their statistics slightly differently. Cases that relate to, for example, tax cases in administrative courts, dept recovery proceedings in the district courts, cases in Insurance Court and land cases are filed under the relevant substance matter and not court cases. Therefore, the Ombudsman handles more court related cases that it statistically looks. Chancellor of Justice issued 22 reprimands and 29 instructions. In six cases he applied the Supreme Court to nullify a decision. He notified the Ombudsman of 14 cases concerning the courts.
Prosecutors:
The Parliamentary Ombudsman's office gave 98 decisions. Ombudsman has issued a decision with his position on the matter as well as the steps to be taken in 5 cases. Those were guidance (ohjaava) or reprehension (moittiva).
Chancellor of Justice issued 3 reprimands and 13 instructions. He transferred 1 case to the Ombudsman.
The Office of the Prosecutor General publishes summary descriptions of cases where the decision taken by a prosecutor or their action has resulted the Prosecutor General to take action. In 2020 there were 30 of such published cases. More here (in Finnish): https://syyttajalaitos.fi/kanteluratkaisuja?tab=2020

(2018): The Parliamentary Ombudsman pronounced 11 sanctions against judges and the Chancellor of Justice 36.
The Parliamentary Ombudsman pronounced 4 sanctions against prosecutors, the Chancellor of Justice 3 and the Office of the Prosecutor General 5.

France

(General Comment): Suspension ("temporary ban on performing duties") is a temporary measure, pronounced in case of emergency. It is a measure taken in the interest of the service and is not a sanction as such. It is intended to be followed by a decision on the merits of the case, concerning the disciplinary fault found.

(2021): The data filled in the table are those of the civil, criminal and administrative justice.
Source: DSJ and Council of State

(2020): The disciplinary sanctions applicable to magistrates are: 1° a reprimand with entry in the file; 2° compulsory removal; 3° removal from certain functions; 3° bis prohibition from being appointed or designated as a single judge for a maximum of five years; 4° lowering of step; 4° bis Temporary exclusion from office for a maximum of one year, with total or partial deprivation of salary; 5° Demotion; 6° Automatic retirement or admission to cease his or her duties when the judge is not entitled to a retirement pension; 7° Removal from office._x000D_
Other prosecutor: compulsory retirement_x000D_
Other judge: refusal of honorary status_x000D_
NB: in France, geographical transfer can be combined with another sanction and this was done on 3 occasions in 2020._x000D_
Data from the judicial order

(2014): In 2014, the category "others" includes temporary exclusion from functions without pay for an administrative judge and two "admissions to leave office", sentence close to dismissal.
There is a difference between the number of disciplinary proceedings initiated and the number of sanctions imposed because of procedural delays. Indeed, sanctions are not necessarily imposed the year of referral to the disciplinary body.

(2012): In 2012, another sanction imposed on a public prosecutor is the sanction of "denial of honorary", sanction applicable against retired judges at the time of the disciplinary decision. The disparity between the number of disciplinary proceedings and the number of penalties imposed results in the absence of obligation on the HJC to rule in the year of referral. It should be noted that in 2012, the Minister of Justice withdrew its request for disciplinary proceedings in a case against a judge.

Germany

(General Comment): Not all Länder collect data on disciplinary measures. Data are available only in individual cases, meaning that no representative result can be reported.

(2021): Four Länder could not provide any data on the number of sanctions and selected "NA". Seven Länder reported "0" for all categories (judges and prosecutors). Therefore, no reliable numbers for the whole of Germany are available.
Länder that could provide data, mentiones the following "other" sanctions: expression of disapproval with a warning.

(2020): - dicontinuation of the disciplinary proceeding
These figures were provided by the Länder of Baden-Württemberg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Nordrhein-Westfahlen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Sachsen, and Schleswig-Holstein. Other Länder could not provide any relevant data. This means that some of the Länder who had data on the number of disciplinary proceedings available, could not provide data on the number of sanctions.

(2018): Ordinary jurisdiction: disapproval
These figures were provided by the Lander of Baden-Württemberg, Bavaria, Berlin, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, North Rhine-Westphalia, Rhineland-Palpatinate, Saxony and Thuringia.

Greece

(2021): The answers given by the courts are either numerical, or that the number of penalties is zero or that the data is not available. It is noted that the supreme courts have answered numerically.

(2020): From the majority of the courts, the answer that has been given is not available.

(2016): - Dismissal due to Serious illness: 2 Judges
- Disciplinary offence not committed:5 Judges
- Disciplinary sanction not imposed:2 Judges
- Discussion postponed:5 Judges

(2012): For 2012, the category “other” subsumed 1 repetition of disciplinary proceedings and 1 declaration of a disciplinary action as unacceptable.

Hungary

(2021): Under the Act on Prosecutors, the so-called 'reproof' is a disciplinary sanction less severe than reprimand. In the reference year, 2 cases were ended with reproof. Another less severe disciplinary sanction is the written warning which is given in case of minor disciplinary offences. In the reference year, 8 cases were finished with a written warning. As to the 2 disciplinary cases that ended with dismissal, one case was initiated in 2020 but was finished in 2021.
Judges: Other category includes 4 cases in which the Service Tribunal finished the case without establishing any disciplinary liability of
the judge.
In the light of the coronavirus epidemic, strict protective measures have been introduced within the Hungarian Prosecution Service in order to protect the health of the prosecution staff and to ensure their operational efficiency. A significant part of the increase in disciplinary sanctions indicated by the CEPEJ was due to minor breaches of these protective measures. The disciplinary sanctions listed as possible replies to be indicated in the CEPEJ questionnaire, namely the disciplinary sanctions of 'suspension', 'withdrawal from the case', 'fine', 'transfer to another (prosecution) geographical location' and 'resignation', do not correspond to any of the disciplinary sanctions listed in our Status Act, hence the indicated possible disciplinary sanctions are not applicable. The disciplinary sanctions of ‘downgrading by one pay grade’ and ‘downgrading by two pay grade” corresponding to 'temporary reduction in salary' and ‘downgrading to inferior position or release from managerial position’ corresponding to ‘downgrading of position’ were not imposed in 2021. Nor was the disciplinary sanction of 'withdrawal of an award, including a title, conferred by the Chief Public Prosecutor' applied.

(2020): Prosecutors: In 1. and 10.: one case was initiated in 2019, ie it does not belong to the above 9 proceedings, but due to the issue it had to be included.
Of the 9 proceedings against prosecutors in 2020, three were discontinued, three, as criminal proceedings were also instituted in the case, were suspended, and in 2021 a written warning was applied in 2021 instead of a disciplinary sanction. The remaining two cases are the above-mentioned one-stop and one office-closed procedure.
In the case of prosecutors, no disciplinary proceedings were initiated in a further 11 minor disciplinary cases, and a written warning, which does not constitute a disciplinary sanction, was applied. The reason for the measure was the guilty breach of official duty in 9 cases, and the certification of an act violating or endangering the authority of his profession with his lifestyle and behavior in 2 cases.
Judges: Other category includes 4 cases in which the Service Tribunal finished the case without establishing any disciplinary liability of the judge.

(2018): "Other": In one case the sanction for a court executive was removal from his/her court executive position, altough he/she remained in his/her judicial position. Five cases were finished without any sanction (e.g. the judge resigned before the end of the case).

(2016): Prosecutors: - 2 disciplinary proceedings were completed by using a written warning that was not a disciplinary punishment.
- Other: dismissal as a disciplinary sanction
Judges:
Disciplinary sanctions that may be imposed on judges committing disciplinary breaches: reprimand, censure, demotion by one pay grade, demotion by two pay grades, exemption from the court executive position, motion for dismissal from the judge's position.

(2014): The figure provided for 2014 excludes those who are currently suspending their attorney practice and the so called trainee lawyers (persons who have graduated from law school, work for a law firms but have not passed the BAR exam yet). The figure also excludes the European community lawyers and the foreign legal advisors working in Hungary (the number of such lawyers is insignificant).
In 2014, concerning judges, in 11 cases the proceeding either was dismissed or no sanction was applied against the judge. In respect of prosecutors, in two cases the proceeding was discontinued and in one case it was suspended.

Ireland

(2021): The judicial conduct regime as set out in the Judicial Council Act 2019 has not yet commenced. Draft Guidelines on Conduct and Ethics have been submitted by the Judicial Conduct Committee to the Board of the Council in accordance with this legislation and once adopted by the Council as a whole, the relevant sections of the Act may then be commenced. The legislative timeframe provides that adoption by the Council be done by the end of June 2022

(2020): The judicial conduct regime as set out in the Judicial Council Act 2019 has not yet commenced. Draft Guidelines on Conduct and Ethics have been submitted by the Judicial Conduct Committee to the Board of the Council in accordance with this legislation and once adopted by the Council as a whole, the relevant sections of the Act may then be commenced. The legislative timeframe provides that adoption by the Council be done by the end of June 2022

(2018): There is currently no mechanism in Ireland for issuing sanctions against judges. The Judicial Council, when established will provide such a mechanism.

Italy

(General Comment): Figures at Q.145 do not include sanctions against administrative judges

(2018): The above figures do not include 3 sanctions to administrative judges.

Latvia

(2021): „Other" cases. For judges - no sanction imposed, only examination of the matter. Article 7, para 8 of the Judicial Disciplinary Liability Law: (8) In exceptional cases, the Judicial Disciplinary Committee may restrict themselves to examination of a disciplinary matter at a sitting, without the imposition of a disciplinary sanction. Even without specific sanction this type of decision of the Disciplinary Board is regarded as sanction because the violation is established. The judge has a disciplinary record about this decision
If a significant difference exists between the number of disciplinary proceedings and the number of sanctions, please indicate the reasons: 3 cases: in two cases the case was dismissed: 1) no violation of law; 2) initialization of wrong proceedings (disciplinary instead of administrative); in one case the judge died

(2020): Section 44 of the Prosecutor's Office Law defines the disciplinary sanctions applicable to the public prosecutor: (1) note; (2) reprimand; (3) reduction of the monthly salary of the public prosecutor to 20 per cent for a period not exceeding six months; (4) demotion; (5) dismissal.
The Other column contains a disciplinary sanction - note (Reproof).
Other for judges- as additional sanction was imposed an extraordinary assessment of the professional work of a judge.
One case was terminate, in 4 cases no sanction was imposed.

(2018): Comment for judges - 3 cases pending; 2 cases – examination (discussion) in disciplinary board. Dismissal means that the application for disciplinary proceedings was dismissed. In 2018 there were no cases examined by the Disciplinary court. One appeal was received. Comment for prosecutors - Section 44 of the Prosecutor's Office Law defines the disciplinary sanctions applicable to the public prosecutor: (1) note; (2) reprimand; (3) reduction of the monthly salary of the public prosecutor to 20 per cent for a period not exceeding six months; (4) downgrades; (5) dismissal.
The column "Other" contains a disciplinary sanction - note (Reproof).

(2016): The disciplinary sanctions applicable to the prosecutor by Section 44 of the Office of the Prosecutor Law: 1) an annotation; 2) a reprimand; 3) reduction of the base salary of the prosecutor up to 20 per cent for a period not exceeding six months; 4) reduction in the grade of office; 5) demotion in office; 6) dismissal from employment.
We note that in the box Other is a disciplinary penalty – an annotation.
2 judges received a remark

(2014): In 2014, the examination of 8 cases against judges was postponed to 2015. The other sanctions pronounced included 2 removals from office; 2 remarks; 6 disciplinary cases were dismissed; in one case the Disciplinary Committee confined itself to the examination of the disciplinary case in the sitting of the disciplinary committee. As for public prosecutors, the category “other” referred to annotations.

(2013): For 2012, the category “other” subsumed with regard to judges 1 formal warning; one terminated disciplinary proceeding and disciplinary cases pending in 2013. As for public prosecutors, the same category referred to annotations.

Lithuania

(2020): other for judges - note as a sanction.
other for prosecutors - 6 admonition - the least severe disciplinary sanction, which have been pronounced against prosucutors in 2020.

(2018): Concerning judges: in 2018 the Judicial Court of Honor adopted 2 decisions: in one disciplinary case it was limited to the review of a disciplinary action, in the second - one the part of the case was terminated, in the other part of the case as the sanction a censure (less severe sanction than a reprimand) was pronounced. Concerning prosecutors:
9 admonitions - the least severe disciplinary sanction – have been pronounced against prosecutors in 2018. Disciplinary sanctions that may be imposed on prosecutor in Lithuania (starting from least severe): 1. Admonition (9 in 2018);
2. Reprimand (5 in 2018); 3. Position downgrade (0 in 2018) 4. Dismissal (3 in 2018) The increase of the number of sanctions in 2018 (comparing with 2016) was due to the complexity of the inspections, also investigations carried out by the Prosecutor's Ethics Commission because of the gravity and nature of the violations committed.

(2016): Disciplinary sanctions that may be imposed on prosecutors (starting from least severe):
1. Admonition (6 sanctions pronounced in 2016);
2. Reprimand (2 sanctions pronounced in 2016) ;
3. Qualification rank downgrade (1 in 2016);
4. Position downgrade (1 in 2016);
5. Dismissal (0 in 2016).

(2014): In 2014, the following sanctions have been pronounced against prosecutors: 1 censure; 3 reprimands; 0 qualification rank downgrade; 1 position downgrade; 1 dismissal. There was no qualification rank downgrade.
The Judicial Court of Honour has decided on 5 cases that were initiated by the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission and imposed these sanctions on judges: 1 censure; 2 reprimands. In one case, the Court limited itself to the review of a disciplinary action and with regard to another case, it dismissed the disciplinary action.
It is noteworthy that in 2014, the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission received 272 complaints, out of which 249 requests were refused for examination (lack of motivation, requests for evaluation of judgments or trials, questions that were raised not on judicial ethics). Besides, the Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission has decided on 9 requests of judges to provide consultations on whether some of their actions would be treated as violation of ethics of judges.

(2012): In 2012, the following sanctions have been pronounced against prosecutors: 4 admonitions; 1 reprimand; 2 position downgrades; 2 resignations. There was no qualification rank downgrade.
There were 8 decisions of the Judicial Court of Honour in respect of judges: 3 decisions imposing a disciplinary sanction (censure); 3 decisions limited to the review of a disciplinary action; 2 decisions dismissing the disciplinary action.

Luxembourg

(2021): The law still provides for the penalty of a warning as a first level of sanction as well as compulsory retirement. Disciplinary sanctions against magistrates (judges and prosecutors) are listed exhaustively in Article 156 of the Law on Judicial Organisation. Withdrawal from a specific case, position downgrade and transfer to another geographical (court) location are not included in this list.

(2020): The law still provides for a warning as the first level of sanction, as well as compulsory retirement. Disciplinary sanctions against magistrates (judges and prosecutors) are listed exhaustively in Article 156 of the Law on Judicial Organization. Withdrawal from a specific case, retroaction of position and geographical transfer are not included in this list.

(2018): L'unique procédure entamée contre un magistrat du siège pendant la procédure de référence s'est terminée par une décision de classement émanant de la formation de discipline de la Cour supérieure de justice.

(2016): In 2016 there have been two disciplinary actions. One of the cases was dismissed as not sufficiently founded, in the second case the perpetrator was revoked from office.

Malta

(General Comment): This data is not available due to issues of professional secrecy.

(2018): This information is not made publicly available.

(2016): The only case mentioned above is know because it was leaked to the local media. The magistrate in question was reprimanded by the Commission for the Administration of Justice for breaching the judicial code of ethics.

Netherlands

(2021): Prosecutors – other sanctions: one was handled as a type of complaint, and the other was a conditional dismissal for 2 years.

(2020): Resignation: whether or not at the insistence of the board (head of the court administration). Technically judges cannot be fired, as they are appointed for life.

(2012): In the frame of the 2012 exercise, it has been explained that the sanctions enumerated in items 2 to 7 were not available yet in the Dutch legislation. As to the item “resignation”, it subsumes dismissal upon request -early retirement- on a combination of a work and private related integrity issue. In 2010 and 2012, the only possible disciplinary measures were the written warning (for example, in the case of neglect of the dignity of the office and duties) and the dismissal. A dismissal is possible in the case of damaging a good state of affairs in the administration of justice and in its trust.
In 2012, there were 49 reported suspicions of integrity violations, 41 of them were actually fixed (39 prosecutors were involved). Most integrity violations had to do with improper use of service resources and the crossing of internal rules (e.g. unauthorized recording leave and undesirable use of the internet or social media). There was a rise in the number of suspected and confirmed integrity violations due to the increased awareness around integrity. Furthermore, in 2012, an Integrity Agency (BI-to) started working. It is a national expertise centre with an advisory, stimulating and controlling role in the area of integrity. Besides, in 2012, the renewed code of conduct was introduced focusing on five core values: professionalism, environmental focus, integrity, openness and diligence.

Poland

(2021): other :
- acquittal;
- consideration of the objection to the remark;
- finding guilty and waiving disciplinary sanction;
- Referral to other courts with jurisdiction;
- pending cases;
- uphold the contested order;

Prosecutors Office: statistical data of the Disciplinary Courts at the Prosecutor General's Office

(2020): Penalties of judges-. Data collected from Disciplinary Courts at the Courts of Appeal in Poland. Disciplinary Court at the Court of Appeal in Wrocław - 2 penalties of admonition;
Disciplinary Court at the Court of Appeal in Gdańsk - 1 penalty of a warning; Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeal in Białystok - 5 decisions on discontinuance of proceedings and in one case the penalty was waived;
Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeals in Kraków - 2 pending proceedings; Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeals in Rzeszów - finding of guilt and waiver of punishment;
Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeals in Szczecin - 2 penalties of admonition and 1 proceeding has not been completed yet;
Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeal in Łódź - 1 withdrawal from imposing a disciplinary penalty Disciplinary Court of the Court of Appeals in Warsaw - 1 reprimand;
Disciplinary Court at the Court of Appeals in Lublin - guilt found, penalty waived, transferred according to jurisdiction;

(2018): According to art. 142 par. 1 of the Law on Prosecution Act of 28th January 2016 (published in the Journal of Laws 2017, item 1767 and later amendments) disciplinary penalties include: admonition, reprimand, dismissal from function, transfer to another place of service, dismissal from prosecutorial service. In view of the above mentioned regulation “other type of sanctions” means admonition and dismissal from prosecutorial service.

(2016): 16- number of admonition of judges
1-suspension of increasing the salary of a judge in repose.

Portugal

(2021): Regarding judges, on n.1 (2 sanctions were registered and 6 non registered), on n.9 (2 are sanctions of compulsory retirement and 1 of pension loss)

(2020): According to article 227 (2) of the Public Prosecution Statute, reprimands may not be registered. One of the reprimands applied in the year 2020 was not registered in the individual file of the sanctioned prosecutor.
Some of the sanctions applied in 2020 concern disciplinary proceedings started in 2019. Some of the disciplinary proceedings started in 2020 (Q144) have been filed (2).
With regard to judges, one of the reprimands was registered in the individual file of the sanctioned prossecutor, one was not and the third one is unknowed. Sanction 7 (transfer to another geographical (court) location) was applied as na accessory penalty of the suspension sanction).

(2018): 9. other: compulsory retirement

(2016): For public prosecutors other include temporary inactivity (2) and compulsory retirement (1).
For judges other include compulsory retirement (5)and dismissal (1).

(2014): For 2012 and 2014, the category “other” encompasses mandatory retirements. Sanctions indicated in items 2 and 4 imply salary reduction.

(2012): For 2012 and 2014, the category “other” encompasses mandatory retirements. Sanctions indicated in items 2 and 4 imply salary reduction.

Romania

(General Comment): In the case of breach of the Deontological Code, there is no disciplinary sanction applicable.
According to our legislation (art. 100 of the Law no. 303/2004 modified and republished) the sanctions that may be applied to judges and prosecutors, according to the seriousness of their violations, are the following: warning; decreasing the gross monthly indemnity by up to 25% for a period from one to 3 months; disciplinary transfer for a period from one to 3 years to another court or prosecutor's office, even lover in rank; suspension from office for a period of up to 6 months; position downgrade; exclusion from the magistracy.

(2021): There should be taken into account that the above mentioned data reflect the number of the disciplinary sanctions rendered in the reference year (2021) irrespectively of the year the disciplinary action was registered in, therefore this number is not necessary equal to the number of disciplinary actions registered in 2021, as these sanctions can be rendered for disciplinary actions registered before 2021 while there are also disciplinary actions registered in 2021 but not yet solved before the end of 2021; moreover, most of the decisions are final but there are also several ones are not final yet (the recourse procedure).
“Position downgrade” - this type of disciplinary sanction did not exist and it has been introduced by the Law no. 242/2018.

(2020): There should be taken into account that the above mentioned data reflect the number of the disciplinary sanctions rendered in the reference year (2020) irrespectively of the year the disciplinary action was registered in, therefore this number is not necessary equal to the number of disciplinary actions registered in 2020, as these sanctions can be rendered for disciplinary actions registered before 2020 while there are also disciplinary actions registered in 2020 but not yet solved before the end of 2020; moreover, most of the decisions are final but there are also several ones are not final yet (the recourse procedure).
“Position downgrade” - this type of disciplinary sanction did not exist and it has been introduced by the Law no. 242/2018.

(2018): There should be taken into account that the above mentioned data reflect the number of the disciplinary sanctions rendered in the reference year (2018) irrespectively of the year the disciplinary action was registered in, therefore this number is not necessary equal to the number of disciplinary actions registered in 2018, as these sanctions can be rendered for disciplinary actions registered before 2018 while there are also disciplinary actions registered in 2018 but not yet solved before the end of 2018.

Slovak Republic

(General Comment): The disciplinary judiciary at the Judicial Council of the Slovak Republic consisted of the Disciplinary Boards (senates) and the Disciplinary Boards (senates) of Appeal. The senates were created by the Judicial Council of the Slovak Republic, which supervised them to the extent specified by law. The first instance disciplinary board/senat consists of 3 members - the president of the board has to be a judge, 1 member is a judge and 1 member is experienced legal professional. The appeal disciplinary board consists of 5 members - the president of the tribunal and 2 members have to be judges, 2 members are experienced legal professionals. In the case of the president and the vice-president of the Supreme Court, the role of disciplinary court is performed by the Constitutional court of the Slovak republic.
The disciplinary judiciary exercised its powers in the above mentioned proces from 1st of July 2017 untill 31st of July 2021. From 1st of August 2021, the Supreme Administrative Court of the Slovak Republic is the disciplinary court for judges of the Slovak Republic.

(2021): In the light of the above-mentioned information concerning the judicial reform, there were no sanctions against judges and public prosecutors imposed by the SAC in 2021. The disciplinary chambers of the SAC started the decision-making process in February/March 2022. Due to the de facto inoperability of the disciplinary chambers of the Judicial Council, there were no sanctions against judges imposed by Judicial Council either. Regarding the sanctions against public prosecutors imposed before 1 August 2021, the SAC does not have the data or statistics of the decision-making of the disciplinary committees.

(2020): Prosecutors: In 2020, no disciplinary measure was imposed by the prosecutor, only one disciplinary was legally terminated, namely with the acquittal of the prosecutor. Judges: In the line 4. "Other" are counted suspension of disciplinary proceedings (16) and liberation (2).

(2018): The difference between the number of disciplinary proceedings initiated and the number of sanctions imposed is caused by the fact that not every initiated disciplinary proceedings results in sanction or finding the defendant guilty. The other reason is that some proceedings were not terminated within the same year.

(2016): In relation to the judges the majority of “other” disciplinary proceedings was ended by the judge being acquitted (9 cases), the disciplinary proceedings being terminated (11 cases), the disciplinary sentence being withheld (1 case) or the sanction being pronounced to be invalid (2 cases). There were situations within one disciplinary proceeding of partly deciding one way and partly deciding the other (for example partly imposing a sanction and partly terminating the disciplinary proceedings), therefore the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings differs from the number of sanctions. In relation to the prosecutors the “other” sanctions include suspension of the disciplinary proceedings due to the initiation of public prosecution in criminal proceedings against the prosecutor (1 case), termination of the disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because of lapse of the period of two years since commitment of the disciplinary misconduct (5 cases), termination of the disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because of failure to file an application on time (1 case), termination of disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because of termination of function of the prosecutor accused (2 cases), termination of the disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because of the application being filed by an unauthorised person (1 case), termination of the disciplinary proceedings due to its inadmissibility because the act was not considered to be a disciplinary misconduct (2 cases) and the prosecutor being acquitted (2 cases).
There were situations within one disciplinary proceeding of partly deciding one way and partly deciding the other (for example partly imposing a sanction and partly terminating the disciplinary proceedings), therefore the number of initiated disciplinary proceedings differs from the number of sanctions.

(2014): In 2014, only 6 disciplinary proceedings were resolved with final and conclusive decision. The remaining proceedings were pending. As concerns the category “other”, it subsumed a removal from the office of the vice-president of a court.
It is noteworthy that in 2014, several essential changes of legislation were made regarding disciplinary sanctioning of prosecutors. As a result, ongoing disciplinary procedures took more time and a low number of disciplinary sanctions were imposed.

(2012): In 2012, only 9 cases were decided by the Disciplinary court, the rest of the proceedings being pending. Besides, as regards the category “other”, in 3 cases the motion was withdrawn, while in 1 case the motion was dismissed.

Slovenia

(General Comment): According to the Judicial Service Act, the following disciplinary sanctions are possible: written warning (CEPEJ: reprimand), suspension of promotion (but not position downgrade, therefore CEPEJ: other), wage reduction (CEPEJ: temporary reduction of salary), transfer to another court (CEPEJ: transfer to another geographical (court) location) and termination of judicial office (CEPEJ: resignation). There are no other disciplinary sanctions corresponding to the rest of the CEPEJ categories.

(2021): In 2021, 4 procedures against judges has ended (2 finding alleged offender not responsible and 2 has been stopped due to procedural reasons).

(2020): In 2020, one procedure agains judges has ended (finding alleged offender not responsible).

(2018): Suspension (judges and public prosecutors): In previous campaigns, the answer was “NAP”, as suspension de facto includes withdrawal from cases, but is not a disciplinary sanction strictly speaking. In terms of the Judial Council Act suspension is a temporary dismissal from the judicial service that is related to the conduct of disciplinary proceedings and may last until the adoption of the final decision of the disciplinary court. In the reference year, one judge was suspended.
Other (judges): Cessation/suspension of promotion.
The difference between the number of disciplinary proceedings and the number of sanctions for judges is due to the fact that not all initiated disciplinary proceedings have been finished during the reference year. In the reference year 2018 two disciplinary proceedings were finished: one initiated already in 2017 and one initiated in 2018. Two disciplinary proceedings initiated in 2018 have not been finished in 2018, but only in 2019.

(2016): Judges, other: Cessation/suspension of promotion.

(2012): In 2012 the following sanctions have been pronounced: 1 reprimand because of an unconscious, late, inappropriate or negligent performance of judicial service. There has been no termination of judicial office for a judge on the grounds that he/she is not suitable for performing judicial service.

Spain

(2012): For 2012, the category “other” encompasses disciplinary proceedings resolved without a sanction for the judge.

Question 146

Austria

(2021): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31 December 2021 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at). The data only include lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers, lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers according to the Lawyers’ Directives registered by 31 December 2021. It does not include legal advisors as such a professions/type of service provider does not exist in Austria.

(2017): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2017 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).
The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.238), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (87) registered by 31st of December 2017. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

(2016): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2016 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).
The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.132), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (84) registered by 31st of December 2016. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

(2015): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2015 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.057), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (81) registered by 31st of December 2015. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

(2014): The 2014 data includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (5940), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (80) and trainee lawyers (2072) registered by 31 December 2014. It does not encompass solicitors or legal advisors as such professions do not exist in Austria.

Belgium

(2021): The figures are for the Orde Van Vlaamse Balies, 10 973, and for the Order of the French-speaking and German-speaking Bars, 8 188 as of 1 December 2021: a total of 19 161 lawyers.
Unfortunately, none of the Bars was able to provide figures by gender. The Bars report a stable annual increase. According to the latest "barometers of the profession" carried out by the Bar Associations (in 2018 and 2020), it seems that the legal profession is becoming more and more feminised, and the age pyramid suggests that this feminisation will increase in the years to come.

(2020): For the Order of the French- and German-speaking Bars: 8,160 and for the Orde van Vlaamse Balies (Order of the Flemish Bars) 10715--> total 18,875. According to a recent study (2020), in December 2019, 64.8% of trainee lawyers were women. On the other hand, 57.6% of the lawyers on the roll (who have completed the traineeship) were men. However, if these percentages are compared with those in previous similar studies, it must be concluded that the legal profession in Belgium is becoming more female.

(2019): The data correspond to the number of lawyers registered with the Belgian bars on September 1, 2019, therefore at the start of the judicial year 2019-2020. This number fluctuates during the judicial year.
Number of lawyers registered with Flemish bars: 10,862.
Number of lawyers registered with French and German speaking bars: 8,043.

(2018): 8002 for the French and German-speaking Bar Association
10656 for the Flemish Bar Association (OVB)

(2017): 7 939 lawyers for the French and German-speaking Bar Association on 1 December 2017
10 665 lawyers at the Flemish Bar (OVB)

(2016): 7,930 lawyers for the French- and German-speaking Bar Association on 1 December 2016
10,602 lawyers at the Flemish Bar (OVB)

(2015): As at 1 December 2015, there were 7,882 French-speaking and German-speaking lawyers (avocats.be) and 10,520 Dutch-speaking lawyers (Orde van Vlaamse balies).

Czech Republic

(2020): Data to: 31.12.2020

(2018): Data to: 31.12. 2018

(2017): There are 11587 active lawyers and 1496 inactive.

(2015): From the above mentioned number of lawyers there are 11011 active practising and 1289 temporary inactive.

(2013): In 2013, 10 255 lawyers are practicing in an active manner, while 1 141 lawyers discontinued their practicing.

Denmark

(2021): The figures given above are the number of lawyers at the end of 2021.

(2013): The 2013 data corresponds to the statistical data for September 2014.

(2012): The 2012 data does not include assistant attorneys.

Finland

(General Comment): As of 2014, only attorneys-at-law, public legal aid lawyers and licenced legal counsels are allowed to represent a client in court. In addition, in-house lawyers can represent their company in court. Lawyers working for trade unions can represent a client in a district court and in the Labour Court in disputes regarding employment relationship. Lawyers working for public authorities can represent the public authority in court.
In order to qualify as an attorney-at-law, a lawyer needs to have at least four years of work experience and must pass the demanding three-part professional qualification test known as the bar examination. The titles of attorney-at-law and attorney's office are protected by law and can only be used by lawyers accepted into the Finnish Bar Association. Attorney's offices employ also associate lawyers, that is lawyers who are not yet members of the bar.

(2021): The total number of lawyers includes 2230 attorneys-at-law, 1738 licensed legal counsels and 205 public legal aid lawyers. These lawyers can represent a client in court. The title of attorney-at-law is protected by law and can only be used by lawyers accepted into the Finnish Bar Association.
The total number of in-house lawyers, trade union lawyers and lawyers working for public authorities is not available.

(2020): In 2020, the total number of lawyers includes 2211 attorneys-at-law, 1664 licensed legal counsels and 212 public legal aid lawyers. These lawyers can represent a client in court. The title of attorney-at-law is protected by law and can only be used by lawyers accepted into the Finnish Bar Association.
The total number of in-house lawyers, trade union lawyers and lawyers working for public authorities is not available.

(2019): It is estimated that there are 16.000 people with law degree in Finland – it is no possible to provide an exact number of "legal advisors".
Approx. 4.000 lawyers can represent their clients in Court. These consist of 1631 licensed legal councels, 2177 members of the Finnish Bar Association (attorneys-at-law) and 214 public legal assistants in state legal aid offices.
The Finnish Bar Association states that 66% are men and 34% women. However, 52% of their new members are women.

(2018): In 2018, the total number of 3965 lawyers includes 2143 attorneys-at-law, 1603 licensed legal counsels and 219 public legal aid lawyers. These lawyers can represent a client in court. The title of attorney-at-law is protected by law and can only be used by lawyers accepted into the Finnish Bar Association.
In addition, in-house lawyers can represent their company in court. Lawyers working for trade unions can represent a client in a district court and in the Labour Court in disputes regarding employment relationship. Lawyers working for public authorities can represent the public authority in court. The total number of these in-house lawyers, trade union lawyers and lawyers working for public authorities is not available.

(2017): The total number of lawyers 3,846 includes 2,137 members of the Finnish Bar Association, 1,588 licensed lawyers and 228 public legal aid lawyers. 107 legal aid lawyers were also members of the Finnish Bar Association.

(2016): The number of lawyers indicated for 2012, 2013 and 2014 refers to members of the Finnish Bar Association who are entitled to use the professional titles advokat (advocate). Law firms (firms owned by members of the Bar) employ also associates. Besides, legal aid offices employ also legal advisers who are not all members of the Bar Association. Till 2014, jurists (persons who have a Master's Degree in law) could offer similar legal services than members of the Bar. From the beginning of the year 2014, only advocates, public legal aid attorneys and counsels who have obtained the license referred to in the Licensed Counsel Act are allowed to represent a client in the court.
In 2016,the total number of lawyers 3,791 includes 2,119 members of the Finnish Bar Association, 1,540 licensed lawyers and 229 public legal aid lawyers (97 public legal aid lawyers are also members of the Finnish Bar Association). Only members of the Finnish Bar Association are entitled to use the professional title "advocate".

France

(2021): Source DACS

(2020): source DACS

(2018): data at the date of 1st of January 2018

(2017): Data as at 1 January 2018

(2016): data as at 1 January 2017

(2014): The 2014 data refers to the number of lawyers on 1 January 2015.

(2012): The 2012 data reflects the number of lawyers in January 2012.

Greece

(2019): The number is indicative and constantly changing, in the absence of restrictions on the number of positions.
Source: Plenary Session of the Presidents of Hellenic Bar Associations

(2018): The number is indicative and constantly changing, in the absence of restrictions on the number of positions.
Source: Plenary Session of the Presidents of Hellenic Bar Associations

(2013): The 2013 data corresponds to the total number in the end of December 2013.

Hungary

(2020): A new act on the attorneys (Act LXXXVIII of 2017) entered into force on 1 January 2018.
https://njt.hu/translated/doc/J2017T0078P_20180101_FIN.pdf

(2018): A new act on the attorneys (Act LXXXVIII of 2017) entered into force on 1 January 2018.
https://njt.hu/translated/doc/J2017T0078P_20180101_FIN.pdf

(2017): A new act on the attorneys entered into force, as of January 1, 2018. The next year's report will reflect the changes.

(2016): A new act on the attorneys will enter into force, as of January 1, 2018. The next year's report will reflect the changes.

Ireland

(2021): As of 31 December 2021, there were 11,316 practicing solicitors in Ireland. 5,319 male, 5971 female and 26 undefined. For the undefined classification, this is due to the Society not being provided with information on the solicitor's gender. These statistics include solicitors with a practicing certificate in the Republic of Ireland, including practicing solicitors employed by the State. Reply from the Law Library: total n: 2118; males 1354; female 764. Please note that the numbers above are as at June 2021 and per our Annual Report https://www.lawlibrary.ie/about/governance/annual-report/ The figures only relate to barristers who are members of the Bar of Ireland, and do not include barristers operating outside of the Bar of Ireland. The Roll of Barristers, held by the LSRA, contain that list. Further the above does not include solicitor numbers, which are available via the Law Society of Ireland and the LSRA.

(2020): The above figure is the sum membership of the Bar of Ireland and the Law Society. Total figure includes 24 lawyers with a gender reported as "Unknown".

(2019): This figure represents the current membership of the Bar Council of Ireland and the Law Society of Ireland.

(2018): This figure represents the current membership of the Bar Council of Ireland and the Law Society of Ireland.

(2017): This figure represents the total number of barristers practising as members of the Law Library/Bar of Ireland and the total number of solicitors who held practising certificates for 2017.

(2016): This figure represents the current membership of the Bar Council of Ireland and the Law Society of Ireland.

(2014): The number of lawyers comprises Solicitors and Barristers in the end of December 2014.

Italy

(2013): For 2013, the number of practicing lawyers was not available. The provided figure corresponds to the number of lawyers in 2012, assuming that data should be almost the same for both years.

Latvia

(2017): This number includes sworn advocates and assistants to sworn advocates.

(2013): There were 1 336 sworn lawyers in Latvia on December 31, 2013, of which 70 - assistants to lawyers and 13 - lawyers from other countries. 116 State legal aid providers have been concluded contracts with the Legal Aid Administration about State-guaranteed legal assistance in civil cases, administrative cases, cross-border disputes and provision of out of court legal assistance. State provided legal assistance in criminal matters in Latvia is provided by sworn lawyers, not by legal aid providers.

Lithuania

(2019): There are also 1008 lawyers' assistants (449 males, 559 females). They can provide some legal service but are not included in the number of lawyers above.

(2018): There are also 943 lawyers' assistants. They can provide some legal service but are not included in the number of lawyers above.

(2017): The number is provided by the Lithuanian Bar Association (the number of practising lawyers (advocats) - 2207. Also there are 925 lawyers' assistants who provide legal service).

(2016): The number is provided by the Lithuanian Bar Association (the number of practising lawyers (advocats). Also there are 870 lawyers' assistants who provide legal service also.

(2015): Numbers are taken from the List of Practising Advocates of Lithuania. The list is regulated by the Law on the Bar and administered by Lithuanian Bar Association. The assistants of advocates is not presented in the data.

Luxembourg

(2021): The Diekirch Bar did not provide details on the breakdown of the number of lawyers by gender. Among lawyers registered at the Luxembourg Bar, who represent 98% of the lawyers registered at the two Luxembourg Bars, 52% were male and 48% were female.

(2015): The number indicated includes the number of lawyers, trainee lawyer, lawyers practising under their home-country professional titles and independent lawyers at September 1st, 2016.

Malta

(2021): The answer to Q146 represents the warranted lawyers who have registered themselves in the Register of Legal Professionals and Law Firms as per Act XIX of 2021. As from this evaluation onwards, the number of lawyers quoted will always be sourced from this official register.

(2017): The number of lawyers quoted in this answer refers to the number of warranted lawyers at the end of 2017. This data is based on a list of warranted lawyers practicing in Malta, compiled by the Department of Justice. Work on this list is ongoing but it is important to note that the figure quoted above, reflects a more faithful representation of the number of warranted lawyers in Malta.

(2016): The number of lawyers quoted in this answer refers to the number of warranted lawyers who are also members of the Chamber of Advocates, at the end of 2016. Throughout 2016, the Chamber of Advocates has been updating their list of members in order to clear the names of the lawyers who have either retired or have passed away. Furthermore, it is important to note that at present membership with the Chamber of Advocates, which is the sole Bar Association in Malta, is not mandatory. Hence over the past few months, the Department of Justice is drawing up the first complete list of warranted and non-warranted lawyers in Malta. Work is still underway so it is important to note that the figure quoted above, which is less than that submitted in the previous evaluation, reflects a more faithful representation of the number of warranted lawyers in Malta.

(2015): The number of lawyers quoted in this answer refers to the number of warranted lawyers on the list of advocates at the end of 2015. It is possible that some of these lawyers have retired so whilst the warrant remains valid, it does not necessarily mean that all 1569 lawyers are practising the profession. At present there does not exist any mechanism wherein lawyers register once they are given the Warrant to practice, and membership with the Chamber of Advocates, which is the sole Bar Association in Malta, is not mandatory to practice as a lawyer.

Netherlands

(2021): On 1-1-2021: 17 964 (9 837 male, 8 127 female)

(2020): This is the number of lawyers on 1-1-2021
Number of lawyers on 1-1-2020: 17.829 (total), 9867 (males), 7962 (females)

(2019): Numbers on 1/1/2020

(2017): Annual report NOVA 2017

Poland

(2020): Number of advocates: total: 19954, male- 10513, female - 8845
Incomplete data: No information on sex of 596 advocates;
Number of legal counsels: total: 37411, male - 17746, female - 19665
It is noteworthy that legal advisers have the same powers as advocates.

(2019): It is the total number of legal advisers and advocates.
It is noteworthy that legal advisers have the same powers as advocates.

(2012): Since 2010, the part-deregulation (carried out in 2007/2008) of the lawyer's profession has been implemented and resulted in a major change in the number of lawyers.

Romania

(2020): There is no official explanation due to legal norms, in principle such fluctuations can be registered within the profession, as long as the total number has not registered significant fluctuations.

Slovak Republic

(2016): The number represents all lawyers registered in the list of the Slovak Bar Association.
Out of this number 848 lawyers have their practise suspended.

(2012): The number of practising lawyers is increasing constantly.

Slovenia

(2017): (Male: 939, 798: female).

Spain

(2021): The data are obtained through the General Bar Association Annual Report 2021. On practicing and resident lawyers.

(2020): The data are obtained through the General Bar Association Annual Report 2020. On practicing and resident lawyers.

(2017): Resident Lawyers (Memory of the General Bar Association 2017)

(2016): Resident Lawyers (31 December 2016)

(2015): In civil cases, mainly the legal representation is for Procuradores. In criminal cases, lawyers can assume legal representation until a Procurador is appointed for the case. In administrative cases legal representation is mostly assumed by lawyers. Graduados sociales' (consultants on labour and social security matters) may represent the parties in labour law proceedings. The responses above are given is on the basis that lawyers have a monopoly on practising the defence at Court which, in Spain, is not equivalent to "legal representation".

Question 147

Austria

(2017): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2017 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).
The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.238), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (87) registered by 31st of December 2017. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

(2016): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2016 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.132), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (84) registered by 31st of December 2016. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

(2015): Statistic from the Austrian Bar (Österreichischer Rechtsanwaltskammertag) of 31st December 2015 (available at www.rechtsanwaelte.at).The data only includes lawyers registered in the list of Austrian lawyers (6.057), lawyers registered in the list of established European lawyers (81) registered by 31st of December 2015. It does not include solicitors nor legal advisors as such professions/types of service providers do not exist in Austria.

Croatia

(2020): Not applicable

Cyprus

(2018): This figure represents the Lawyers who are registered and have a license for registering practicing advocates

(2017): the lawyers who do not renew their license are not included in this number

Czech Republic

(2016): There are no legal advisors (as decribed in the question above) in the Czech Republic.

Denmark

(2019): License to practice as an "advokat" is mandatory in Denmark.

Finland

(2019): The Association of Finnish Lawyers, which is the only association in Finland for all lawyers, has approximately 16.000 members. 55% of their lawyer members are women, and 57% of the student members are women. (https://www.lakimiesliitto.fi/liitto/jasenet/)

France

(2019): This category does not exist. The profession of legal adviser was integrated into the legal profession by the law of 31 December 1990. The activity of legal advice is open to certain professionals by virtue of their status but also to other professionals after an approval has been issued by the Ministry of Justice.

Germany

(General Comment): All lawyers in Germany are empowered to plead before court. No distinction is made between different groups of lawyers in Germany, such as between solicitors and barristers. The stated within question 146 include in-house lawyers according to section 46 para. 2 of the Federal Code for Lawyers (Bundesrechtsanwaltsordnung – BRAO). These are persons, who exercise their profession as salaried employees of persons or companies other than lawyers or patent attorneys or in a company for the joint practice of law or patent law. They shall be deemed to be practising as a lawyer if they are working as a lawyer for their employer under an employment agreement The conditions to be met with regard to the requirement “working as a lawyer” are set out in section 46 para. 3. Compared to lawyers, their powers to provide for legal advice and representation in court are restricted according to section 46 para. 5 (restriction to the employer’s legal affairs) and according to section 46c para. 2 BRAO. Like lawyers, in-house lawyers have to be admitted to the legal profession by the competent regional bar association. There are 22 765 in-house lawyers admitted to the legal profession in Germany. In addition to lawyers, certain other individuals may also appear in court as legal advisers but there are no statistical data on these individuals.

(2021): See the general comments

(2020): See the general comments

(2019): See the general comments

Greece

(2021): All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.

(2020): All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.

Hungary

(General Comment): Legal advisors (jogtanácsos) facilitate the functioning of the organisation by which they are employed. They conduct legal representation within the organisation, provide legal advice and information; prepare applications, contracts and other documents; participate in organising legal work. As a general rule, legal advisors, in contrast to attorneys, discharge their duties (which are not as extensive as those of attorneys) as employees. Their compensation is based on the regulations concerning employment. Any person entered in the register maintained by the county court in Budapest can become a legal advisor. Besides, applicants must hold citizenship in one of the member States participating in the Agreement on the European Economic Area; have no criminal record; hold a university degree; have passed the Hungarian professional examination in law.

(2020): Legal advisors (jogtanácsos) facilitate the functioning of the organisation by which they are employed. They conduct legal representation within the organisation, provide legal advice and information; prepare applications, contracts and other documents; participate in organising legal work. As a general rule, legal advisors, in contrast to attorneys, discharge their duties (which are not as extensive as those of attorneys) as employees. Their compensation is based on the regulations concerning employment. Any person entered in the register maintained by the county court in Budapest can become a legal advisor. Besides, applicants must hold citizenship in one of the member States participating in the Agreement on the European Economic Area; have no criminal record; hold a university degree; have passed the Hungarian professional examination in law.

Ireland

(2021): Traditionally, solicitors in Ireland could only represent their clients at the District Court and Circuit Court and would be required to engage a barrister to advocate on behalf of their clients at the higher courts. However, this has changed in recent years, and practicing solicitors are now entitled to a rights of audience and may argue cases at all courts. More information is available here:
https://mcmahonsolicitors.ie/parties/#:~:text=Originally%2C%20only%20barristers%20had%20rights,majority%20of%20Circuit%20Court%20cases.
https://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/justice/courtroom/solicitors.html

Latvia

(2017): According to Advocacy Law of the Republic of Latvia in accordance with the procedures specified by this Law, the following persons may work as advocates in Latvia:
1) sworn advocates;
2) assistants to sworn advocates;
3) citizens of European Union Member States who have obtained the qualification of an advocate in one of the European Union Member States (hereinafter - advocates of European Union Member States).
Foreign advocates, except for advocates of European Union Member States, may practice in Latvia in accordance with the international agreements on legal assistance binding to the Republic of Latvia. Solicitors, in-house counsellors and others is an unregulated profession in Latvia and consequently is not counted, controlled or otherwise supervised.

Lithuania

(2015): Numbers are taken from the List of Practising Advocates of Lithuania. The list is regulated by the Law on the Bar and administered by Lithuanian Bar Association. The assistants of advocates is not presented in the data.

Netherlands

(2017): NA

(2016): NA.

Slovenia

(General Comment): Persons entered in the directory of the Bar Association of Slovenia are only lawyers (and not other legal experts, in-house counsellors etc.)

Question 148

Bulgaria

(2019): With a comment that legal advisors, other legal educated staff at institutions, businesses, legal entities and sole traders who are hired employees represent only their employer in court ("as a client")

(2018): With a comment that legal advisors, other legal educated staff at institutions, businesses, legal entities and sole traders who are hired employees represent only their employer in court ("as a client").

Croatia

(2020): Not applicable

Czech Republic

(2016): There are no legal advisors (as decribed in the question 147) in the Czech Republic.

Denmark

(2019): This number include lawyers who have deposited their Danish license to practice as a lawyer. The number is limited to persons born after the 1st of October 1954. Please note that all lawyers have a degree in law (cand.jur), but to practice law in Denmark as an "advokat", lawyers need a license. Lawyers without a license are not included in the number.

Estonia

(General Comment): Data on the number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court is not collected.

Finland

(2018): The exact number of legal advisors who cannot represent their clients in court is not available.

France

(2021): Source DACS

(2018): There is no regulated profession in France for lawyers who cannot represent clients in court.

Greece

(2021): All lawyers can be legal advisers and therefore have the right to be represented in court.

(2020): All lawyers can be legal advisors therefore they have the right to represent their clients in court.

(2019): All lawyers can be legal advisors therefore they have the right to represent their clients in court.

(2018): All lawyers can be legal advisors therefore they have the right to represent their clients in court.

(2016): All lawyers can be legal advisors therefore they have the right to represent their clients in court.

Ireland

(2021): Solicitors may represent their clients in all court. However, many prefer to engage a barrister to do so on behalf of their client particularly in the higher courts. The Society is not aware of any exact figure of legal advisors who are prevented from representing their clients in court.

Latvia

(2017): Solicitors, in-house counsellors and others is an unregulated profession in Latvia and consequently is not counted, controlled or otherwise supervised. Also, for example, Civil Procedure Law provides that in some case categories/the Supreme Court persons can conduct cases by themselves or with the intermediation of an advocate. Due to this it is not possible to count persons who cannot represent their clients in court.

(2016): There was a mistake in last cycle. Not all legal advisors can represent their clients in court, for instance, in criminal cases only sworn advocate can represent their clients in court.

Malta

(General Comment): This data was not available prior to 2014. It started being collected by the Department of Justice in 2015.

(2021): Throughout 2021, 4 new applications have been submitted out of which 3 were accepted.

(2019): Throughout 2019, only 5 EU legal professionals were granted the respective certificate of registration with the limitation that they cannot represent their clients in court. Many more applications are pending evaluation.

(2018): The figure of 135 legal advisors is derived form the composite of 101 legal advisors at the end of 2017 and 34 new applications throughout 2018. hence at the end of 2018, there were 135 legal advisors who could practice with an established lawyer in Malta but cannot represent clients in court.

(2017): In 2017, there have been 25 newly registered legal advisors.

Poland

(2019): "0" in principle, however: 4078 advocates and 10449 legal advisers - because of their non-practition.
Non-practitioners who have not lost their qualifications but who are registered on the list of non-practitioners, cannot provide services to clients, including representation in courts.

Portugal

(2021): We do not have this figure in Portugal.

(2020): We do not have this figure in Portugal.

Slovak Republic

(2018): Slovak legal order does not regulate this type of legal advisors.

(2017): The Slovak legal system does not recognize this kind of legal advisors.

Indicator 8: The existence and use of alternative dispute resolution methods

Table 8.1 Number of accredited or registered mediators for court related mediation (absolute values and per 100 000 inhabitants) from 2012 to 2021 (Q1, Q166)

States	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021	
	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.	Absolute number	Per 100 000 inhab.
Austria	2 400	28,4	2 400	28,3	2 456	28,6	2 313	26,6	2 562	29,3	2 234	25,4	2 273	25,8	1 692	19,0	1 741	19,5	1 645	18,3
Belgium	1 134	10,2	1 157	10,4	1 352	12,1	1 457	12,9	1 454	12,8	1 744	15,3	2 122	18,6	2 399	21,0	2 577	22,4	2 463	21,3
Bulgaria	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Croatia	406	9,5	406	9,6	453	10,7	474	11,3	549	13,2	588	14,3	612	15,0	632	15,6	673	16,7	706	18,2
Cyprus	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	388	3,7	442	4,2	421	4,0	589	5,6	620	5,9	660	6,2	657	6,2	589	5,5	669	6,3	686	6,5
Denmark	127	2,3	124	2,2	151	2,7	147	2,6	143	2,5	135	2,3	143	2,5	142	2,4	143	2,4	143	2,4
Estonia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
France	NA	NA	2 435	3,7	2 450	3,7	2 571	3,9	2 940	4,4	2 940	4,4	1 436	2,1	NA	NA	2 542	3,8	2 542	3,8
Germany	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Greece	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1 665	15,4	1 809	16,8	1 665	15,5	2 553	23,8	NA	NA	2 985	28,0
Hungary	12	0,1	20	0,2	120	1,2	160	1,6	174	1,8	174	1,8	153	1,6	203	2,1	141	1,4	150	1,5
Ireland	35	0,8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Italy	NA	NA	NA	NA	19 266	31,7	21 555	35,5	23 612	39,0	23 932	39,6	24 010	39,8	23 875	39,6	23 804	40,2	24 944	42,3
Latvia	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	24	1,2	38	1,9	43	2,2	46	2,4	52	2,7	48	2,5	50	2,6	50	2,7
Lithuania	47	1,6	47	1,6	109	3,7	129	4,5	269	9,4	366	13,0	469	16,8	392	14,0	552	19,7	663	23,6
Luxembourg	110	21,0	130	23,6	135	24,0	110	19,5	173	29,3	144	23,9	198	32,3	227	36,3	238	37,5	245	38,0
Malta	69	16,3	69	16,1	61	13,9	61	13,5	66	14,3	69	14,5	67	14,1	67	13,6	66	12,8	71	13,8
Netherlands	820	4,9	927	5,5	1 187	7,0	1 409	8,3	1 466	8,6	1 511	8,8	1 002	5,8	935	5,4	865	4,9	803	4,6
Poland	NA	NA	-		NA	NA	-		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4 120	10,7	4 100	10,7	4 102	10,8
Portugal	255	2,4	250	2,4	196	1,9	221	2,1	514	5,0	617	6,0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	4 136	19,4	10 847	54,4	6 833	30,7	11 701	59,2	5 080	25,9	4 739	24,3	4 585	23,6	11 234	57,9	11 259	58,7	3 075	16,2
Slovak Republic	633	11,7	846	15,6	1 068	19,7	1 248	23,0	1 450	26,7	1 664	30,6	913	16,8	798	14,6	877	16,1	909	16,7
Slovenia	347	16,9	341	16,5	311	15,1	292	14,1	281	13,6	272	13,2	276	13,3	267	12,7	258	12,2	245	11,6
Spain	NA	NA	-		1 151	2,5	3 289	7,1	NA	NA	5 302	11,4	6 939	14,8	7 710	16,3	8 896	18,8	9 921	20,9
Sweden	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Average	728	9,9	1 363	13,0	2 097	11,9	2 654	14,1	2 392	14,4	2 576	14,4	2 643	14,8	3 216	17,4	3 303	17,0	2 966	15,8
Median	347	9,5	406	9,6	437	8,9	532	9,8	585	13,0	660	13,2	785	14,9	715	14,3	769	14,4	803	16,2
Minimum	12	0,1	20	0,2	24	1,2	38	1,6	43	1,8	46	1,8	52	1,6	48	2,1	50	1,4	50	1,5
Maximum	4 136	28,4	10 847	54,4	19 266	31,7	21 555	59,2	23 612	39,0	23 932	39,6	24 010	39,8	23 875	57,9	23 804	58,7	24 944	42,3
Nb of values	27	27	27	25	27	27	27	26	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA	26%	26%	19%	20%	19%	19%	15%	15%	19%	19%	15%	15%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%	15%	15%
% of NAP	19%	19%	19%	20%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%

Table 8.2(EC) Number of court related mediation procedures (absolute values) in 2021 (Q167)

States	EC Code	Total number of mediation cases (total 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6)	1	2	3	4	5	6
			Civil and commercial cases	Family cases	Administrative cases	Employment dismissal cases	Criminal cases	Consumer cases
Austria	20	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	2	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	13	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	448	NA
Denmark	4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	26	2 219	801	1 242	NAP	176	NAP	NA
France	10	NA	NA	NA	2 208	NA	NA	NA
Germany	5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	8	2 286	402	208	2	0	1 674	0
Hungary	17	929	138	770	1	20	NAP	NA
Ireland	7	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	12	NA	83 256	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	15	584	350	210	7	14	NAP	2
Luxembourg	16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	51	NA
Malta	18	1 821	7	1 814	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	19	2 015	NA	NA	NA	NA	787	NA
Poland	21	32 580	15 785	9 017	NA	3 717	4 061	NA
Portugal	22	NA	1 083	246	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	23	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	25	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	892	NA
Slovenia	24	2 418	2 055	NA	NAP	363	NAP	NA
Spain	9	9 640	912	3 287	NA	2 600	2 841	NA
Sweden	27	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA
Average		6 055	10 479	2 099	555	984	1 536	1
Median		2 219	857	1 006	5	176	892	1
Minimum		584	7	208	1	0	51	0
Maximum		32 580	83 256	9 017	2 208	3 717	4 061	2
Nb of values		27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA		67%	63%	70%	52%	63%	48%	85%
% of NAP		0%	0%	0%	33%	11%	26%	7%

Table 8.3 Number of court related mediation procedures (per 100 000 inhabitants) in 2021 (Q1, Q167)

States	EC Code	Total number of mediation cases (total 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6)	1	2	3	4	5	6
			Civil and commercial cases	Family cases	Administrative cases	Employment dismissal cases	Criminal cases	Consumer cases
Austria	*20*	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA
Belgium	*1*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bulgaria	*2*	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NAP	NA
Croatia	*11*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cyprus	*13*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Czech Republic	*3*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,3	NA
Denmark	*4*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Estonia	*6*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Finland	*26*	40,0	14,4	22,4	NAP	3,2	NAP	NA
France	*10*	NA	NA	NA	3,3	NA	NA	NA
Germany	*5*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greece	*8*	21,4	3,8	1,9	0,0	0,0	15,7	0,0
Hungary	*17*	9,6	1,4	7,9	0,0	0,2	NAP	NA
Ireland	*7*	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Italy	*12*	NA	141,2	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA
Latvia	*14*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Lithuania	*15*	20,8	12,5	7,5	0,2	0,5	NAP	0,1
Luxembourg	*16*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,9	NA
Malta	*18*	352,8	1,4	351,5	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Netherlands	*19*	11,5	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,5	NA
Poland	*21*	85,5	41,4	23,7	NA	9,8	10,7	NA
Portugal	*22*	NA	10,5	2,4	NA	NA	NA	NA
Romania	*23*	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NAP	NA	NA
Slovak Republic	*25*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16,4	NA
Slovenia	*24*	114,8	97,5	NA	NAP	17,2	NAP	NA
Spain	*9*	20,3	1,9	6,9	NA	5,5	6,0	NA
Sweden	*27*	NA	NA	NA	NAP	NA	NA	NA
Average		75,2	32,6	53,0	0,9	5,2	9,3	0,0
Median		21,4	11,5	7,7	0,1	3,2	7,9	0,0
Minimum		9,6	1,4	1,9	0,0	0,0	4,3	0,0
Maximum		352,8	141,2	351,5	3,3	17,2	16,4	0,1
Nb of values		27	27	27	27	27	27	27
% of NA		67%	63%	70%	52%	63%	48%	85%
% of NAP		0%	0%	0%	33%	11%	26%	7%

Indicator 8: The existence and use of alternative dispute resolution methods

comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by country

Question 166. Number of accredited or registered mediators for court-related mediation:

Question 167. Number of court-related mediations:

Austria

Q166 (2019): The list of mediators started in 2004; registration is always limited for a specific period: five years after the initial registration and ten years for continuation of an existing registration. Many mediators registered in 2004, applied for continuation of the registration in 2009 but did not do so in 2019. This explains the significant drop in registered mediators.

Q166 (2015): Q166
http://www.mediatorenliste.justiz.gv.at

Q168
Sec. 198 – 209 CPC

Q167 (2021): Datewarehouse (register data of the case management application “Verfahrensautomation Justiz”). There is no data available if the settlement agreements are the results of court-related mediations. Parties may agree on a settlement agreement without mediation.

Q167 (2020): Datewarehouse (register data of the case management application “Verfahrensautomation Justiz”). There is no data available if the settlement agreements are the results of court-related mediations. Parties may agree on a settlement agreement without mediation.

Belgium

Q166 (General Comment): A mediator may receive several accreditations. The Federal Mediation Commission determines the criteria for the accreditation of mediators under Articles 1726 and 1727 § 6 of the Judicial Code.

Q166 (2021): Data provided by the Federal Mediation Commission: https://www.cfm-fbc.be/fr.
The difference (in figures) with the previous cycle is explained in particular by the removal of mediators who are no longer up to date with their continuing training obligation.
Mediation Barometer 2021 (some figures and trends), link:
https://www.cfm-fbc.be/sites/default/files/content/explorer/slides_barometer_-_fr.pdf
A mediator may receive several accreditations. The Federal Mediation Commission determines the criteria for the accreditation of mediators under Articles 1726 and 1727 § 6 of the Judicial Code.

Q166 (2020):
"The difference in the number of mediators compared to the previous cycle is explained in particular by the removal of mediators who are no longer up to date with their continuing education obligation.
As of 31/12/2020, 2577 mediators are accredited by the Federal Mediation Commission (CFM) and more than 3400 accreditations with this same CFM (some mediators having in fact several accreditations in family, civil and commercial, social, administrative matters).
The difference (as for the figure) with the previous cycle is explained in particular by the striking off of mediators who are no longer up to date with their obligation of permanent training.
"

Q166 (2019): The number of accredited mediators in 2019 was 2,399. The number of approvals (by type of civil litigation) granted to mediators: 3,177, including 2,178 to women and 999 to men.
A mediator can be accredited in family matters as well as in civil and commercial matters. S/he may have one or all of the accreditation (family, civil and commercial, social affairs, mediation with public authorities). So one mediator is not equal to one acreditation.
Q166 (2018): 2122 accredited mediators with 2788 accreditations granted, 907 for male mediators and 1881 accreditations for female mediators
Q166 (2017): Information on mediation: http://www.mediation-justice.be

Q166 (2016): Information on mediation: http://www.mediation-justice.be

Q166 (2015): number of médiators at 13/10/2016

Q166 (2012): 2012: the competence over the court houses is transferred from the federal level to the authorities.

Q167 (2021): The Federal Mediation Commission does not have data on the number of court related mediation procedures.

Q167 (2020): We do not have figures on the number of mediations per year in Belgium.

Q167 (2017): Federal Mediation Commission

Q167 (2016): There are no official statistics

Q167 (2014): In 2014, there has been 2 763 resolved criminal mediation procedures.

Q167 (2012): In 2012, the number of mediation proceedings initiated in criminal matters was 6 352, according to the 2012 annual activity report of the Directorate General of the Court House. The number of resolved mediation proceedings in criminal matters was 2 800, according to the College of Public Prosecutors.

Bulgaria

Q166 (2021): The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of June 2022 the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 2929 (for 2021 the number of newly registered is 214).
Q166 (2020): The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of July 2021 the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 2767 (for 2020 the number of newly registered is 233).
Q166 (2019): The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). At the end of 2019 the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 2419.

Q166 (2018): The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of May 2019 the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 2311 (for 2018 the number of newly registered is 250).
Q166 (2015): Number of registered mediators is 1501 up to 31.12.2015.

Croatia

Q167 (2021): Ministry of Justice and Public Administration

Cyprus

Q167 (2020): court registry

Czech Republic

Q166 (2021): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 359 probate and mediation officials and 327 mediators in non criminal cases.
Q166 (2020): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 356 probate and mediation officials and 313 mediators in non criminal cases.
Q166 (2019): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 347 probate and mediation officials and 242 mediators in non criminal cases.
Q166 (2018): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 429 probate and mediation officials and 228 mediators in non criminal cases. The number of mediators is increasing since the Ministry of Justice supports broader use of other criminal sanctions which are alternatives to imprisonment such as house arrest.
Q166 (2017): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 421 probate and mediation officials and 239 (from this number 211 active and 28 inactive) mediators in non criminal cases. The number of mediators in non criminal cases is constantly increasing since the entry into force of a law on judicial mediation in civil matters in 2012.

Q166 (2016): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 398 probate and mediation officials and 222 mediators in non criminal cases. The number of mediators in non criminal cases is constantly increasing since the entry into force of a law on judicial mediation in civil matters in 2012.

Q166 (2015): From the mentioned number of mediators there are 381 probate and mediation officials and 208 mediators in non criminal cases.
The number of mediators in non criminal cases is constantly increasing since the entry into force of a law on judicial mediation in civil matters in 2012.

Q167 (2021): Probation and Mediation Service

Q167 (2020): Probation and Mediation Service

Q167 (2019): There could be three types of outcomes: 1. settlement agreement - 659
2. partly settlement agreement (e.g. with one victim and not with the other one) - 64
3. non-agreement - 45
Source:Probation and Mediation Service

Q167 (2018): There could be three types of outcomes: 1. settlement agreement - 602
2. partly settlement agreement (e.g. with one victim and not with the other one) - 48
3. non-agreement - 31
Source:Probation and Mediation Service

Q167 (2017): Mediation in criminal cases is mostly voluntary. The decrease in the number of mediations is mainly due to the decrease in the number of cases in the pre-trial proceedings to which Probation and Mediation Service (PMS) has entered. The enters of probation officers into the pre-trial proceedings is mostly dependent on the available capacities of the staff PMS that they can allocate for the selection, the preparing and the implementation of mediation. PMS and her employees are overloaded by the control of alternative sanctions such as probation and community sanctions, which they are delegated directly by the court. This causes a decreasing of the enters into the pre-trial proceedings and thus a decreasing of the numbers of mediations. Source:
Probation and Mediation Service

Q167 (2016): Probation and Mediation Service

Denmark

Q166 (2021): The number of registered attorneys who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2021 is 53. The number of registred jugdes who serves as mediators in court mediation in 2021 is 90.

Q166 (2020): The number of registered attorneys who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2020 is 53. The number of registred jugdes who serves as mediators in court mediation in 2020 is 90.

Q166 (2018): The number of registered judges who serve as mediators in court mediation in 2018 is 86. The number of registered attorneys
who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2018 is 57.

Q166 (2017): In 2017 there are 57 registered attorneys and 78 judges with a special mediation education as of 1st July 2017. There is a different process of appointment. Judge mediators go through a special education, and registered attorneys must file a job application to become mediator. There we have updated numbers for judge mediators. Attorneys are appointed every 4 years and the last appointment window was in 2016. The number of attorneys is therefore the same as last year. Source: http://www.domstol.dk/saadangoerdu/retsmaegling/Documents/Liste%20over%20advokatmaeglere.pdf

Q166 (2016): The number of registered judges who serve as mediators in court mediation in 2016 is 86. The number of registered attorneys who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2016 is 57.

Q167 (General Comment): Data above all relates to the district courts. The two High Courts also mediate a small number of cases, but due to data problems from a new system to deal with civil cases, the Western High Court wrote in their annual report, that they were unable to see from the system how many cases they had where mediation was used. Therefor Danish Court Administration ignores the two High Courts. There are data breaches as to see when a case surpasses to mediation. In the new Civil system that was introduced gradually from September 2017 to February 2018, data on surpasses can only be seen when the case is finalized. Before we could see it when the case surpassed to mediation. The transition does not give problems to measure finished mediation as in both the new and the old civil system, a mediation is finished when it is finished. The data breach gives some problems to measure number of finished court-related mediations as this figure is combined by finished cases and cases where mediation was abandoned. The abandoned cases are first measured when the cases are finished in the court system with a court decision and not when they were first abandoned. In the figure for “number of finished court-related mediations”, Danish Court Administration has ignored cases where the parties did not meet at least one time. Danish Court Administration have 5 so-called private criminal cases. In Denmark, there is no procedure for mediation of criminal cases, but private criminal cases may be mediated. Private criminal cases are cases where private legal entities (people or companies) sue others for criminal offenses. It seems that earlier data are only data of mediation where the mediation ended up with an agreement. Now the questions from CEPEJ both include start of mediation, finished court-related mediation and number of cases where an agreement is obtained.

Q167 (2021): https://www.domstol.dk/media/0sxivq1d/retsmaegling-2021.pdf
Data above all relates to the district courts. In the Civil system can only be seen when the case is finalized. Before we could see it when the case surpassed to mediation. The abandoned cases are first measured when the cases are finished in the court system with a court decision and not when they were first abandoned. In the figure for “number of finished court-related mediations”, Danish Court Administration has ignored cases where the parties did not meet at least one time.

Q167 (2020): Data is not available.

Q167 (2019): Please note that the definitions have been changed. Mediation is now measured when the case is finalized. So the number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation is therefore the same as the number of cases of finished court-related mediations. It should also be noted that it is not a possibility in general to mediate a criminal case. What is included here is ONLY criminal cases dealt with in the Civil court.

Q167 (2017): The figures in the table relate only to judge mediations.
Total amount of cases that has been transferred to a mediation process in 2017 is 1130 (both judge and attorney mediations). Mediation in district courts is 1031. Mediation in appeal courts is 99. The number for the appeal courts does not state what type of case. Question 1+2+3+4+5 is therefore only completed with district courts numbers. 528 of the 1130 cases has been finalized with an agreement due to mediation. Source:
http://www.domstol.dk/om/talogfakta/statistik/Documents/Civile%20sager/2017/Civile%20sager_byretter%202017%20-%20retsmægling.pdf and statistics from the Danish Court Administration
Concerning the sub-category "criminal cases" the data refers to privately prosecuted criminal cases which are subject to the same process as civil cases (acc. the Justice Administration Act § 989). This means that mediation will be offered in this type of criminal cases as well.

Q167 (2016): At the level of district courts, 548 cases are finalized with an agreement. The total encompasses also 40 cases before the two High Courts. The source concerning "Civil and commercial cases" and "Family cases" is the Danish Court Administration. Please note that a focus area and project for the Courts of Denmark in 2015 and 2016 was ADR. Desired outcomes were to extend people’s knowledge of ADR as an alternative to court rulings and orders, to lower the case processing time and to reach better solutions. The project identified 3 main action areas: more cases should be settled through judicial mediation, uniformity in the process prior to the settlement of a case through ADR and knowledge of ADR is disseminated both internally and externally in the courts. The implementation and communication during and after this project has increased public awareness and the increase in the number of mediation proceedings is a results of these efforts.

Q167 (2014): In 2014, as regards the number of administrative cases and employment dismissals cases, these are included in the category “civil cases”. Judicial mediation procedures are not available in Denmark for criminal cases. Only the number of successful mediation proceedings is indicated within the table. The number of proposed mediation proceedings was the following: civil cases: 518; family cases: 294.

Q167 (2012): In 2012, in the district courts there were 962 mediation cases divided in civil cases and family cases. In addition,the two high courts had 185 mediation cases (included in the total) which are not divided per category. Only the number of successful mediation proceedings is indicated within the table. The number of proposed mediation proceedings was the following: civil cases: 600; family cases: 338.

Estonia

Q167 (General Comment): Data on the number of court-related mediations are not recorded in any information system and are therefore not available.

Finland

Q166 (General Comment): In Finland there is no accreditation or a register for court-related mediators, all mediators being trained in a special training program for mediation.
Q166 (2019): In Finland there is no accreditation or a register for court-related mediators. All mediators are trained in a special training program for mediation.
Q167 (General Comment): Consumer cases are not statistically specified. The number of cases in which consumers are involved, are included in the number of the civil and commercial cases.
Q167 (2021): National Courts Administration and the Le-gal Reg-is-ter Cen-tres (ORK) / Case management database of the District Courts
Q167 (2020): National Courts Administration

Q167 (2019): The National Courts Administration is currently working on improving the method of calculating the numbers related to mediation. Therefore, the numbers given this year are not strictly compatible with last years numbers. With this new calculation method the number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation would in 2018 have been 2255 cases. The number of finished court-related mediations includes cases in which the mediation has started before 2019 and which have been concluded 2019. The number of civil and commercial cases include all other cases than those in the section 2 and 4 in which the parties agreed to start mediation. Consumer cases are not statistically specified. The number of cases in which consumers are involved, are therefore included in the number of the civil and commercial cases. Number of cases in which there is a settlement agreement include only the cases in which full settlement has been reached. However, it is typical that there are partial settlements. So, the number of of settlements in total, including cases in which there is a partial settlement (and some minor issue t.eg legal costs has been forwarded back to civil proceedings) is 1773.

Q167 (2018): The number of finished court-related mediations includes cases in which the mediation has started before 2018 and which have been concluded 2018.

France

Q166 (2021): 2854 of which 2542 are natural persons, the others are legal persons
source SADJAV
Q166 (2020): "There are also 312 legal persons
These data concern only civil mediation and come from the SADJAV and the DACS. The increase in the number of mediators registered on the lists of mediators established by the seond instance courts is indicative of the development of the use of alternative dispute resolution methods and more particularly mediation.
The Ministry of Justice strongly encourages mediators to register on these lists. Registration on the lists of mediators with the second instance courts obeys certain conditions as mentioned in the decree n°2021-95 of January 29, 2021 amending the decrees n°2017-1457 of October 9, 2017 relating to the list of mediators with the second instance court. In addition, the mediator wishing to be registered must provide, in support of his application, supporting documents attesting in particular to his training (decree of January 29, 2021 fixing the list of supporting documents to be provided for registration on the list provided for in article 22-1 A of law n°95-125 of February 8, 1995 relating to the organization of the jurisdictions and to civil, criminal and administrative procedure). A verification of his or her criminal record is also carried out.
These requirements help to ensure the minimum guarantees (training, impartiality, independence and verification of criminal status) required of a mediator recommended by the courts. Finally, the mediators registered on these lists have a better visibility since the litigants are led to go to the lists of the second instance court to find a mediator (https://www.justice.fr/r%C3%A9gler-litiges-autrement/m%C3%A9diation).
A mediator recommended by the justice is, moreover, a guarantee of confidence for the litigants. "

Q166 (2018): The data are approximate because they have been compiled manually from the lists of mediators at the courts of appeal, published and provided for by article 8 of Act No. 2016-1547 of 18 November 2016 on the modernization of 21st century justice and partial because the service is still waiting for the publication and/or registration of 13 lists, on 05 June 2019. It is recalled that in the French judicial system, the judge remains free to appoint a mediator who does not appear on the lists drawn up by the courts of appeal. Indeed, these lists are intended for the information of the judge.

Q166 (2016): Except for the profession of family mediator for which a diploma is required, the profession of mediator in civil and commercial matters is not regulated and there is no national register of mediators. Nevertheless, it is possible to consider as registered: mediators in criminal matters entrusted with tasks by public prosecutors (312), justice conciliators who are volunteers and selected by judicial bodies (1958), and the family mediators empowered by the family allowances funds (670). Data is not presented in full time equivalent.

Q166 (2015): Accredited mediators are family mediators, criminal mediators and legal conciliators, who work in courts or are subsidised by the family allowance funds.

Source: Ministry of Justice, General Secretariat, Sub-Directorate of Statistics and Studies, Access to Law and Victim Assistance Unit

Q167 (General Comment): In criminal matters, mediation does not strictly speaking lead to a settlement. In fact, in the event of successful mediation, the public prosecutor's office will close the case on the grounds of successful "criminal mediation". If the mediation fails, the prosecutor's office takes over the prosecution, based on the opportunity principle, and can decide to prosecute the perpetrator in court.

Q167 (2021): It is useful to recall here that a voluntary project has been launched in the field of mediation at the initiative of the judge before the administrative courts, with each court having to reach a quantified objective of mediations proposed by the judge and accepted by the parties (but without any obligation to see these mediations lead to an agreement, which the court does not control. The objective is, over the period 2019-2022, to reach approximately 2000 mediations initiated by the judge before the administrative courts (i.e. approximately 1% of the entries of the TA and CAA).
As regards administrative justice, the data come from the Council of State.

Q167 (2020): "We have started a voluntarist project in the field of mediation at the initiative of the judge before the administrative jurisdiction, each jurisdiction having to reach a quantified objective of mediations proposed by the judge and accepted by the parties (but without obligation to see these mediations leading to an agreement, which the jurisdiction does not control. The objective is, over the period 2019-2022, to reach about 2000 mediations initiated by the judge before the administrative courts (i.e. about 1% of the entries of the TA and CAA).
Source : highest administrative Court "

Q167 (2018): Statistics 2017 for family mediation
General Secretariat of the Council of State for Administrative Affairs
For successful criminal mediation (alternative procedures to prosecution), the data in 2018 are 7656, down from 2016, which had 9894 data, without any explanation on this evolution. In labour law cases, there are 8220 resolved cases after conciliation between the parties.

Q167 (2017): General Secretariat of the Council of State

Germany

Q166 (General Comment): Germany does not have a system of accreditation or registration for mediators. In addition, there is no statistical data available on the number of court annexed mediation cases. For these reasons, Germany cannot provide information on the number of accredited or registered mediators who practice judicial mediation.

Q166 (2018): Germany does not have a system of accreditation or registration for mediators. In addition, there is no statistical data available on the number of court annexed mediation cases. For these reasons, Germany cannot provide information on the number of accredited or registered mediators who practice judicial mediation.

Q166 (2017): Germany does not have a system of accreditation or registration for mediators. In addition, there is no statistical data available
on the number of court annexed mediation cases. For these reasons, Germany cannot provide information on the number of accredited or registered mediators who practice judicial mediation.

Q166 (2016): Germany does not have a system of accreditation or registration for mediators. In addition, there is no statistical data available on the number of court annexed mediation cases. For these reasons, Germany cannot provide information on the number of accredited or registered mediators who practice judicial mediation.

Q167 (2014): Statistics on the situation given in the Federal Republic exist only for court-internal mediations/proceedings before a conciliation judge. The latter have been performed in 2013 before the civil courts, family courts, administrative courts, labour courts, social courts, and finance courts. Judges sitting on court-internal mediation proceedings have no authority to hand down a decision. However, the statistics on the situation given in the Federal Republic do not reflect any cases in which parties are instructed to pursue out-of-court mediation.

Greece

Q166 (2021): Of the 2985 mediators active are 2963.

Q166 (2020): There is no relevant information regarding the data.

Q166 (2019): The interest of people to acquire the status of mediator increased in 2019 without any special or official reason.

Q167 (2021): Question 167 was answered by justStat of the Ministry of Justice.

Q167 (2020): In question 167 it is impossible to collect statistics for the following reasons. If it is a mediation of law 4640/2019, the minutes are not submitted to any public authority or file, but to the competent courts and are probably not recorded in a file. It is much more impossible to distinguish between such cases. In the case of judicial mediation under Article 214b of the Code of Civil Procedure, this information can only be gathered by the competent courts.

Q167 (2017): As mentioned in Q163-1, the substantial application of Law 4446/2016 started to take effect during 2017, therefore, there were 1782 judicial mediations in administrative cases.

Hungary

Q166 (2016): There is a continuous training for court secretaries and judges in the field of mediation so that is the reason for the increasing number. To be registered as a court mediator one must finish this training (organized by the National Office for the Judiciary).
Q166 (2014): The increase in the number of judicial mediators between 2013 and 2014 is a result of constant training organized by the National Office for the Judiciary.
Q166 (2013): Registered mediator can be any natural or legal person, who complies with the legal requirements (concerning university degree, mediation training etc.). According to the relevant legislation (Act LV of 2002 on Mediation) mediators established in other EEA Member States (i.e. living in the European Economic Area) can act in a current case in Hungary. The foreign mediator should inform the Ministry of Justice, which shall specify the rights for one year.

Q167 (2021): Consumer cases are included in category 1 "civil and commercial cases".

Q167 (2020): Consumer cases are included in category 1 "civil and commercial cases".

Q167 (2019): Administrative cases (nr.3.) and consumer cases (nr.6.) are included in category civil and commercial cases (nr.1.)
Q167 (2018): Consumer cases are included in the category "civil and commercial cases".
National Office for the Judiciary

Q167 (2016): National Office for the Judiciary

Ireland

Q166 (2014): 2014: Reforms are also under consideration. Legislation is being prepared to promote mediation as a viable, effective and efficient alternative to court proceedings thereby reducing legal costs, speeding up the resolution of disputes and relieving the stress involved in court proceedings. It is anticipated that a Mediation Bill will be published in 2015 with a view to enactment of the legislation quickly thereafter.
Q167 (General Comment): In Ireland we don't have court ordered mediation, as per section 16 of the Mediation act 2017: Courts may invite parties to attend mediation (but it is not mandated or ordered). For this reason, and in the absence of the establishment of the mediation council, there is currently no central area for recording data on mediation. When the mediation council is established, we hope we can provide this data.

Italy

Q166 (2018): The above figures refer to public mediators who deal with civil and commercial mediation procedures. Therefore these figures do not include mediators in family matters (818) nor in consumer cases.
Q166 (2016): The number of accredited mediators is destined to grow. Probably at a lower growth rate.

Q167 (General Comment): In Italy one party may initiate a mediation procedure and the other party may decide to take part to it or not. To clarify things, please consider that in 2021 in Italy 267.270 mediation proceedings were initiated. Both parties showed up at the first mediation meeting in 83.256 cases. Please also note that these figures refer to private mediation. For some matter subjects the mediation is mandatory and it is managed by private mediation companies. Please note that the above figures refer to mediation procedures monitored by the Ministry of Justice. In Italy, there is a plethora of different forms of ADR procedures and some are not so widespread. Court-related mediations do exist for both family cases and labour cases but such mediation proceedings are not monitored by the Ministry of Justice. In 2020 the procedures subject to mediation were extended to the disputes related to COVID.

Q167 (2020): Mediation is not provided for administrative justice (NAP). The other forms of mediation are provided by bodies external to the judiciary (e.g. Corecom) and therefore they do not fall under the control/vision of the Ministry of Justice. In 2020 the numbers are deeply affected by the Pandemic. If we look at the first half of 2021, we can already see a “recovery” in this respect.

Q167 (2019): In Italy one party may initiate a mediation procedure and the other party may decide to take part to it or not. To clarify things, please consider that in 2019 in Italy 256.311 mediation proceedings were initiated. Both parties showed up at the first mediation meeting in only 72.664 mediation proceedings. Please also note that these figures refer to private mediation. For some matter subjects the mediation is mandatory and it is managed by private mediation companies. Please note that the above figures refer to mediation procedures monitored by the Ministry of Justice. In Italy, there is a plethora of different forms of ADR procedures and some are not so widespread. Court-related mediations do exist for both family cases and labour cases but such mediation proceedings are not monitored by the Ministry of Justice.

Q167 (2018): Figures for this question cannot be compared between 2018 and previous years. The current answer reflects the way the question has been rephrased compared to 2016. In 2016 it read “Number of judicial mediation procedures” whereas in 2018 it was changed into “Number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation”.In Italy one party may initiate a mediation procedure and the other party may decide to take part to it or not. To clarify things, please consider that in 2018 in Italy 258.786 mediation proceedings were initiated. Both parties showed up at the first mediation meeting in only 76.569 mediation proceedings. Please also note that these figures refer to private mediation. For some matter subjects the mediation is mandatory and it is managed by private mediation companies. Please note that the above figures refer to mediation procedures monitored by the Ministry of Justice. In Italy, there is a plethora of different forms of ADR procedures and some are not so widespread. Court-related mediations do exist for both family cases and labour cases but such mediation proceedings are not monitored by the Ministry of Justice; this is why they were not considered in 2016.

Q167 (2017): Please amend the "Civil and commercial case" time series as follows:
Year 2014: 295010
Year 2015: 300455
Year 2016: 269988
Year 2017: 263263
The figures provided during the last few years did not include all mediation agencies. In particular, there was one mediation agency which was not included in our analysis because it was considered (from a statistical perspective) an outlier. After an investigation of the inspection body we recognize that there are no ground to keep this agency out of the analysis.

Q167 (2016): The Department of Statistics and Organizational Analysis (within the Ministry of Justice) periodically publish reports on mediation procedures on its website:
https://webstat.giustizia.it/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/Analisi%20e%20ricerche/forms/mediazione.aspx
The latest reports are available in English as well.
The 2016 data has been up-dated in order to reflect data from all mediation agencies in Italy (the previous data (183977) did not include one mediation agency).
Q167 (2014): The Department of Statistics and Organizational Analysis of the Ministry of Justice periodically publishes reports on mediation procedures on its
website:https://webstat.giustizia.it/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/Analisi%20e%20ricerche/forms/mediazione.aspx

Q167 (2012): The Department of Statistics and Organizational Analysis of the Ministry of Justice periodically publishes reports on mediation procedures on its
website:https://webstat.giustizia.it/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/Analisi%20e%20ricerche/forms/mediazione.aspx

Latvia

Q166 (2021): Source for question no.166 – website of Council of Certified Mediators https://sertificetimediatori.lv/mediatori/

Q166 (2020): Data are available only about certified mediators. According legislation there can be practicing mediators and certified mediators. The former is a natural person selected freely by the parties who have agreed to conduct mediation while the latter, is a mediator who, in accordance with the procedures laid down in the laws and regulations, has acquired mediation and received a certificate which gives him/her the right to be included in the list of mediators.

Q166 (2019): Data are available only about certified mediators. According legislation there can be practicing mediators and certified mediators. The former is a natural person selected freely by the parties who have agreed to conduct mediation while the latter, is a mediator who, in accordance with the procedures laid down in the laws and regulations, has acquired mediation and received a certificate which gives him/her the right to be included in the list of mediators.

Q166 (2015): Variation of the number of mediators is constant since every year new mediators pass the exam and become certified mediators
Q167 (2020): Source for question 166 – Council of Certified Mediators (https://sertificetimediatori.lv/mediatori/)

Q167 (2018): Ministry of Justice

Lithuania

Q166 (General Comment): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country and the development of the application of mediation might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.
Till 1st January, 2019 National Couts Administration have been maintained the list of court mediators which included judges and other persons (not judges). Due to a change in legal regulation (from 1st January, 2019), National Courts Administration maintains only the list of Judges who have been granted the status of mediators (Article 5 (2) of the Law on Mediation of the Republic of Lithuania) and transmits this data to the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service. The latter maintains the common list of mediators and decides on the status of mediator for persons who are not judges. The mentioned list is published on the website of the The State Garanteed Legal Aid Service (Article 5 (6) of the Law on Mediation). It is to notice that court-related mediation in practice is more often executed by mediators judges however the mediators who are not judges are also allowed to mediate at this stage when they are appointed by the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service.

Q166 (2021): from 2021 January 1 all mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania have the right to conduct judicial mediation in both civil and administrative cases.
Q166 (2020): In 2020 the list contained 438 mediators not judges (of which 100 males and 338 females), and 114 mediators judges (of which 27 males and 87 females).
The Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania, implementing the project co-financed by the European Union Structural Funds No. 10.1.4-V-922-01-005 "Development of the Conciliation Mediation System", taking into account the expansion of the Institute of Mediation and the consequent increased need for mediators, initiated the organization of training for mediators, during which a total of 420 persons (320 people were trained in the training of 40 academic hours, 100 people took part in the training of 24 academic hours).
This training took place in May – October, 2019. All participants signed a contract for the provision of training services, one of the conditions of which was the obligation to register to take the qualification exam for mediators and to come to take it. Due to the fact that the Training Participants' Agreement did not provide for the obligation to pass the mediators' qualification examination but to come to take it, the Ministry of Justice did not collect information on the proportion of trainees who passed the mediators' qualification examination, but the persons who took part in this training were very active in applying for the qualification examination for mediators. There were also cases when those who did not pass the mediator qualification exam for the first time registered to take the exam again six months later.
October – November in 2020 specialized training for mediators on the topic “Mediation in family disputes in the presence of signs of domestic violence” was organized on the order of the Ministry of Justice. A total of 60 mediators participated in the training. These training were intended to improve the qualification of mediators in disputes where are possible signs of domestic violence, therefore only mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania and having signed agreements with the State Guaranteed Legal Aid Service on the provision of compulsory mediation services could participate in.
It is noteworthy that the organized training, which were free of charge for their participants, increased the number of mediators in both 2019 and 2020. In this context, it would not be appropriate to compare the increase between 2019 and 2020 .

Q166 (2019): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.
Till 1st January, 2019 National Couts Administration have been maintained the list of court mediators which included judges and other persons (not judges). Due to a change in legal regulation (from 1st January, 2019), National Courts Administration maintains only the list of Judges who have been granted the status of mediators (Article 5 (2) of the Law on Mediation of the Republic of Lithuania) and transmits this data to the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service. The latter maintains the common list of mediators and decides on the status of mediator for persons who are not judges. The mentioned list is published on the website of the The State Garanteed Legal Aid Service (Article 5 (6) of the Law on Mediation). On 31 December, 2019 the list contained 286 mediators not judges (of which 71 males and 215 females), and 106 mediators judges (of which 25 males and 81 females).
It is to notice that court-related mediation in practice is more often executed by mediators judges however the mediators who are not judges are also allowed to mediate at this stage when they are appointed by the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service.

Q166 (2018): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.

Q166 (2017): The number of the mediators could increase due to the more effective spread of the information about the judicial mediation.
Q166 (2016): Judicial mediation is becoming more popular, efforts made by the judiciary and the National Courts Administration, as well as the legislator, resulted in an increased number of mediators.
Q166 (2015): National Courts Administration, data of the Activities report of 2015 of the Commission of the Judicial Mediation (http://www.teismai.lt/data/public/uploads/2016/03/teismines-mediacijos-komisijos-2015-m.-veiklos-apibendrinimas.pdf)

The main reforms that have been implemented over the last two years in judicial mediation:
From the 1st January 2015 the judicial mediation is available in all the courts of general jurisdiction. Before it was only available in courts, who participated in the pilot project. It is only available in civil cases. The judicial mediation is free of charge and parties may choose the judicial mediator from the List of Judicial Mediators (the List of Judicial Mediators is available at website https://e.teismas.lt/lt/public/teismin%C4%97-mediacija/). Judges, assisstants of judges, lawyers, psichologists and other persons of different background are on the List of Judicial Mediators.

The peculiarity is that judges can also have the status of judicial mediator. The parties may choose the judge, who deals with the case (if she/he has the status of judicial mediator) to act as judicial mediator. If a peaceful agreement is reached in such a case he/she has also the power to validate it.
Parties may also choose the judge of the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court of Lithuania to deal with their dispute, which is heard by the court of lower instance, i.e. the dispute, which arose in the court of first instance, can be dealt with by the judge of the higher court.
In order to secure the impartiality of a judge, the judge, who was dealing with the dispute as judicial mediator has an obligation to opt out from the case at later stage.

In order to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Judicial Council has also decided, that judges in every case should decide on suitability of the case for judicial mediation. It was also decided to set at least 4 hours of trainings on judicial mediation in the training programmes of judges.

National Courts Administration has implemented the EU project on e-services in administration of justice in 2015. During the project, management of the process of judicial mediation was created in the Information System of Lithuanian Courts LITEKO. Parties have a possibility to make a statement in the claim or other document on judicial mediation, the judicial mediator can access the case via electronic means, can arrange the judicial mediation session via electronic means, the parties can discuss on a peaceful agreement, can sign and deliver it to the court via electronic means, i.e. E-Service Portal of Lithuanian Courts (https://e.teismas.lt/en/public/home/).

Q166 (2014): One of the reasons explaining the increase of the number of judicial mediators in 2014 is that from 1st January, 2015 new regulations on judicial mediation came into force, which set stricter requirements for candidates to judicial mediators (requirement for longer trainings (32 hours instead of 16 hours), requirement to attend the meetings of the Judicial Mediation Commission). Therefore persons, who wished to act as judicial mediators hurried to deliver their documents before the 1st. January, 2015, so that their request would be considered under rules, which were valid before 1st. January, 2015.

Q167 (2021): family, labor and consumer cases are civil cases, so the number of cases in these respective categories is subtracted from the total number of civil cases. LITEKO
Q167 (2020): Observing the general trend of court proceedings, it can be seen that in 2020, compared to the previous year, the number of family law cases (due to divorce, child support, etc.) decreased significantly: 15,709 cases were examined (18,066 in 2019; 18,564 in 2018). It is believed that it was mandatory mediation (the requirement to initiate mediation proceedings in such cases before applying to the court for the settlement of a family dispute) that allowed to reduce the number of cases in court and court-related mediations.
The decrease in the number of completed mediation proceedings in 2020 compared to the previous year is thought to be due to an overall decrease in the number of court cases received (the number of civil cases heard in district and regional courts (I instance) decreased by 6% in 2020 compared to 2019 and was 13.646% less than in 2018). The reduction in numbers may also have been influenced by the restrictions imposed following the quarantine in the country following the COVID-19 pandemic, the lack of court hearings and judicial mediation proceedings.

Q167 (2019): As a result of mediation publicity campaigns conducted by the Ministry of Justice, the National Judicial Administration and other entities, those who go to court have more and more information about the possibility of resolving a dispute amicably through judicial mediation. Participants in the proceedings receive an explanation of the possibility to use judicial mediation together with the procedural documents. Judges also explain the essence of mediation to the parties in the cases before them and suggest the use of judicial mediation procedure (such an obligation is enshrined in law).
On 1 March 2019 the provisions of the Law on Administrative Proceedings of the Republic of Lithuania entered into force, enabling administrative disputes to be resolved with the help of judicial mediation. Judicial mediation is possible for an administrative dispute that allows the parties to enter into an amicable settlement under the law.
In order to positively assess the contribution of judges to the promotion of judicial mediation processes and the involvement of judges in judicial mediation, in 2019 the procedure for evaluating the performance of judges has been updated, which provides that during the evaluation of a judge's performance he may be awarded a certain amount of points for his activities as a mediator, the number of cases transferred to mediation by the judge is also taken into consideration.
It should be noted that family, labour cases and consumer cases, as well as civil and commercial cases, are heard by courts of general jurisdiction (in Lithuania there are no specialized courts for these cathegories of cases).

Q167 (2018): It should be noted that family, labour cases and consumer cases, as well as civil and commercial cases, are heard by courts of general jurisdiction (in Lithuania there are no specialized courts for these cathegories of cases).

Q167 (2017): The total number of judicial mediation procedures increased due to the more frequent use of this type of a procedure (in all fields - civil and commercial law, family law, labour law).
The number of judicial mediation procedures concerning civil and commercial cases increased because the judicial mediation becomes more popular.
Q167 (2016): The number of judicial mediation procedures concerning civil and commercial cases increased because the judicial mediation becomes more popular.
Q167 (2014): Judicial mediation is available in civil cases, where an agreement can be reached (family cases are treated as civil cases). As a matter of fact, 60% of the judicial mediation cases were family cases, 12% were cases on compensation of damages and loss, 10% - cases on property rights, 8% - employment cases.
Q167 (2012): There is no possibility to deliver accurate statistical data about cases in courts, in which the mediation was applied in 2012 (only 44 courts out of 67 replied). Pursuant to these data, in 17 cases the mediation procedure has been started in 2012. It should be noted that some of the courts have actively reconciled the parties in civil cases during the hearing: according to the data of the survey, there were signed 397 peace treaties in 2012 (not during the mediation procedure).

Luxembourg

Q166 (General Comment): The figures provided represent the total number of accredited mediators as of 31.12. of the reference year (in civil, commercial and criminal matters) without taking into account mediators who have ceased their activity.
Source: Ministry of Justice
Q166 (2020): The increase in the number of mediators is the consequence of a political decision to focus on alternative methods of dispute resolution. This political decision has been translated in particular by a strengthening of the mediation offer.

Q166 (2019): The figures provided represent the total number of accredited mediators (in civil, commercial and criminal matters) without taking into account mediators who have ceased their activity.
Q166 (2016): There are 92 mediators for criminal matter and 81 in civil and commercial matter.

Q167 (2020):
"Criminal Mediations: JUCHA, 2021
"

Q167 (2019): Criminal mediations: JUCHA, 2019

Q167 (2018): Criminal mediations: JUCHA 2008

Malta

Q166 (2017): The data regarding the number of mediators was provided by The Malta Mediation Centre, quoting the number of mediators duly accredited and registered in terms of the provisions of the Mediation Act, 2004 (Cap. 474 of the Laws of Malta).

Q166 (2016): The data regarding the number of mediators was provided by The Malta Mediation Centre, quoting the number of mediators duly accredited and registered in terms of the provisions of the Mediation Act, 2004 (Cap. 474 of the Laws of Malta).

Q166 (2015): The data regarding the number of mediators was provided by The Malta Mediation Centre, quoting the number of mediators duly accredited and registered in terms of the provisions of the Mediation Act, 2004 (Cap. 474 of the Laws of Malta).

Q167 (2021): The answers in Question 167.1 reflect Court-referred mediation and not voluntary mediation (outside a court context). Throughout 2021, 7 new cases were sent to mediation by the court, 3 of which were unsuccessful, 3 were revoked by the court and 1 was successful.
Q167 (2019): The Malta Mediation Centre received for the first time in 2019, the first case at mediation according to Art 10.2 of the Chp 579 Media and Defamation Act. This case was actually filed in court in 2018 but was then referred for mediation in 2019, and it is still ongoing.
Q167 (2017): This data has been provided by the Mediation Coordinator at the Family Court.

Netherlands

Q166 (2018): In campaigns to promote mediation, many people have been trained to become a mediator, and were accredited. Therefore, we observe that there are more people that want to be professional mediators than there is demand for the mediation services. The decrease of the number of mediators was discussed in the news media. The explanation given for the decrease was that the fee for being registered went up substantially. Many mediators who did hardly have cases to mediate, gave up.
Q166 (2015): In the frame of the 2015 exercise the number of mediatiors has increased, especially since the increase of the own financial contribution in divorce cases. Lawyers practice more often judicial mediation, which is less expensive.

Q166 (2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been explained that the number of mediations has increased, especially since the increase of the own financial contribution in divorce cases. Lawyers practice more often judicial mediation, which is less expensive.
Q166 (2012): The number provided for 2012 refers to accredited judicial mediators. In 2010 there were 4 015 mediators registered at the Dutch Mediation Institute (NMI).
The number provided for 2012 refers to accredited judicial mediators. The number of accredited mediators in general was 2 949. The decrease observed between 2010 and 2012 was due to new registration directives of the Dutch Mediation Institute.

Q167 (2021): A total of 65,4% of finished mediations ended in a settlement (either completely, or partially).
For criminal cases, 83,3% of finished mediations ended in a settlement (either completely or partially).
https://jaarverslagrechtspraak.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2022/05/Jaarverslag-Rechtspraak-2021.pdf#page=56

Q167 (2020): Lower numbers in 2020 are due to the corona pandemic, as not al mediations can be done digitally, for example. Raad voor de rechtspraak en gerechten (Judicial Council and the Courts). https://jaarverslagrechtspraak.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/04/Jaarverslag-Rechtspraak-2020.pdf#page=45

Q167 (2019): Data are produced by Judicial Council and courts

Q167 (2018): Mediation has been promoted for many years in the Netherlands. In that sense nothing special happened in 2017/2018. In 2018 a new program started to promote mediation in criminal cases. The rise of the number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation may be explained by the implementation of this program . The data are produced by the Judicial council and the Courts

Q167 (2017): The indicated data refers to the number of mediation procedures started in 2017. The number of completed mediation procedures for this year is 2 316.
Q167 (2016): The Council of Judiciairy annual report 2016. The categorization in our source is different from the categorization above, so we cannot give the breakdown.
The indicated data refers to the number of mediation procedures started in 2016. The number of completed mediation procedures for this year is 2 326.
Q167 (2012): In 2012, the number of mediations decreased because in January 2011 the so called ‘mediation incentive contribution’ of € 200 stopped.

Poland

Q166 (2021): *2020 data

Q166 (2019): The Ministry of Justice is currently working on the project "Dissemination of alternative dispute resolution methods by raising the competence of mediators, establishing the National Register of Mediators (KRM) and information activities.". The National Register of Mediators (KRM) will be a public register containing information on persons practicing the profession of mediator. The functioning of KRM will allow for ordering and increasing the ministry's control over the activity and number of mediators in Poland.

Q166 (2017): The central register of mediators in Poland is not maintained. There are two separate list of registered mediators maintained by each regional courts – a list of permanent mediators created by the president of a reginal court and a list of mediators created by mediation organisations. There is no possibility to account number of registered mediators because mediators are repeated on both lists and in different courts also.

Q166 (2016): The central register of mediators in Poland is not maintained. There are two separate list of registered mediators maintained by each regional courts – a list of permanent mediators created by the president of a reginal court and a list of mediators created by mediation organisations. There is no possibility to account number of registered mediators because mediators are repeated on both lists and in different courts also.

Q167 (2020): Mediation proceedings based on statistical data - regional and district courts in the years 2006-2020) – developed by the Ministry of Justice.
*In accordance with the regulation which is contained in the Ordinance of the Council of Ministers of March 31, 2020 on the establishment of restrictions, orders and prohibitions in relation with the COVID19 epidemic, in the period from March 31, 2020, the performance of tasks by common courts was limited due to remote work and quarantine of employees of court departments. Mediation can be conducted in any case in the field of labour law, in which it is possible to sign a settlement, and most labour matters belong to this category. In the period 2019-2020 (at the time when an up-ward trend was observed), they mainly concerned conflicts that could have been influenced by remote work, e.g. lack of accurate, correct communication and direct contact between employees. That is why labour courts began to direct disputes towards an ADR methods, indicating that mediation may not only faster finish a case, but also be more financially attractive, which - as the data shows - resulted in a greater interest in this method of alternative dispute resolution in employee matters, as well as parties to conclude agreements.
*In 2020 total impact of cases before common courts was lower by 21.1% compared to 2019. The reduced impact of cases was caused among others by the COVID19 epidemic and related limitations. Limitations related to the pandemic have also affected the prisons and custodies closings, where mediation takes place after the sentence, representing a large percentage of mediation in criminal cases. Courts, in order not to extend the proceedings, resigned from referring cases to mediation.

Q167 (2019): “Postępowanie mediacyjne w świetle danych statystyczych – sądy rejonowe i okręgowe w latach 2006-2019” (eng. Mediation proceedings based on statistical data - regional and district courts in the years 2006-2019) – developed by the Ministry of Justice
There are no separate statistics for cases involving consumer cases. Such cases are classified as civil cases.
Q167 (2018): There are no separate statistics for cases involving consumer cases. Such cases are classified as civil cases.

Q167 (2017): Information gathered by the Managerial Statistical Information Division in Department of the Strategy and European Funds in Ministry of Justice
https://isws.ms.gov.pl/pl/baza-statystyczna/publikacje/download,2779,7.html With regard to administrative cases: Supreme Administrative Court – Information about activities of Administrative Courts in 2017
http://www.nsa.gov.pl/download.php?plik=1551
Q167 (2016): The number of mediation procedure increased significantly caused by implemented changes in law, esspecially in Code of Civil Procedure. We can notice that percentage of mediation cases raise in relation to cases in which mediation procedure can be apply.

Portugal

Q166 (2020): There is a national registry on private mediators and also a national registry on public mediators, but one can not determine who among them practice court- related mediation. Besides, since the registration is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation.)

Q166 (2018): There is a national registry on private mediators and also a national registry on public mediators, but one can not determine who among them practice court- related mediation. Besides, since the registration is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation.)

Q166 (2017): this number includes mediators of the Ministry of Justice registered public systems mediation and mediators of the Peace Courts. Unlike previous data (before 2016), the 2016 and 2017 data also include accredited conflict mediators in accordance with Law n.29/2013 of 19 April (Mediation Law).
The slight increase in the number of accredited mediators between the years of 2016 and 2017 is due to the increased number of applications for inclusion on the list organized by the Ministry of Justice submitted by private mediators.

Q166 (2016): this number includes mediators of the Ministry of Justice registered public systems mediation and mediators of the Peace Courts. Unlike previous data, it also includes accredited conflict mediators in accordance with Law n.29/2013 of 19 April (Mediation Law).

Q166 (2015):

The given number in question 166 includes the mediators of the Ministry of Justice' registered public systems mediation and mediators of the Peace Courts. In addition to this number there are 234 accredited conflict mediators in accordance with article 9 (1) (e) of Law No. 29/2013, of 19 April (Mediation Law), regulated by Ministerial Ordinance No. 344/2013, of 27 November.

Please acknowledge that registered public system mediators and mediators of the Peace Courts can also be accredited conflict mediators but not the other way around.

Q167 (2021): Directorate General of Justice Policy (Ministry of Justice)

Q167 (2020): Directorate-General for Justice Policy - Ministry of Justice

Q167 (2019): The total number of cases doesn't include data on criminal cases. This number is protected by statistical confidentiality.
Data on criminal cases is protected by statistical confidentiality.
Data on consumer cases is included in civil and commercial cases.

Q167 (2018): As for the years 2016 and 2017, we have provided the numbers, according to the Justice Statistics – Directorate-General for Justice Policy - and these statistics do not include the number of cases for which parties agreed to start mediation, but only the number of procedures that were concluded with a mediation agreement in a given year. For 2018, we have called upon another statistic source - the annual report of the Council of the Courts of Peace – which provides indeed the number of cases for which parties agreed to start mediation in the courts of peace. Concerning "family cases", the numbers are correct, since the indicated number of finished court-related mediations also include procedures that had begun in 2017, but were concluded in 2018, whereas the number of cases for which the parties agreed to start such mediation only refers to 2018.

Q167 (2017): 167.2 -The number of family mediation has decreased in 2017. In 2016 the number had increased as a result of the entry into force of the General Regime of the Civil Juvenile Procedure (RGPTC) which established that the judge had to determine the intervention of either the family mediation system or send the parties to a technical hearing if they couldn´t reach an agreement. After the entry into force of this new legal framework, as judges became familiar with the new procedure, they are forwarding more cases to the technical hearings instead of mediation. In addition, the number of family cases brought to court has decreased, as well as the direct requests for mediation from the parties.
167.5 - In 2017, for reasons of statistical disclosure, data is protected due to the small number.

Q167 (2016): Directorate-General for Justice Policy - Ministry of Justice

Romania

Q166 (2021): The data were communicated by the Mediation Council, reflecting the pace of the authorization process as a mediator by the Mediation Council (which may register fluctuations from year to year), of persons who meet the conditions provided by law. The decrease in the number of mediators is caused by withdrawals or suspensions of mediators' authorizations (possibly because of the low number of requests for mediation).

Q166 (2020): The data were communicated by the Mediation Council, reflecting the pace of the authorization process as a mediator by the Mediation Council (which may register fluctuations from year to year), of persons who meet the conditions provided by law.

Q166 (2019): The number of mediators accredited annually by the Mediation Council registers fluctuations, from year to year, being related most of the times to the legislative amendments brought to the mediation law, which can determine the increase in the number of persons requesting the accreditation as mediator, after the training courses required by law.

Q166 (2016): Regarding the variation registered in the number of authorizations granted to the mediators during the period 2014-2016, we mention that this was due to the legislative changes in the field of mediation occurred during that period.

Q166 (2013): The increase of the number of mediators in 2012 and 2013 comparing to 2010 is a result of the legislative reforms, stimulating the ADR.

Q166 (2012): The increase of the number of mediators in 2012 and 2013 comparing to 2010 is a result of the legislative reforms, stimulating the ADR.

Q167 (2021): Although we cannot offer a total of the cases of court-related mediation, divided into the categories above, according to the statistical system in the field (which is ongoing at this moment), we could extract a number of 476 mediation agreement authorized by the court (2021) on December 31, of which 188 in stock/ pending cases (on December 31, 2020) and 288 received/incoming cases during 2021.
Background and legislation elements (remain valid from the last cycle):
The control of the state regarding the mediation is indirect and it concerns the agreement concluded by the parties after following the mediation procedure – such an agreement constitutes an act under private signature. In order to become an authentic act, it has to be authenticated by the notary public or authorized by the court. Thus, if the conflict has already been submitted to a court, the settlement by mediation of such a case can be possible at the initiative of the involved parties or at the recommendation of the court and accepted by the parties, concerning rights the parties can dispose over in accordance with the legal provisions. Mediation can deal with the total or partial settlement of the concerned litigation. The court shall, on the request of the parties, issue a decision in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code regarding the expedient court decision.
According with the provisions of article 59 para. 2 of the Law no. 192/2006, the parties to the mediation agreement may go to court to request, in compliance with the legal proceedings, to give a decision to legalize their understanding. Competence shall lay with the court in whose jurisdiction any of the parties have their domicile or residence or, where appropriate, the head office or the court of first instance in whose jurisdiction is located the place where it has been signed mediation agreement. The decision whereby the court consents on the understanding between parties shall be delivered in the council room and shall be an enforcement order under the law. The provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law no 134/2010 (New Civil Procedure Code), republished, as amended, shall apply accordingly.
Mediation in case of a dispute before the law courts, according with the provisions of article 61 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006. in case the conflict was brought to justice, its settlement by mediation may take place at the initiative of the parties or at the proposal of any of them or on the recommendation of the court, concerning the rights which the parties may enjoy under the law. Mediation may have as subject settlement of all or part of the dispute. The mediator may not charge fees for informing the parties. Also, according with the provisions of art. 63 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006, in case the matter has been settled by means of mediation, the court shall deliver, at the request of the parties and in compliance with the requirements of law, a judgment, the provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law No 134/2010, republished, as amended, being applied accordingly.

Q167 (2020): Although we cannot offer a total of the cases of court-related mediation, divided into the categories above, according to the statistical system in the field (which is ongoing at this moment), we could extract a number of 614 mediation agreement authorized by the court (2020).
Background and legislation elements (remain valid from the last cycle):
The control of the state regarding the mediation is indirect and it concerns the agreement concluded by the parties after following the mediation procedure – such an agreement constitutes an act under private signature. In order to become an authentic act, it has to be authenticated by the notary public or authorized by the court. Thus, if the conflict has already been submitted to a court, the settlement by mediation of such a case can be possible at the initiative of the involved parties or at the recommendation of the court and accepted by the parties, concerning rights the parties can dispose over in accordance with the legal provisions. Mediation can deal with the total or partial settlement of the concerned litigation. The court shall, on the request of the parties, issue a decision in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code regarding the expedient court decision.
According with the provisions of article 59 para. 2 of the Law no. 192/2006, the parties to the mediation agreement may go to court to request, in compliance with the legal proceedings, to give a decision to legalize their understanding. Competence shall lay with the court in whose jurisdiction any of the parties have their domicile or residence or, where appropriate, the head office or the court of first instance in whose jurisdiction is located the place where it has been signed mediation agreement. The decision whereby the court consents on the understanding between parties shall be delivered in the council room and shall be an enforcement order under the law. The provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law no 134/2010 (New Civil Procedure Code), republished, as amended, shall apply accordingly.
Mediation in case of a dispute before the law courts, according with the provisions of article 61 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006. in case the conflict was brought to justice, its settlement by mediation may take place at the initiative of the parties or at the proposal of any of them or on the recommendation of the court, concerning the rights which the parties may enjoy under the law. Mediation may have as subject settlement of all or part of the dispute. The mediator may not charge fees for informing the parties. Also, according with the provisions of art. 63 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006, in case the matter has been settled by means of mediation, the court shall deliver, at the request of the parties and in compliance with the requirements of law, a judgment, the provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law No 134/2010, republished, as amended, being applied accordingly.

Q167 (2018): Although we cannot offer a total of the cases of court-related mediation, divided into the three categories above, according to the statistical system in the field (which is ongoing at this moment), we could extract a number 1070 mediation agreement authorized by the court (2018) Background and legislation elements:
The control of the state regarding the mediation is indirect and it concerns the agreement concluded by the parties after following the mediation procedure – such an agreement constitutes an act under private signature. In order to become an authentic act, it has to be authenticated by the notary public or authorized by the court. Thus, if the conflict has already been submitted to a court, the settlement by mediation of such a case can be possible at the initiative of the involved parties or at the recommendation of the court and accepted by the parties, concerning rights the parties can dispose over in accordance with the legal provisions. Mediation can deal with the total or partial settlement of the concerned litigation. The court shall, on the request of the parties, issue a decision in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code regarding the expedient court decision.
According with the provisions of article 59 para. 2 of the Law no. 192/2006, the parties to the mediation agreement may go to court to request, in compliance with the legal proceedings, to give a decision to legalize their understanding. Competence shall lay with the court in whose jurisdiction any of the parties have their domicile or residence or, where appropriate, the head office or the court of first instance in whose jurisdiction is located the place where it has been signed mediation agreement. The decision whereby the court consents on the understanding between parties shall be delivered in the council room and shall be an enforcement order under the law. The provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law no 134/2010 (New Civil Procedure Code), republished, as amended, shall apply accordingly.
Mediation in case of a dispute before the law courts, according with the provisions of article 61 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006. in case the conflict was brought to justice, its settlement by mediation may take place at the initiative of the parties or at the proposal of any of them or on the recommendation of the court, concerning the rights which the parties may enjoy under the law. Mediation may have as subject settlement of all or part of the dispute. The mediator may not charge fees for informing the parties. Also, according with the provisions of art. 63 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006, in case the matter has been settled by means of mediation, the court shall deliver, at the request of the parties and in compliance with the requirements of law, a judgment, the provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law No 134/2010, republished, as amended, being applied accordingly.

Q167 (2016): There are no statistics on the number of mediation procedures (Council of Mediation)

Slovak Republic

Q166 (2021): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 84 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2020): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2019): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

Q166 (2018): In previous cycles the number of registered mediators provided by the Ministry of Justice included all persons listed in the register of mediators, including those who has been stroke out of a list or suspended. For this evaluation cycle we can provide the number of active registered mediators.
Q166 (2012): In 2012, all disciplinary proceedings against lawyers were initiated on the basis of alleged breach of professional obligations laid down by the Act on the Legal Profession or the Code on Professional Conduct for Lawyers. A criminal offence committed by a lawyer (who was found guilty by the criminal court in final judgment) is the reason for suspension or disbarment under the Act on the Legal Profession. However, it is not an issue of disciplinary proceedings.

Q167 (2019): Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic

Slovenia

Q166 (General Comment): The procedures for listing (and un-listing) individual medators are led by individual courts.

Q166 (2021): The procedures for listing (and un-listing) individual mediators are led by individual courts.

Q167 (General Comment): Under category “1. Civil and commercial cases”, all mediation cases at local and district courts are reported (including family cases and consumer cases).
Q167 (2021): The number of finished mediations and settlement decreased from 2019 to 2020 (by 22% and 26% respecitvely; due to the impact of Covid-19 pandemics) and increased in 2021 (by 23% and 33% respectively). The number of mediations and settlements in 2021, compared to 2019, stayed roughly the same.
Q167 (2017): Data source: The Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse.
Data source: The Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse. The figures represent resolved mediation cases (no matter what was the outcome of mediaton). The category 1. Civil cases includes family cases. The figure at the category 4. Employment dismissals cases is the number of mediations at the labour and social courts and includes employment dismissal cases.

Q167 (2016): Data source: The Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse.
The figures represent resolved mediation cases (no matter what was the outcome of mediaton). The category 1. Civil cases includes family cases. The figure at the category 4. Employment dismissals cases is the number of mediations at the labour and social courts and includes employment dismissals cases.
The difference (decrease) in number of mediation cases compared to 2014 can be partially due to decrease in number of incoming court cases (see Q91). In 2016, the mediation was offered in 7.969 civil and 1.475 labour cases.

Q167 (2014): The figures represent resolved mediation cases (no matter what was the outcome of mediation). The category 1. Civil cases includes family cases. The figure at the category 4. Employment dismissals cases is the number of mediations at the labour and social courts and includes employment dismissals cases.
In 2014, the mediation was offered in 10.854 civil and 2.003 labour cases.
Differences to 2012: in 2012, data was reported by the Ministry of Justice, since 2014 the data source is the Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse.

Q167 (2012): The 2012 data show rising trends of readiness of parties to use judicial meditation and capacities of the courts to supply it. The area of judicial mediation and alternative resolution procedures in general has been the focus of legislative changes in 2009 according to which courts of first and second instances had to adopt mediation procedures.

Spain

Q166 (2021): The figure provided is the addition of number of mediators (natural persons), Institutions of mediation, Mediators in insolvency cases and Mediators in insolvency cases (legal persons); all of them registered in the Registry of Mediators.
This Registry is not compulsory for civil cases, so the number of persons that act as mediatos may be higher.

Q166 (2020): The figure provided is the number of mediators (natural and legal persons) registered in the Registry of Mediators.
This Registry is not compulsory, so the number of persons that act as mediatos may be higher.
Mediation does not have a long tradition in Spain. However, it has good legislative support, and broad institutional support (for example, from the General Council of the Judiciary).
The Draft Law on Procedural Efficiency Measures contains rules that will enhance it (such as providing that the attempted solution be a prior procedural requirement).

Q166 (2019): The figure indicated is the sum of [Mediators + Insolvency mediators + Institutions of Mediation + Legal Persons Insolvency
mediators] registered in the Registry of Mediation of the Ministry of Justice.
The registry is not compulsory and there are other Registries in Autonomous Regions.

Q166 (2018): The figure indicated is the sum of [Mediators + Insolvency mediators + Institutions of Mediation + Legal Persons Insolvency mediators] registered in the Registry of Mediation of the Ministry of Justice.
The registry is not compulsory and there are other Registries in Autonomous Regions. Therefore, the figure is not a complete and perfect national data.

Q166 (2017): The data indicates the number of natural persons registered as Mediators and Mediators on Insolvency, in the Registry of Mediators and Mediation Institutions. (Registration is not compulsory).
Moreover, there are 123 Institutions of Mediation, and other 132 legal persons registered as Mediators on Insolvency. Law 5/2012 on mediation in civil and commercial matters regulated mediation. The Royal Decree 980/2013, develops the previous Law and creates the Register of Mediators and Mediation Institutions. Registration in the Register is voluntary, therefore, its figures are still indicative. But in general the regulation offers a better structuring of the Mediation Institution and a progressive improvement of the quality of the data. Moreover, Mediation is being developed and implemented more and more, both by public initiatives and by professional Associations.

Q166 (2016): In the Registry of the Ministry of Justice there are 1160 private mediators registered who work in the whole territory. The mediation takes place out of Courts. The Court during the first hearing informs to the parties about the possibility of going to mediation, and can suspend the procedure if the parties decide to try the mediation.
The registry mentioned is voluntary (not mandatory), so the figure is a posible approximation. The number of Institutions of Mediation is 66.

Q166 (2015): The approval in 2012 of the Act on mediation in civil and commercial matters could have influence on the increase in the number of mediators.

Q167 (2021): Judicial Statistics department (General Council for the Judiciary)

Q167 (2020): Given the severe restrictions between March and May of 2020, the pandemic is a possible explanation of the decreased number of court-related mediation proceedings in respect of all legal matters.

Q167 (2017): The figures indicate the files transferred by Courts to mediation procedures. There is not data about issues directly solved in mediation before starting the judicial proceeding.
The advancement in the implementation of mediation explains the increase in the number of “civil and commercial cases” on the one hand and “criminal cases” on the other hand. There are no specific reasons explaining the decreases in the number of mediation procedures concerning family law cases and employment dismissal cases.

Q167 (2016): A reform of the Civil Procedural Law in 2015, introduced certain obligations of the Court and of the Judge to inform the parties about the possibility to bring the case to mediation. Accordingly, the number of civil and commercial cases, as well as the number of family cases increased in a significant way between 2014 and 2016. No particular explanation can be provided in respect of the decrease in the number of judicial mediation procedures in criminal matters.

Q167 (2014): In 2014, regarding labour cases, 460 609 mediation procedures were conducted prior to the initiation of cases before the labour courts, but there is not specific data available about the employment dismissals cases.

Q167 (2012): In 2012, regarding labour matters, 12 725 cases were diverted to mediation, 3 464 granted an agreement, but there was no data available on employment dismissals cases. As for criminal matters, 1 166 cases were diverted to mediation during the instruction phase and 16 953 cases were diverted to mediation before the Criminal Court.

Indicator 8: The existence and use of alternative dispute resolution methods

comments provided by the national correspondents

organised by question no.

Question 166. Number of accredited or registered mediators for court-related mediation:

Question 167. Number of court-related mediations:

Question 166

Austria

(2019): The list of mediators started in 2004; registration is always limited for a specific period: five years after the initial registration and ten years for continuation of an existing registration. Many mediators registered in 2004, applied for continuation of the registration in 2009 but did not do so in 2019. This explains the significant drop in registered mediators.

(2015): Q166
http://www.mediatorenliste.justiz.gv.at

Q168
Sec. 198 – 209 CPC

Belgium

(General Comment): A mediator may receive several accreditations. The Federal Mediation Commission determines the criteria for the accreditation of mediators under Articles 1726 and 1727 § 6 of the Judicial Code.

(2021): Data provided by the Federal Mediation Commission: https://www.cfm-fbc.be/fr.
The difference (in figures) with the previous cycle is explained in particular by the removal of mediators who are no longer up to date with their continuing training obligation.
Mediation Barometer 2021 (some figures and trends), link:
https://www.cfm-fbc.be/sites/default/files/content/explorer/slides_barometer_-_fr.pdf
A mediator may receive several accreditations. The Federal Mediation Commission determines the criteria for the accreditation of mediators under Articles 1726 and 1727 § 6 of the Judicial Code.

(2020):
"The difference in the number of mediators compared to the previous cycle is explained in particular by the removal of mediators who are no longer up to date with their continuing education obligation.
As of 31/12/2020, 2577 mediators are accredited by the Federal Mediation Commission (CFM) and more than 3400 accreditations with this same CFM (some mediators having in fact several accreditations in family, civil and commercial, social, administrative matters).
The difference (as for the figure) with the previous cycle is explained in particular by the striking off of mediators who are no longer up to date with their obligation of permanent training.
"

(2019): The number of accredited mediators in 2019 was 2,399. The number of approvals (by type of civil litigation) granted to mediators: 3,177, including 2,178 to women and 999 to men.
A mediator can be accredited in family matters as well as in civil and commercial matters. S/he may have one or all of the accreditation (family, civil and commercial, social affairs, mediation with public authorities). So one mediator is not equal to one acreditation.

(2018): 2122 accredited mediators with 2788 accreditations granted, 907 for male mediators and 1881 accreditations for female mediators

(2017): Information on mediation: http://www.mediation-justice.be

(2016): Information on mediation: http://www.mediation-justice.be

(2015): number of médiators at 13/10/2016

(2012): 2012: the competence over the court houses is transferred from the federal level to the authorities.

Bulgaria

(2021): The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of June 2022 the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 2929 (for 2021 the number of newly registered is 214).

(2020): The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of July 2021 the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 2767 (for 2020 the number of newly registered is 233).

(2019): The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). At the end of 2019 the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 2419.

(2018): The information about the number of registered court-related mediators is not available (NA). As of May 2019 the total number of mediators registered in the Unified Register of Mediators at the Ministry of Justice is 2311 (for 2018 the number of newly registered is 250).

(2015): Number of registered mediators is 1501 up to 31.12.2015.

Czech Republic

(2021): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 359 probate and mediation officials and 327 mediators in non criminal cases.

(2020): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 356 probate and mediation officials and 313 mediators in non criminal cases.

(2019): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 347 probate and mediation officials and 242 mediators in non criminal cases.

(2018): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 429 probate and mediation officials and 228 mediators in non criminal cases. The number of mediators is increasing since the Ministry of Justice supports broader use of other criminal sanctions which are alternatives to imprisonment such as house arrest.

(2017): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 421 probate and mediation officials and 239 (from this number 211 active and 28 inactive) mediators in non criminal cases. The number of mediators in non criminal cases is constantly increasing since the entry into force of a law on judicial mediation in civil matters in 2012.

(2016): From the above mentioned number of mediators there are 398 probate and mediation officials and 222 mediators in non criminal cases. The number of mediators in non criminal cases is constantly increasing since the entry into force of a law on judicial mediation in civil matters in 2012.

(2015): From the mentioned number of mediators there are 381 probate and mediation officials and 208 mediators in non criminal cases.
The number of mediators in non criminal cases is constantly increasing since the entry into force of a law on judicial mediation in civil matters in 2012.

Denmark

(2021): The number of registered attorneys who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2021 is 53. The number of registred jugdes who serves as mediators in court mediation in 2021 is 90.

(2020): The number of registered attorneys who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2020 is 53. The number of registred jugdes who serves as mediators in court mediation in 2020 is 90.

(2018): The number of registered judges who serve as mediators in court mediation in 2018 is 86. The number of registered attorneys
who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2018 is 57.

(2017): In 2017 there are 57 registered attorneys and 78 judges with a special mediation education as of 1st July 2017. There is a different process of appointment. Judge mediators go through a special education, and registered attorneys must file a job application to become mediator. There we have updated numbers for judge mediators. Attorneys are appointed every 4 years and the last appointment window was in 2016. The number of attorneys is therefore the same as last year. Source: http://www.domstol.dk/saadangoerdu/retsmaegling/Documents/Liste%20over%20advokatmaeglere.pdf

(2016): The number of registered judges who serve as mediators in court mediation in 2016 is 86. The number of registered attorneys who are appointed to serve as mediators in court mediation in 2016 is 57.

Finland

(General Comment): In Finland there is no accreditation or a register for court-related mediators, all mediators being trained in a special training program for mediation.

(2019): In Finland there is no accreditation or a register for court-related mediators. All mediators are trained in a special training program for mediation.

France

(2021): 2854 of which 2542 are natural persons, the others are legal persons
source SADJAV

(2020): "There are also 312 legal persons
These data concern only civil mediation and come from the SADJAV and the DACS. The increase in the number of mediators registered on the lists of mediators established by the seond instance courts is indicative of the development of the use of alternative dispute resolution methods and more particularly mediation.
The Ministry of Justice strongly encourages mediators to register on these lists. Registration on the lists of mediators with the second instance courts obeys certain conditions as mentioned in the decree n°2021-95 of January 29, 2021 amending the decrees n°2017-1457 of October 9, 2017 relating to the list of mediators with the second instance court. In addition, the mediator wishing to be registered must provide, in support of his application, supporting documents attesting in particular to his training (decree of January 29, 2021 fixing the list of supporting documents to be provided for registration on the list provided for in article 22-1 A of law n°95-125 of February 8, 1995 relating to the organization of the jurisdictions and to civil, criminal and administrative procedure). A verification of his or her criminal record is also carried out.
These requirements help to ensure the minimum guarantees (training, impartiality, independence and verification of criminal status) required of a mediator recommended by the courts. Finally, the mediators registered on these lists have a better visibility since the litigants are led to go to the lists of the second instance court to find a mediator (https://www.justice.fr/r%C3%A9gler-litiges-autrement/m%C3%A9diation).
A mediator recommended by the justice is, moreover, a guarantee of confidence for the litigants. "

(2018): The data are approximate because they have been compiled manually from the lists of mediators at the courts of appeal, published and provided for by article 8 of Act No. 2016-1547 of 18 November 2016 on the modernization of 21st century justice and partial because the service is still waiting for the publication and/or registration of 13 lists, on 05 June 2019. It is recalled that in the French judicial system, the judge remains free to appoint a mediator who does not appear on the lists drawn up by the courts of appeal. Indeed, these lists are intended for the information of the judge.

(2016): Except for the profession of family mediator for which a diploma is required, the profession of mediator in civil and commercial matters is not regulated and there is no national register of mediators. Nevertheless, it is possible to consider as registered: mediators in criminal matters entrusted with tasks by public prosecutors (312), justice conciliators who are volunteers and selected by judicial bodies (1958), and the family mediators empowered by the family allowances funds (670). Data is not presented in full time equivalent.

(2015): Accredited mediators are family mediators, criminal mediators and legal conciliators, who work in courts or are subsidised by the family allowance funds.

Source: Ministry of Justice, General Secretariat, Sub-Directorate of Statistics and Studies, Access to Law and Victim Assistance Unit

Germany

(General Comment): Germany does not have a system of accreditation or registration for mediators. In addition, there is no statistical data available on the number of court annexed mediation cases. For these reasons, Germany cannot provide information on the number of accredited or registered mediators who practice judicial mediation.

(2018): Germany does not have a system of accreditation or registration for mediators. In addition, there is no statistical data available on the number of court annexed mediation cases. For these reasons, Germany cannot provide information on the number of accredited or registered mediators who practice judicial mediation.

(2017): Germany does not have a system of accreditation or registration for mediators. In addition, there is no statistical data available
on the number of court annexed mediation cases. For these reasons, Germany cannot provide information on the number of accredited or registered mediators who practice judicial mediation.

(2016): Germany does not have a system of accreditation or registration for mediators. In addition, there is no statistical data available on the number of court annexed mediation cases. For these reasons, Germany cannot provide information on the number of accredited or registered mediators who practice judicial mediation.

Greece

(2021): Of the 2985 mediators active are 2963.

(2020): There is no relevant information regarding the data.

(2019): The interest of people to acquire the status of mediator increased in 2019 without any special or official reason.

Hungary

(2016): There is a continuous training for court secretaries and judges in the field of mediation so that is the reason for the increasing number. To be registered as a court mediator one must finish this training (organized by the National Office for the Judiciary).

(2014): The increase in the number of judicial mediators between 2013 and 2014 is a result of constant training organized by the National Office for the Judiciary.

(2013): Registered mediator can be any natural or legal person, who complies with the legal requirements (concerning university degree, mediation training etc.). According to the relevant legislation (Act LV of 2002 on Mediation) mediators established in other EEA Member States (i.e. living in the European Economic Area) can act in a current case in Hungary. The foreign mediator should inform the Ministry of Justice, which shall specify the rights for one year.

Ireland

(2014): 2014: Reforms are also under consideration. Legislation is being prepared to promote mediation as a viable, effective and efficient alternative to court proceedings thereby reducing legal costs, speeding up the resolution of disputes and relieving the stress involved in court proceedings. It is anticipated that a Mediation Bill will be published in 2015 with a view to enactment of the legislation quickly thereafter.

Italy

(2018): The above figures refer to public mediators who deal with civil and commercial mediation procedures. Therefore these figures do not include mediators in family matters (818) nor in consumer cases.

(2016): The number of accredited mediators is destined to grow. Probably at a lower growth rate.

Latvia

(2021): Source for question no.166 – website of Council of Certified Mediators https://sertificetimediatori.lv/mediatori/

(2020): Data are available only about certified mediators. According legislation there can be practicing mediators and certified mediators. The former is a natural person selected freely by the parties who have agreed to conduct mediation while the latter, is a mediator who, in accordance with the procedures laid down in the laws and regulations, has acquired mediation and received a certificate which gives him/her the right to be included in the list of mediators.

(2019): Data are available only about certified mediators. According legislation there can be practicing mediators and certified mediators. The former is a natural person selected freely by the parties who have agreed to conduct mediation while the latter, is a mediator who, in accordance with the procedures laid down in the laws and regulations, has acquired mediation and received a certificate which gives him/her the right to be included in the list of mediators.

(2015): Variation of the number of mediators is constant since every year new mediators pass the exam and become certified mediators

Lithuania

(General Comment): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country and the development of the application of mediation might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.
Till 1st January, 2019 National Couts Administration have been maintained the list of court mediators which included judges and other persons (not judges). Due to a change in legal regulation (from 1st January, 2019), National Courts Administration maintains only the list of Judges who have been granted the status of mediators (Article 5 (2) of the Law on Mediation of the Republic of Lithuania) and transmits this data to the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service. The latter maintains the common list of mediators and decides on the status of mediator for persons who are not judges. The mentioned list is published on the website of the The State Garanteed Legal Aid Service (Article 5 (6) of the Law on Mediation). It is to notice that court-related mediation in practice is more often executed by mediators judges however the mediators who are not judges are also allowed to mediate at this stage when they are appointed by the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service.

(2021): from 2021 January 1 all mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania have the right to conduct judicial mediation in both civil and administrative cases.

(2020): In 2020 the list contained 438 mediators not judges (of which 100 males and 338 females), and 114 mediators judges (of which 27 males and 87 females).
The Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania, implementing the project co-financed by the European Union Structural Funds No. 10.1.4-V-922-01-005 "Development of the Conciliation Mediation System", taking into account the expansion of the Institute of Mediation and the consequent increased need for mediators, initiated the organization of training for mediators, during which a total of 420 persons (320 people were trained in the training of 40 academic hours, 100 people took part in the training of 24 academic hours).
This training took place in May – October, 2019. All participants signed a contract for the provision of training services, one of the conditions of which was the obligation to register to take the qualification exam for mediators and to come to take it. Due to the fact that the Training Participants' Agreement did not provide for the obligation to pass the mediators' qualification examination but to come to take it, the Ministry of Justice did not collect information on the proportion of trainees who passed the mediators' qualification examination, but the persons who took part in this training were very active in applying for the qualification examination for mediators. There were also cases when those who did not pass the mediator qualification exam for the first time registered to take the exam again six months later.
October – November in 2020 specialized training for mediators on the topic “Mediation in family disputes in the presence of signs of domestic violence” was organized on the order of the Ministry of Justice. A total of 60 mediators participated in the training. These training were intended to improve the qualification of mediators in disputes where are possible signs of domestic violence, therefore only mediators registered in the list of mediators of the Republic of Lithuania and having signed agreements with the State Guaranteed Legal Aid Service on the provision of compulsory mediation services could participate in.
It is noteworthy that the organized training, which were free of charge for their participants, increased the number of mediators in both 2019 and 2020. In this context, it would not be appropriate to compare the increase between 2019 and 2020 .

(2019): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.
Till 1st January, 2019 National Couts Administration have been maintained the list of court mediators which included judges and other persons (not judges). Due to a change in legal regulation (from 1st January, 2019), National Courts Administration maintains only the list of Judges who have been granted the status of mediators (Article 5 (2) of the Law on Mediation of the Republic of Lithuania) and transmits this data to the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service. The latter maintains the common list of mediators and decides on the status of mediator for persons who are not judges. The mentioned list is published on the website of the The State Garanteed Legal Aid Service (Article 5 (6) of the Law on Mediation). On 31 December, 2019 the list contained 286 mediators not judges (of which 71 males and 215 females), and 106 mediators judges (of which 25 males and 81 females).
It is to notice that court-related mediation in practice is more often executed by mediators judges however the mediators who are not judges are also allowed to mediate at this stage when they are appointed by the State Garanteed Legal Aid Service.

(2018): On 29 June, 2017 new regulation for mediation and becoming mediator was adopted which entered into force from 2019-01-01. The amendments that have been made set new requirements to improve the quality of mediation services. Also, the establishment of mediation as a professional activity (with the exception of judicial mediation by judges) is approved, part of such activity is paid by state. These factors as well as the overall promotion of mediation in the country might have impact on the significant increase of the number of people that gained the status of mediator.

(2017): The number of the mediators could increase due to the more effective spread of the information about the judicial mediation.

(2016): Judicial mediation is becoming more popular, efforts made by the judiciary and the National Courts Administration, as well as the legislator, resulted in an increased number of mediators.

(2015): National Courts Administration, data of the Activities report of 2015 of the Commission of the Judicial Mediation (http://www.teismai.lt/data/public/uploads/2016/03/teismines-mediacijos-komisijos-2015-m.-veiklos-apibendrinimas.pdf)

The main reforms that have been implemented over the last two years in judicial mediation:
From the 1st January 2015 the judicial mediation is available in all the courts of general jurisdiction. Before it was only available in courts, who participated in the pilot project. It is only available in civil cases. The judicial mediation is free of charge and parties may choose the judicial mediator from the List of Judicial Mediators (the List of Judicial Mediators is available at website https://e.teismas.lt/lt/public/teismin%C4%97-mediacija/). Judges, assisstants of judges, lawyers, psichologists and other persons of different background are on the List of Judicial Mediators.

The peculiarity is that judges can also have the status of judicial mediator. The parties may choose the judge, who deals with the case (if she/he has the status of judicial mediator) to act as judicial mediator. If a peaceful agreement is reached in such a case he/she has also the power to validate it.
Parties may also choose the judge of the Court of Appeal, the Supreme Court of Lithuania to deal with their dispute, which is heard by the court of lower instance, i.e. the dispute, which arose in the court of first instance, can be dealt with by the judge of the higher court.
In order to secure the impartiality of a judge, the judge, who was dealing with the dispute as judicial mediator has an obligation to opt out from the case at later stage.

In order to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Judicial Council has also decided, that judges in every case should decide on suitability of the case for judicial mediation. It was also decided to set at least 4 hours of trainings on judicial mediation in the training programmes of judges.

National Courts Administration has implemented the EU project on e-services in administration of justice in 2015. During the project, management of the process of judicial mediation was created in the Information System of Lithuanian Courts LITEKO. Parties have a possibility to make a statement in the claim or other document on judicial mediation, the judicial mediator can access the case via electronic means, can arrange the judicial mediation session via electronic means, the parties can discuss on a peaceful agreement, can sign and deliver it to the court via electronic means, i.e. E-Service Portal of Lithuanian Courts (https://e.teismas.lt/en/public/home/).

(2014): One of the reasons explaining the increase of the number of judicial mediators in 2014 is that from 1st January, 2015 new regulations on judicial mediation came into force, which set stricter requirements for candidates to judicial mediators (requirement for longer trainings (32 hours instead of 16 hours), requirement to attend the meetings of the Judicial Mediation Commission). Therefore persons, who wished to act as judicial mediators hurried to deliver their documents before the 1st. January, 2015, so that their request would be considered under rules, which were valid before 1st. January, 2015.

Luxembourg

(General Comment): The figures provided represent the total number of accredited mediators as of 31.12. of the reference year (in civil, commercial and criminal matters) without taking into account mediators who have ceased their activity. Source: Ministry of Justice

(2020): The increase in the number of mediators is the consequence of a political decision to focus on alternative methods of dispute resolution. This political decision has been translated in particular by a strengthening of the mediation offer.

(2019): The figures provided represent the total number of accredited mediators (in civil, commercial and criminal matters) without taking into account mediators who have ceased their activity.

(2016): There are 92 mediators for criminal matter and 81 in civil and commercial matter.

Malta

(2017): The data regarding the number of mediators was provided by The Malta Mediation Centre, quoting the number of mediators duly accredited and registered in terms of the provisions of the Mediation Act, 2004 (Cap. 474 of the Laws of Malta).

(2016): The data regarding the number of mediators was provided by The Malta Mediation Centre, quoting the number of mediators duly accredited and registered in terms of the provisions of the Mediation Act, 2004 (Cap. 474 of the Laws of Malta).

(2015): The data regarding the number of mediators was provided by The Malta Mediation Centre, quoting the number of mediators duly accredited and registered in terms of the provisions of the Mediation Act, 2004 (Cap. 474 of the Laws of Malta).

Netherlands

(2018): In campaigns to promote mediation, many people have been trained to become a mediator, and were accredited. Therefore, we observe that there are more people that want to be professional mediators than there is demand for the mediation services. The decrease of the number of mediators was discussed in the news media. The explanation given for the decrease was that the fee for being registered went up substantially. Many mediators who did hardly have cases to mediate, gave up.

(2015): In the frame of the 2015 exercise the number of mediatiors has increased, especially since the increase of the own financial contribution in divorce cases. Lawyers practice more often judicial mediation, which is less expensive.

(2014): In the frame of the 2014 exercise, it has been explained that the number of mediations has increased, especially since the increase of the own financial contribution in divorce cases. Lawyers practice more often judicial mediation, which is less expensive.

(2012): The number provided for 2012 refers to accredited judicial mediators. In 2010 there were 4 015 mediators registered at the Dutch Mediation Institute (NMI).
The number provided for 2012 refers to accredited judicial mediators. The number of accredited mediators in general was 2 949. The decrease observed between 2010 and 2012 was due to new registration directives of the Dutch Mediation Institute.

Poland

**(2021): ***2020 data

(2019): The Ministry of Justice is currently working on the project "Dissemination of alternative dispute resolution methods by raising the competence of mediators, establishing the National Register of Mediators (KRM) and information activities.". The National Register of Mediators (KRM) will be a public register containing information on persons practicing the profession of mediator. The functioning of KRM will allow for ordering and increasing the ministry's control over the activity and number of mediators in Poland.

(2017): The central register of mediators in Poland is not maintained. There are two separate list of registered mediators maintained by each regional courts – a list of permanent mediators created by the president of a reginal court and a list of mediators created by mediation organisations. There is no possibility to account number of registered mediators because mediators are repeated on both lists and in different courts also.

(2016): The central register of mediators in Poland is not maintained. There are two separate list of registered mediators maintained by each regional courts – a list of permanent mediators created by the president of a reginal court and a list of mediators created by mediation organisations. There is no possibility to account number of registered mediators because mediators are repeated on both lists and in different courts also.

Portugal

(2020): There is a national registry on private mediators and also a national registry on public mediators, but one can not determine who among them practice court- related mediation. Besides, since the registration is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation.)

(2018): There is a national registry on private mediators and also a national registry on public mediators, but one can not determine who among them practice court- related mediation. Besides, since the registration is not mandatory, there are also some mediators that are not registered and may practice court-related mediation.)

(2017): this number includes mediators of the Ministry of Justice registered public systems mediation and mediators of the Peace Courts. Unlike previous data (before 2016), the 2016 and 2017 data also include accredited conflict mediators in accordance with Law n.29/2013 of 19 April (Mediation Law).
The slight increase in the number of accredited mediators between the years of 2016 and 2017 is due to the increased number of applications for inclusion on the list organized by the Ministry of Justice submitted by private mediators.

(2016): this number includes mediators of the Ministry of Justice registered public systems mediation and mediators of the Peace Courts. Unlike previous data, it also includes accredited conflict mediators in accordance with Law n.29/2013 of 19 April (Mediation Law).

(2015):

The given number in question 166 includes the mediators of the Ministry of Justice' registered public systems mediation and mediators of the Peace Courts. In addition to this number there are 234 accredited conflict mediators in accordance with article 9 (1) (e) of Law No. 29/2013, of 19 April (Mediation Law), regulated by Ministerial Ordinance No. 344/2013, of 27 November.

Please acknowledge that registered public system mediators and mediators of the Peace Courts can also be accredited conflict mediators but not the other way around.

Romania

(2021): The data were communicated by the Mediation Council, reflecting the pace of the authorization process as a mediator by the Mediation Council (which may register fluctuations from year to year), of persons who meet the conditions provided by law. The decrease in the number of mediators is caused by withdrawals or suspensions of mediators' authorizations (possibly because of the low number of requests for mediation).

(2020): The data were communicated by the Mediation Council, reflecting the pace of the authorization process as a mediator by the Mediation Council (which may register fluctuations from year to year), of persons who meet the conditions provided by law.

(2019): The number of mediators accredited annually by the Mediation Council registers fluctuations, from year to year, being related most of the times to the legislative amendments brought to the mediation law, which can determine the increase in the number of persons requesting the accreditation as mediator, after the training courses required by law.

(2016): Regarding the variation registered in the number of authorizations granted to the mediators during the period 2014-2016, we mention that this was due to the legislative changes in the field of mediation occurred during that period.

(2013): The increase of the number of mediators in 2012 and 2013 comparing to 2010 is a result of the legislative reforms, stimulating the ADR.

(2012): The increase of the number of mediators in 2012 and 2013 comparing to 2010 is a result of the legislative reforms, stimulating the ADR.

Slovak Republic

(2021): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 84 Probation officers located on District Courts.

(2020): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

(2019): In criminal matters is mediation provided by the 81 Probation officers located on District Courts.

(2018): In previous cycles the number of registered mediators provided by the Ministry of Justice included all persons listed in the register of mediators, including those who has been stroke out of a list or suspended. For this evaluation cycle we can provide the number of active registered mediators.

(2012): In 2012, all disciplinary proceedings against lawyers were initiated on the basis of alleged breach of professional obligations laid down by the Act on the Legal Profession or the Code on Professional Conduct for Lawyers. A criminal offence committed by a lawyer (who was found guilty by the criminal court in final judgment) is the reason for suspension or disbarment under the Act on the Legal Profession. However, it is not an issue of disciplinary proceedings.

Slovenia

(General Comment): The procedures for listing (and un-listing) individual medators are led by individual courts.

(2021): The procedures for listing (and un-listing) individual mediators are led by individual courts.

Spain

(2021): The figure provided is the addition of number of mediators (natural persons), Institutions of mediation, Mediators in insolvency cases and Mediators in insolvency cases (legal persons); all of them registered in the Registry of Mediators.
This Registry is not compulsory for civil cases, so the number of persons that act as mediatos may be higher.

(2020): The figure provided is the number of mediators (natural and legal persons) registered in the Registry of Mediators.
This Registry is not compulsory, so the number of persons that act as mediatos may be higher.
Mediation does not have a long tradition in Spain. However, it has good legislative support, and broad institutional support (for example, from the General Council of the Judiciary).
The Draft Law on Procedural Efficiency Measures contains rules that will enhance it (such as providing that the attempted solution be a prior procedural requirement).

(2019): The figure indicated is the sum of [Mediators + Insolvency mediators + Institutions of Mediation + Legal Persons Insolvency
mediators] registered in the Registry of Mediation of the Ministry of Justice.
The registry is not compulsory and there are other Registries in Autonomous Regions.

(2018): The figure indicated is the sum of [Mediators + Insolvency mediators + Institutions of Mediation + Legal Persons Insolvency mediators] registered in the Registry of Mediation of the Ministry of Justice.
The registry is not compulsory and there are other Registries in Autonomous Regions. Therefore, the figure is not a complete and perfect national data.

(2017): The data indicates the number of natural persons registered as Mediators and Mediators on Insolvency, in the Registry of Mediators and Mediation Institutions. (Registration is not compulsory).
Moreover, there are 123 Institutions of Mediation, and other 132 legal persons registered as Mediators on Insolvency. Law 5/2012 on mediation in civil and commercial matters regulated mediation. The Royal Decree 980/2013, develops the previous Law and creates the Register of Mediators and Mediation Institutions. Registration in the Register is voluntary, therefore, its figures are still indicative. But in general the regulation offers a better structuring of the Mediation Institution and a progressive improvement of the quality of the data. Moreover, Mediation is being developed and implemented more and more, both by public initiatives and by professional Associations.

(2016): In the Registry of the Ministry of Justice there are 1160 private mediators registered who work in the whole territory. The mediation takes place out of Courts. The Court during the first hearing informs to the parties about the possibility of going to mediation, and can suspend the procedure if the parties decide to try the mediation.
The registry mentioned is voluntary (not mandatory), so the figure is a posible approximation. The number of Institutions of Mediation is 66.

(2015): The approval in 2012 of the Act on mediation in civil and commercial matters could have influence on the increase in the number of mediators.

Question 167

Austria

(2021): Datewarehouse (register data of the case management application “Verfahrensautomation Justiz”). There is no data available if the settlement agreements are the results of court-related mediations. Parties may agree on a settlement agreement without mediation.

(2020): Datewarehouse (register data of the case management application “Verfahrensautomation Justiz”). There is no data available if the settlement agreements are the results of court-related mediations. Parties may agree on a settlement agreement without mediation.

Belgium

(2021): The Federal Mediation Commission does not have data on the number of court related mediation procedures.

(2020): We do not have figures on the number of mediations per year in Belgium.

(2017): Federal Mediation Commission

(2016): There are no official statistics

(2014): In 2014, there has been 2 763 resolved criminal mediation procedures.

(2012): In 2012, the number of mediation proceedings initiated in criminal matters was 6 352, according to the 2012 annual activity report of the Directorate General of the Court House. The number of resolved mediation proceedings in criminal matters was 2 800, according to the College of Public Prosecutors.

Croatia

(2021): Ministry of Justice and Public Administration

Cyprus

(2020): court registry

Czech Republic

(2021): Probation and Mediation Service

(2020): Probation and Mediation Service

(2019): There could be three types of outcomes: 1. settlement agreement - 659
2. partly settlement agreement (e.g. with one victim and not with the other one) - 64
3. non-agreement - 45
Source:Probation and Mediation Service

(2018): There could be three types of outcomes: 1. settlement agreement - 602
2. partly settlement agreement (e.g. with one victim and not with the other one) - 48
3. non-agreement - 31
Source:Probation and Mediation Service

(2017): Mediation in criminal cases is mostly voluntary. The decrease in the number of mediations is mainly due to the decrease in the number of cases in the pre-trial proceedings to which Probation and Mediation Service (PMS) has entered. The enters of probation officers into the pre-trial proceedings is mostly dependent on the available capacities of the staff PMS that they can allocate for the selection, the preparing and the implementation of mediation. PMS and her employees are overloaded by the control of alternative sanctions such as probation and community sanctions, which they are delegated directly by the court. This causes a decreasing of the enters into the pre-trial proceedings and thus a decreasing of the numbers of mediations. Source:
Probation and Mediation Service

(2016): Probation and Mediation Service

Denmark

(General Comment): Data above all relates to the district courts. The two High Courts also mediate a small number of cases, but due to data problems from a new system to deal with civil cases, the Western High Court wrote in their annual report, that they were unable to see from the system how many cases they had where mediation was used. Therefor Danish Court Administration ignores the two High Courts. There are data breaches as to see when a case surpasses to mediation. In the new Civil system that was introduced gradually from September 2017 to February 2018, data on surpasses can only be seen when the case is finalized. Before we could see it when the case surpassed to mediation. The transition does not give problems to measure finished mediation as in both the new and the old civil system, a mediation is finished when it is finished. The data breach gives some problems to measure number of finished court-related mediations as this figure is combined by finished cases and cases where mediation was abandoned. The abandoned cases are first measured when the cases are finished in the court system with a court decision and not when they were first abandoned. In the figure for “number of finished court-related mediations”, Danish Court Administration has ignored cases where the parties did not meet at least one time. Danish Court Administration have 5 so-called private criminal cases. In Denmark, there is no procedure for mediation of criminal cases, but private criminal cases may be mediated. Private criminal cases are cases where private legal entities (people or companies) sue others for criminal offenses. It seems that earlier data are only data of mediation where the mediation ended up with an agreement. Now the questions from CEPEJ both include start of mediation, finished court-related mediation and number of cases where an agreement is obtained.

(2021): https://www.domstol.dk/media/0sxivq1d/retsmaegling-2021.pdf
Data above all relates to the district courts. In the Civil system can only be seen when the case is finalized. Before we could see it when the case surpassed to mediation. The abandoned cases are first measured when the cases are finished in the court system with a court decision and not when they were first abandoned. In the figure for “number of finished court-related mediations”, Danish Court Administration has ignored cases where the parties did not meet at least one time.

(2020): Data is not available.

(2019): Please note that the definitions have been changed. Mediation is now measured when the case is finalized. So the number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation is therefore the same as the number of cases of finished court-related mediations. It should also be noted that it is not a possibility in general to mediate a criminal case. What is included here is ONLY criminal cases dealt with in the Civil court.

(2017): The figures in the table relate only to judge mediations.
Total amount of cases that has been transferred to a mediation process in 2017 is 1130 (both judge and attorney mediations). Mediation in district courts is 1031. Mediation in appeal courts is 99. The number for the appeal courts does not state what type of case. Question 1+2+3+4+5 is therefore only completed with district courts numbers. 528 of the 1130 cases has been finalized with an agreement due to mediation. Source:
http://www.domstol.dk/om/talogfakta/statistik/Documents/Civile%20sager/2017/Civile%20sager_byretter%202017%20-%20retsmægling.pdf and statistics from the Danish Court Administration
Concerning the sub-category "criminal cases" the data refers to privately prosecuted criminal cases which are subject to the same process as civil cases (acc. the Justice Administration Act § 989). This means that mediation will be offered in this type of criminal cases as well.

(2016): At the level of district courts, 548 cases are finalized with an agreement. The total encompasses also 40 cases before the two High Courts. The source concerning "Civil and commercial cases" and "Family cases" is the Danish Court Administration. Please note that a focus area and project for the Courts of Denmark in 2015 and 2016 was ADR. Desired outcomes were to extend people's knowledge of ADR as an alternative to court rulings and orders, to lower the case processing time and to reach better solutions. The project identified 3 main action areas: more cases should be settled through judicial mediation, uniformity in the process prior to the settlement of a case through ADR and knowledge of ADR is disseminated both internally and externally in the courts. The implementation and communication during and after this project has increased public awareness and the increase in the number of mediation proceedings is a results of these efforts.

(2014): In 2014, as regards the number of administrative cases and employment dismissals cases, these are included in the category "civil cases". Judicial mediation procedures are not available in Denmark for criminal cases. Only the number of successful mediation proceedings is indicated within the table. The number of proposed mediation proceedings was the following: civil cases: 518; family cases: 294.

(2012): In 2012, in the district courts there were 962 mediation cases divided in civil cases and family cases. In addition,the two high courts had 185 mediation cases (included in the total) which are not divided per category. Only the number of successful mediation proceedings is indicated within the table. The number of proposed mediation proceedings was the following: civil cases: 600; family cases: 338.

Estonia

(General Comment): Data on the number of court-related mediations are not recorded in any information system and are therefore not available.

Finland

(General Comment): Consumer cases are not statistically specified. The number of cases in which consumers are involved, are included in the number of the civil and commercial cases.

(2021): National Courts Administration and the Le-gal Reg-is-ter Cen-tres (ORK) / Case management database of the District Courts

(2020): National Courts Administration

(2019): The National Courts Administration is currently working on improving the method of calculating the numbers related to mediation. Therefore, the numbers given this year are not strictly compatible with last years numbers. With this new calculation method the number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation would in 2018 have been 2255 cases. The number of finished court-related mediations includes cases in which the mediation has started before 2019 and which have been concluded 2019. The number of civil and commercial cases include all other cases than those in the section 2 and 4 in which the parties agreed to start mediation. Consumer cases are not statistically specified. The number of cases in which consumers are involved, are therefore included in the number of the civil and commercial cases. Number of cases in which there is a settlement agreement include only the cases in which full settlement has been reached. However, it is typical that there are partial settlements. So, the number of of settlements in total, including cases in which there is a partial settlement (and some minor issue t.eg legal costs has been forwarded back to civil proceedings) is 1773.

(2018): The number of finished court-related mediations includes cases in which the mediation has started before 2018 and which have been concluded 2018.

France

(General Comment): In criminal matters, mediation does not strictly speaking lead to a settlement. In fact, in the event of successful mediation, the public prosecutor's office will close the case on the grounds of successful "criminal mediation". If the mediation fails, the prosecutor's office takes over the prosecution, based on the opportunity principle, and can decide to prosecute the perpetrator in court.

(2021): It is useful to recall here that a voluntary project has been launched in the field of mediation at the initiative of the judge before the administrative courts, with each court having to reach a quantified objective of mediations proposed by the judge and accepted by the parties (but without any obligation to see these mediations lead to an agreement, which the court does not control. The objective is, over the period 2019-2022, to reach approximately 2000 mediations initiated by the judge before the administrative courts (i.e. approximately 1% of the entries of the TA and CAA).
As regards administrative justice, the data come from the Council of State.

(2020): "We have started a voluntarist project in the field of mediation at the initiative of the judge before the administrative jurisdiction, each jurisdiction having to reach a quantified objective of mediations proposed by the judge and accepted by the parties (but without obligation to see these mediations leading to an agreement, which the jurisdiction does not control. The objective is, over the period 2019-2022, to reach about 2000 mediations initiated by the judge before the administrative courts (i.e. about 1% of the entries of the TA and CAA).
Source : highest administrative Court "

(2018): Statistics 2017 for family mediation
General Secretariat of the Council of State for Administrative Affairs
For successful criminal mediation (alternative procedures to prosecution), the data in 2018 are 7656, down from 2016, which had 9894 data, without any explanation on this evolution. In labour law cases, there are 8220 resolved cases after conciliation between the parties.

(2017): General Secretariat of the Council of State

Germany

(2014): Statistics on the situation given in the Federal Republic exist only for court-internal mediations/proceedings before a conciliation judge. The latter have been performed in 2013 before the civil courts, family courts, administrative courts, labour courts, social courts, and finance courts. Judges sitting on court-internal mediation proceedings have no authority to hand down a decision. However, the statistics on the situation given in the Federal Republic do not reflect any cases in which parties are instructed to pursue out-of-court mediation.

Greece

(2021): Question 167 was answered by justStat of the Ministry of Justice.

(2020): In question 167 it is impossible to collect statistics for the following reasons. If it is a mediation of law 4640/2019, the minutes are not submitted to any public authority or file, but to the competent courts and are probably not recorded in a file. It is much more impossible to distinguish between such cases. In the case of judicial mediation under Article 214b of the Code of Civil Procedure, this information can only be gathered by the competent courts.

(2017): As mentioned in Q163-1, the substantial application of Law 4446/2016 started to take effect during 2017, therefore, there were 1782 judicial mediations in administrative cases.

Hungary

(2021): Consumer cases are included in category 1 "civil and commercial cases".

(2020): Consumer cases are included in category 1 "civil and commercial cases".

(2019): Administrative cases (nr.3.) and consumer cases (nr.6.) are included in category civil and commercial cases (nr.1.)

(2018): Consumer cases are included in the category "civil and commercial cases".
National Office for the Judiciary

(2016): National Office for the Judiciary

Ireland

(General Comment): In Ireland we don't have court ordered mediation, as per section 16 of the Mediation act 2017: Courts may invite parties to attend mediation (but it is not mandated or ordered). For this reason, and in the absence of the establishment of the mediation council, there is currently no central area for recording data on mediation. When the mediation council is established, we hope we can provide this data.

Italy

(General Comment): In Italy one party may initiate a mediation procedure and the other party may decide to take part to it or not. To clarify things, please consider that in 2021 in Italy 267.270 mediation proceedings were initiated. Both parties showed up at the first mediation meeting in 83.256 cases. Please also note that these figures refer to private mediation. For some matter subjects the mediation is mandatory and it is managed by private mediation companies. Please note that the above figures refer to mediation procedures monitored by the Ministry of Justice. In Italy, there is a plethora of different forms of ADR procedures and some are not so widespread. Court-related mediations do exist for both family cases and labour cases but such mediation proceedings are not monitored by the Ministry of Justice. In 2020 the procedures subject to mediation were extended to the disputes related to COVID.

(2020): Mediation is not provided for administrative justice (NAP). The other forms of mediation are provided by bodies external to the judiciary (e.g. Corecom) and therefore they do not fall under the control/vision of the Ministry of Justice. In 2020 the numbers are deeply affected by the Pandemic. If we look at the first half of 2021, we can already see a “recovery” in this respect.

(2019): In Italy one party may initiate a mediation procedure and the other party may decide to take part to it or not. To clarify things, please consider that in 2019 in Italy 256.311 mediation proceedings were initiated. Both parties showed up at the first mediation meeting in only 72.664 mediation proceedings. Please also note that these figures refer to private mediation. For some matter subjects the mediation is mandatory and it is managed by private mediation companies. Please note that the above figures refer to mediation procedures monitored by the Ministry of Justice. In Italy, there is a plethora of different forms of ADR procedures and some are not so widespread. Court-related mediations do exist for both family cases and labour cases but such mediation proceedings are not monitored by the Ministry of Justice.

(2018): Figures for this question cannot be compared between 2018 and previous years. The current answer reflects the way the question has been rephrased compared to 2016. In 2016 it read “Number of judicial mediation procedures” whereas in 2018 it was changed into “Number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation”.In Italy one party may initiate a mediation procedure and the other party may decide to take part to it or not. To clarify things, please consider that in 2018 in Italy 258.786 mediation proceedings were initiated. Both parties showed up at the first mediation meeting in only 76.569 mediation proceedings. Please also note that these figures refer to private mediation. For some matter subjects the mediation is mandatory and it is managed by private mediation companies. Please note that the above figures refer to mediation procedures monitored by the Ministry of Justice. In Italy, there is a plethora of different forms of ADR procedures and some are not so widespread. Court-related mediations do exist for both family cases and labour cases but such mediation proceedings are not monitored by the Ministry of Justice; this is why they were not considered in 2016.

(2017): Please amend the "Civil and commercial case" time series as follows:
Year 2014: 295010
Year 2015: 300455
Year 2016: 269988
Year 2017: 263263
The figures provided during the last few years did not include all mediation agencies. In particular, there was one mediation agency which was not included in our analysis because it was considered (from a statistical perspective) an outlier. After an investigation of the inspection body we recognize that there are no ground to keep this agency out of the analysis.

(2016): The Department of Statistics and Organizational Analysis (within the Ministry of Justice) periodically publish reports on mediation procedures on its website:
https://webstat.giustizia.it/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/Analisi%20e%20ricerche/forms/mediazione.aspx
The latest reports are available in English as well.
The 2016 data has been up-dated in order to reflect data from all mediation agencies in Italy (the previous data (183977) did not include one mediation agency).

(2014): The Department of Statistics and Organizational Analysis of the Ministry of Justice periodically publishes reports on mediation procedures on its
website:https://webstat.giustizia.it/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/Analisi%20e%20ricerche/forms/mediazione.aspx

(2012): The Department of Statistics and Organizational Analysis of the Ministry of Justice periodically publishes reports on mediation procedures on its
website:https://webstat.giustizia.it/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/Analisi%20e%20ricerche/forms/mediazione.aspx

Latvia

(2020): Source for question 166 – Council of Certified Mediators (https://sertificetimediatori.lv/mediatori/)

(2018): Ministry of Justice

Lithuania

(2021): family, labor and consumer cases are civil cases, so the number of cases in these respective categories is subtracted from the total number of civil cases. LITEKO

(2020): Observing the general trend of court proceedings, it can be seen that in 2020, compared to the previous year, the number of family law cases (due to divorce, child support, etc.) decreased significantly: 15,709 cases were examined (18,066 in 2019; 18,564 in 2018). It is believed that it was mandatory mediation (the requirement to initiate mediation proceedings in such cases before applying to the court for the settlement of a family dispute) that allowed to reduce the number of cases in court and court-related mediations.
The decrease in the number of completed mediation proceedings in 2020 compared to the previous year is thought to be due to an overall decrease in the number of court cases received (the number of civil cases heard in district and regional courts (I instance) decreased by 6% in 2020 compared to 2019 and was 13.646% less than in 2018). The reduction in numbers may also have been influenced by the restrictions imposed following the quarantine in the country following the COVID-19 pandemic, the lack of court hearings and judicial mediation proceedings.

(2019): As a result of mediation publicity campaigns conducted by the Ministry of Justice, the National Judicial Administration and other entities, those who go to court have more and more information about the possibility of resolving a dispute amicably through judicial mediation. Participants in the proceedings receive an explanation of the possibility to use judicial mediation together with the procedural documents. Judges also explain the essence of mediation to the parties in the cases before them and suggest the use of judicial mediation procedure (such an obligation is enshrined in law).
On 1 March 2019 the provisions of the Law on Administrative Proceedings of the Republic of Lithuania entered into force, enabling administrative disputes to be resolved with the help of judicial mediation. Judicial mediation is possible for an administrative dispute that allows the parties to enter into an amicable settlement under the law.
In order to positively assess the contribution of judges to the promotion of judicial mediation processes and the involvement of judges in judicial mediation, in 2019 the procedure for evaluating the performance of judges has been updated, which provides that during the evaluation of a judge's performance he may be awarded a certain amount of points for his activities as a mediator, the number of cases transferred to mediation by the judge is also taken into consideration.
It should be noted that family, labour cases and consumer cases, as well as civil and commercial cases, are heard by courts of general jurisdiction (in Lithuania there are no specialized courts for these cathegories of cases).

(2018): It should be noted that family, labour cases and consumer cases, as well as civil and commercial cases, are heard by courts of general jurisdiction (in Lithuania there are no specialized courts for these cathegories of cases).

(2017): The total number of judicial mediation procedures increased due to the more frequent use of this type of a procedure (in all fields - civil and commercial law, family law, labour law).
The number of judicial mediation procedures concerning civil and commercial cases increased because the judicial mediation becomes more popular.

(2016): The number of judicial mediation procedures concerning civil and commercial cases increased because the judicial mediation becomes more popular.

(2014): Judicial mediation is available in civil cases, where an agreement can be reached (family cases are treated as civil cases). As a matter of fact, 60% of the judicial mediation cases were family cases, 12% were cases on compensation of damages and loss, 10% - cases on property rights, 8% - employment cases.

(2012): There is no possibility to deliver accurate statistical data about cases in courts, in which the mediation was applied in 2012 (only 44 courts out of 67 replied). Pursuant to these data, in 17 cases the mediation procedure has been started in 2012. It should be noted that some of the courts have actively reconciled the parties in civil cases during the hearing: according to the data of the survey, there were signed 397 peace treaties in 2012 (not during the mediation procedure).

Luxembourg

(2020):
"Criminal Mediations: JUCHA, 2021
"

(2019): Criminal mediations: JUCHA, 2019

(2018): Criminal mediations: JUCHA 2008

Malta

(2021): The answers in Question 167.1 reflect Court-referred mediation and not voluntary mediation (outside a court context). Throughout 2021, 7 new cases were sent to mediation by the court, 3 of which were unsuccessful, 3 were revoked by the court and 1 was successful.

(2019): The Malta Mediation Centre received for the first time in 2019, the first case at mediation according to Art 10.2 of the Chp 579 Media and Defamation Act. This case was actually filed in court in 2018 but was then referred for mediation in 2019, and it is still ongoing.

(2017): This data has been provided by the Mediation Coordinator at the Family Court.

Netherlands

(2021): A total of 65,4% of finished mediations ended in a settlement (either completely, or partially).
For criminal cases, 83,3% of finished mediations ended in a settlement (either completely or partially).
https://jaarverslagrechtspraak.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2022/05/Jaarverslag-Rechtspraak-2021.pdf#page=56

(2020): Lower numbers in 2020 are due to the corona pandemic, as not al mediations can be done digitally, for example. Raad voor de rechtspraak en gerechten (Judicial Council and the Courts). https://jaarverslagrechtspraak.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/04/Jaarverslag-Rechtspraak-2020.pdf#page=45

(2019): Data are produced by Judicial Council and courts

(2018): Mediation has been promoted for many years in the Netherlands. In that sense nothing special happened in 2017/2018. In 2018 a new program started to promote mediation in criminal cases. The rise of the number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation may be explained by the implementation of this program . The data are produced by the Judicial council and the Courts

(2017): The indicated data refers to the number of mediation procedures started in 2017. The number of completed mediation procedures for this year is 2 316.

(2016): The Council of Judiciairy annual report 2016. The categorization in our source is different from the categorization above, so we cannot give the breakdown.
The indicated data refers to the number of mediation procedures started in 2016. The number of completed mediation procedures for this year is 2 326.

(2012): In 2012, the number of mediations decreased because in January 2011 the so called ‘mediation incentive contribution’ of € 200 stopped.

Poland

(2020): Mediation proceedings based on statistical data - regional and district courts in the years 2006-2020) – developed by the Ministry of Justice.
*In accordance with the regulation which is contained in the Ordinance of the Council of Ministers of March 31, 2020 on the establishment of restrictions, orders and prohibitions in relation with the COVID19 epidemic, in the period from March 31, 2020, the performance of tasks by common courts was limited due to remote work and quarantine of employees of court departments. Mediation can be conducted in any case in the field of labour law, in which it is possible to sign a settlement, and most labour matters belong to this category. In the period 2019-2020 (at the time when an up-ward trend was observed), they mainly concerned conflicts that could have been influenced by remote work, e.g. lack of accurate, correct communication and direct contact between employees. That is why labour courts began to direct disputes towards an ADR methods, indicating that mediation may not only faster finish a case, but also be more financially attractive, which - as the data shows - resulted in a greater interest in this method of alternative dispute resolution in employee matters, as well as parties to conclude agreements.
*In 2020 total impact of cases before common courts was lower by 21.1% compared to 2019. The reduced impact of cases was caused among others by the COVID19 epidemic and related limitations. Limitations related to the pandemic have also affected the prisons and custodies closings, where mediation takes place after the sentence, representing a large percentage of mediation in criminal cases. Courts, in order not to extend the proceedings, resigned from referring cases to mediation.

(2019): "Postępowanie mediacyjne w świetle danych statystyczych – sądy rejonowe i okręgowe w latach 2006-2019" (eng. Mediation proceedings based on statistical data - regional and district courts in the years 2006-2019) – developed by the Ministry of Justice
There are no separate statistics for cases involving consumer cases. Such cases are classified as civil cases.

(2018): There are no separate statistics for cases involving consumer cases. Such cases are classified as civil cases.

(2017): Information gathered by the Managerial Statistical Information Division in Department of the Strategy and European Funds in Ministry of Justice
https://isws.ms.gov.pl/pl/baza-statystyczna/publikacje/download,2779,7.html With regard to administrative cases: Supreme Administrative Court – Information about activities of Administrative Courts in 2017
http://www.nsa.gov.pl/download.php?plik=1551

(2016): The number of mediation procedure increased significantly caused by implemented changes in law, esspecially in Code of Civil Procedure. We can notice that percentage of mediation cases raise in relation to cases in which mediation procedure can be apply.

Portugal

(2021): Directorate General of Justice Policy (Ministry of Justice)

(2020): Directorate-General for Justice Policy - Ministry of Justice

(2019): The total number of cases doesn't include data on criminal cases. This number is protected by statistical confidentiality.
Data on criminal cases is protected by statistical confidentiality.
Data on consumer cases is included in civil and commercial cases.

(2018): As for the years 2016 and 2017, we have provided the numbers, according to the Justice Statistics – Directorate-General for Justice Policy - and these statistics do not include the number of cases for which parties agreed to start mediation, but only the number of procedures that were concluded with a mediation agreement in a given year. For 2018, we have called upon another statistic source - the annual report of the Council of the Courts of Peace – which provides indeed the number of cases for which parties agreed to start mediation in the courts of peace. Concerning "family cases", the numbers are correct, since the indicated number of finished court-related mediations also include procedures that had begun in 2017, but were concluded in 2018, whereas the number of cases for which the parties agreed to start such mediation only refers to 2018.

(2017): 167.2 -The number of family mediation has decreased in 2017. In 2016 the number had increased as a result of the entry into force of the General Regime of the Civil Juvenile Procedure (RGPTC) which established that the judge had to determine the intervention of either the family mediation system or send the parties to a technical hearing if they couldn´t reach an agreement. After the entry into force of this new legal framework, as judges became familiar with the new procedure, they are forwarding more cases to the technical hearings instead of mediation. In addition, the number of family cases brought to court has decreased, as well as the direct requests for mediation from the parties.
167.5 - In 2017, for reasons of statistical disclosure, data is protected due to the small number.

(2016): Directorate-General for Justice Policy - Ministry of Justice

Romania

(2021): Although we cannot offer a total of the cases of court-related mediation, divided into the categories above, according to the statistical system in the field (which is ongoing at this moment), we could extract a number of 476 mediation agreement authorized by the court (2021) on December 31, of which 188 in stock/ pending cases (on December 31, 2020) and 288 received/incoming cases during 2021.
Background and legislation elements (remain valid from the last cycle):
The control of the state regarding the mediation is indirect and it concerns the agreement concluded by the parties after following the mediation procedure – such an agreement constitutes an act under private signature. In order to become an authentic act, it has to be authenticated by the notary public or authorized by the court. Thus, if the conflict has already been submitted to a court, the settlement by mediation of such a case can be possible at the initiative of the involved parties or at the recommendation of the court and accepted by the parties, concerning rights the parties can dispose over in accordance with the legal provisions. Mediation can deal with the total or partial settlement of the concerned litigation. The court shall, on the request of the parties, issue a decision in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code regarding the expedient court decision.
According with the provisions of article 59 para. 2 of the Law no. 192/2006, the parties to the mediation agreement may go to court to request, in compliance with the legal proceedings, to give a decision to legalize their understanding. Competence shall lay with the court in whose jurisdiction any of the parties have their domicile or residence or, where appropriate, the head office or the court of first instance in whose jurisdiction is located the place where it has been signed mediation agreement. The decision whereby the court consents on the understanding between parties shall be delivered in the council room and shall be an enforcement order under the law. The provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law no 134/2010 (New Civil Procedure Code), republished, as amended, shall apply accordingly.
Mediation in case of a dispute before the law courts, according with the provisions of article 61 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006. in case the conflict was brought to justice, its settlement by mediation may take place at the initiative of the parties or at the proposal of any of them or on the recommendation of the court, concerning the rights which the parties may enjoy under the law. Mediation may have as subject settlement of all or part of the dispute. The mediator may not charge fees for informing the parties. Also, according with the provisions of art. 63 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006, in case the matter has been settled by means of mediation, the court shall deliver, at the request of the parties and in compliance with the requirements of law, a judgment, the provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law No 134/2010, republished, as amended, being applied accordingly.

(2020): Although we cannot offer a total of the cases of court-related mediation, divided into the categories above, according to the statistical system in the field (which is ongoing at this moment), we could extract a number of 614 mediation agreement authorized by the court (2020).
Background and legislation elements (remain valid from the last cycle):
The control of the state regarding the mediation is indirect and it concerns the agreement concluded by the parties after following the mediation procedure – such an agreement constitutes an act under private signature. In order to become an authentic act, it has to be authenticated by the notary public or authorized by the court. Thus, if the conflict has already been submitted to a court, the settlement by mediation of such a case can be possible at the initiative of the involved parties or at the recommendation of the court and accepted by the parties, concerning rights the parties can dispose over in accordance with the legal provisions. Mediation can deal with the total or partial settlement of the concerned litigation. The court shall, on the request of the parties, issue a decision in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code regarding the expedient court decision.
According with the provisions of article 59 para. 2 of the Law no. 192/2006, the parties to the mediation agreement may go to court to request, in compliance with the legal proceedings, to give a decision to legalize their understanding. Competence shall lay with the court in whose jurisdiction any of the parties have their domicile or residence or, where appropriate, the head office or the court of first instance in whose jurisdiction is located the place where it has been signed mediation agreement. The decision whereby the court consents on the understanding between parties shall be delivered in the council room and shall be an enforcement order under the law. The provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law no 134/2010 (New Civil Procedure Code), republished, as amended, shall apply accordingly.
Mediation in case of a dispute before the law courts, according with the provisions of article 61 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006. in case the conflict was brought to justice, its settlement by mediation may take place at the initiative of the parties or at the proposal of any of them or on the recommendation of the court, concerning the rights which the parties may enjoy under the law. Mediation may have as subject settlement of all or part of the dispute. The mediator may not charge fees for informing the parties. Also, according with the provisions of art. 63 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006, in case the matter has been settled by means of mediation, the court shall deliver, at the request of the parties and in compliance with the requirements of law, a judgment, the provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law No 134/2010, republished, as amended, being applied accordingly.

(2018): Although we cannot offer a total of the cases of court-related mediation, divided into the three categories above, according to the statistical system in the field (which is ongoing at this moment), we could extract a number 1070 mediation agreement authorized by the court (2018) Background and legislation elements:
The control of the state regarding the mediation is indirect and it concerns the agreement concluded by the parties after following the mediation procedure – such an agreement constitutes an act under private signature. In order to become an authentic act, it has to be authenticated by the notary public or authorized by the court. Thus, if the conflict has already been submitted to a court, the settlement by mediation of such a case can be possible at the initiative of the involved parties or at the recommendation of the court and accepted by the parties, concerning rights the parties can dispose over in accordance with the legal provisions. Mediation can deal with the total or partial settlement of the concerned litigation. The court shall, on the request of the parties, issue a decision in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code regarding the expedient court decision.
According with the provisions of article 59 para. 2 of the Law no. 192/2006, the parties to the mediation agreement may go to court to request, in compliance with the legal proceedings, to give a decision to legalize their understanding. Competence shall lay with the court in whose jurisdiction any of the parties have their domicile or residence or, where appropriate, the head office or the court of first instance in whose jurisdiction is located the place where it has been signed mediation agreement. The decision whereby the court consents on the understanding between parties shall be delivered in the council room and shall be an enforcement order under the law. The provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law no 134/2010 (New Civil Procedure Code), republished, as amended, shall apply accordingly.
Mediation in case of a dispute before the law courts, according with the provisions of article 61 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006. in case the conflict was brought to justice, its settlement by mediation may take place at the initiative of the parties or at the proposal of any of them or on the recommendation of the court, concerning the rights which the parties may enjoy under the law. Mediation may have as subject settlement of all or part of the dispute. The mediator may not charge fees for informing the parties. Also, according with the provisions of art. 63 para. 1 of the Law no. 192/2006, in case the matter has been settled by means of mediation, the court shall deliver, at the request of the parties and in compliance with the requirements of law, a judgment, the provisions of articles 438 - 441 of the Law No 134/2010, republished, as amended, being applied accordingly.

(2016): There are no statistics on the number of mediation procedures (Council of Mediation)

Slovak Republic

(2019): Ministry of Justice of the Slovak republic

Slovenia

(General Comment): Under category “1. Civil and commercial cases”, all mediation cases at local and district courts are reported (including family cases and consumer cases).

(2021): The number of finished mediations and settlement decreased from 2019 to 2020 (by 22% and 26% respecitvely; due to the impact of Covid-19 pandemics) and increased in 2021 (by 23% and 33% respectively). The number of mediations and settlements in 2021, compared to 2019, stayed roughly the same.

(2017): Data source: The Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse.
Data source: The Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse. The figures represent resolved mediation cases (no matter what was the outcome of mediaton). The category 1. Civil cases includes family cases. The figure at the category 4. Employment dismissals cases is the number of mediations at the labour and social courts and includes employment dismissal cases.

(2016): Data source: The Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse.
The figures represent resolved mediation cases (no matter what was the outcome of mediaton). The category 1. Civil cases includes family cases. The figure at the category 4. Employment dismissals cases is the number of mediations at the labour and social courts and includes employment dismissals cases.
The difference (decrease) in number of mediation cases compared to 2014 can be partially due to decrease in number of incoming court cases (see Q91). In 2016, the mediation was offered in 7.969 civil and 1.475 labour cases.

(2014): The figures represent resolved mediation cases (no matter what was the outcome of mediation). The category 1. Civil cases includes family cases. The figure at the category 4. Employment dismissals cases is the number of mediations at the labour and social courts and includes employment dismissals cases.
In 2014, the mediation was offered in 10.854 civil and 2.003 labour cases.
Differences to 2012: in 2012, data was reported by the Ministry of Justice, since 2014 the data source is the Supreme Court`s Data Warehouse.

(2012): The 2012 data show rising trends of readiness of parties to use judicial meditation and capacities of the courts to supply it. The area of judicial mediation and alternative resolution procedures in general has been the focus of legislative changes in 2009 according to which courts of first and second instances had to adopt mediation procedures.

Spain

(2021): Judicial Statistics department (General Council for the Judiciary)

(2020): Given the severe restrictions between March and May of 2020, the pandemic is a possible explanation of the decreased number of court-related mediation proceedings in respect of all legal matters.

(2017): The figures indicate the files transferred by Courts to mediation procedures. There is not data about issues directly solved in mediation before starting the judicial proceeding.
The advancement in the implementation of mediation explains the increase in the number of “civil and commercial cases” on the one hand and “criminal cases” on the other hand. There are no specific reasons explaining the decreases in the number of mediation procedures concerning family law cases and employment dismissal cases.

(2016): A reform of the Civil Procedural Law in 2015, introduced certain obligations of the Court and of the Judge to inform the parties about the possibility to bring the case to mediation. Accordingly, the number of civil and commercial cases, as well as the number of family cases increased in a significant way between 2014 and 2016. No particular explanation can be provided in respect of the decrease in the number of judicial mediation procedures in criminal matters.

(2014): In 2014, regarding labour cases, 460 609 mediation procedures were conducted prior to the initiation of cases before the labour courts, but there is not specific data available about the employment dismissals cases.

(2012): In 2012, regarding labour matters, 12 725 cases were diverted to mediation, 3 464 granted an agreement, but there was no data available on employment dismissals cases. As for criminal matters, 1 166 cases were diverted to mediation during the instruction phase and 16 953 cases were diverted to mediation before the Criminal Court.

Annex 2

Extract of the CEPEJ Scheme for evaluating judicial system

Click below to open the file

CEPEJ Scheme for evaluating judicial system

Annex 3

Extract of the explanatory note to the scheme for evaluating judicial system

Click below to open the file

Explanatory note to the scheme for evaluating judicial system

Annex 4

Definitions of the Clearance Rate (CR) and the Disposition Time (DT)

The CEPEJ has chosen to develop performance indicators of courts at the European level. The GOJUST Guidelines[1] invite the member states to organise their data collection system so as to be able to provide the relevant information for calculating such indicators. The first indicator is the Clearance Rate. This allows a useful comparison even though the parameters of the cases concerned are not identical in every respect. This indicator can be used to see if the courts are keeping up with the number of incoming cases without increasing their backlog. The second indicator is the calculated Disposition Time. By making use of a specific calculation method, it is possible to generate data concerning the estimated time that is needed to bring a case to an end. This method can provide relevant information on the overall functioning of the courts of a state or entity. Gradually, the report of the CEPEJ will enable a comparative evaluation of the functioning of judicial systems in dealing with case-flows coming in and going out of the courts.

Clearance Rate (CR)

The Clearance Rate is a simple ratio, obtained by dividing the number of resolved cases by the number of incoming cases, expressed in a percentage:

$$Clearance\ Rate\ (\%) = \frac{Resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period}{Incoming\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 100$$

A Clearance Rate close to 100 % indicates the ability of the court or of a judicial system to resolve approximately as many cases as the number of incoming cases within the given time period. A Clearance Rate above 100 % indicates the ability of the system to resolve more cases than those received, thus reducing the number of pending cases at the end of the measurement period, including any existing backlog. Finally, a Clearance Rate below 100 % appears when the number of incoming cases is higher than the number of resolved cases. In this case, the total number of pending cases will increase.

Essentially, the Clearance Rate shows how the court or the judicial system is coping with the in-flow of cases. It allows comparisons even when the parameters of the cases concerned in different countries are not identical in every respect.

Disposition Time (DT)

The calculated Disposition Time measures the theoretical time necessary for a pending case to be solved in court in the light of the current pace of work of the courts in that country or entity.
The Disposition Time is obtained by dividing the number of pending cases at the end of the observed period by the number of resolved cases within the same period multiplied by 365 (days in a year):

$$Calculated\ Disposition\ Time = \frac{Number\ of\ pending\ cases\ at\ the\ end\ of\ a\ period}{Number\ of\ resolved\ cases\ in\ a\ period} \times 365$$

The conversion into days simplifies the understanding of the relation between pending and resolved cases within a period. The calculated Disposition Time would show, for example, that the time necessary for solving a pending case has increased from 120 days to 150 days. This allows comparisons within the same jurisdiction over time and, with some prudence, between judicial systems in different countries or entities. It is also relevant for assessing court efficiency in this regard in the light of established standards for the length of proceedings.

It should be noted that this indicator is not a calculation of the average time needed to process a case but a theoretical estimate of the time needed to process pending cases. However, the indicator fails to show the mix, concentration, or merits of the cases. Thus, for example, if the ratio indicates that pending cases will be processed in 90 days, some cases might be solved on the 10th day and others on the 90th day. Case level data of the actual duration of cases from functional ICT systems is needed in order to review these details and make a full analysis. In the meantime, this formula may offer valuable information on the estimated maximum duration of cases that are still pending.

PDF ISBN 978-92-76-98603-4 DOI 10.2838/52091 DS--07-23-026-EN-N

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2023